

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S194.001	Thomson Survey Ltd	General / Process	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas, I believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural Hazards chapter can be included.	Amend the location of the Coastal Hazard rules by transferring them along with the Standards out of the Coastal Environment chapter and into the Natural Hazards chapter. Insert a cross reference in the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part
FS446.002	Omata Estate		Support	Support request to locate coastal hazard rules in Natural Hazards Chapter as this will achieve a clearer framework in the Plan.	Allow	Amend the location of the Coastal Hazard rules by transferring them along with the Standards out of the Coastal Environment chapter and into the Natural Hazards chapter. Insert a cross reference in the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.	Accept in part
FS547.003	Heron Point Limited		Support	Support request to locate coastal hazard rules in Natural Hazards Chapter. This will assist future users with easily locating all natural hazards provisions	Allow	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate drafting	Accept in part
FS305.003	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Support request to locate coastal hazard rules in Natural Hazards Chapter. This will assist future users with easily locating all natural hazards provisions	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
S391.001	Phill Grimshaw	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Provisions should enable the ability for people to exercise their existing use rights, where rebuilding a house 'like for like' and which result in effects which are the same or similar in character, intensity, and scale	Insert additional provisions which allow residents within the district to develop a house/building/activity in accordance with Section 10 of the RMA 1991 (certain existing uses in relation to land protected) despite the hazard overlays which may apply to their properties		Reject
S477.013	Te Waka Pupuri Putea Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	As Kaitiaki, we are and have been acutely aware of the degradation of Papatuanuku (Earth mother) and all living things between her and Ranginui (Sky Father) and the unavoidable consequences that can be generally categorised as Climate Change issues since pre-colonial times until present.	Amend the Plan as required to be forward-thinking regarding climate-related issues as the geography of our rohe makes us more susceptible to these issues and their potentially dire consequences		Accept in part
S359.009	Northland Regional Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Recent updates from the Ministry for the Environment indicate that sea level is rising faster than anticipated. The Proposed Plan	Amend the planning maps to align with updated NRC hazard maps (inferred)		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				should therefore consider the potential for updating of NRC hazard maps and working with NRC to reflect new understanding of the issue.			
FS24.66	Lynley Newport		Support in part	Whilst the most up to date hazard mapping is essential, there is a process issue to be considered. the Council cannot simply change maps - the issue is district wide and any updates or changes to hazard mapping would need to go through the full Schedule 1 plan change process every time there is a change. If there are immediate changes sought by the NRC, then the hazards section of the PDP and associated maps would have to be re-notified.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
FS67.11	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The submission by the NRC seeks to introduce new Hazards Mapping without showing the specific effect of that relief on properties, or providing proper justification, including under section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.12	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The submission by the NRC seeks to introduce new Hazards Mapping without showing the specific effect of that relief on properties, or providing proper justification, including under section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS143.67	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	The submission by the NRC seeks to introduce new Hazards Mapping without showing the specific effect of that relief on properties, or providing proper justification, including under section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.11	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The submission by the NRC seeks to introduce new Hazards Mapping without showing the specific effect of that relief on properties, or providing proper justification, including under section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS25.053	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the intent of providing direction that provides a clear statement of how communities will respond to climate change.	Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to appropriate wording.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS446.005	Omata Estate		Oppose	Any mapping that has potentially greater impacts on property needs to be fully tested and a full analysis and planning process is required to determine the best methods to address updated information. A further hazards mapping plan change may be required to ensure a clear and consistent approach to hazard management throughout the region and Far North District.	Disallow	retain	Accept in part
FS66.11	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The submission by the NRC seeks to introduce new Hazards Mapping without showing the specific effect of that relief on properties, or providing proper justification, including under section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS23.099	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	With the introduction of the Climate Change and National Adaption Plans last year it is appropriate to include provisions relating to climate change, and to ensure other provisions take into account climate change to the extent relevant.	Allow	Allow the relief sought by making changes to make appropriate provision for climate change.	Accept in part
FS243.002	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kainga Ora original submission sought the River Flood Hazard Area maps be removed from the FNPDP and placed in a non-statutory layer available via a GIS viewer. This is a consistent approach to identify such hazards countrywide and provides for regular updates to hazard information without the requirement to go through Plan Changes to update the planning maps.	Allow	Allow original submission	Accept in part
FS547.006	Heron Point Limited		Oppose	Reject Submission. Any mapping that has potentially greater impacts on property needs to be fully tested and a full analysis and planning process is required to determine the best methods to address updated information. A further hazards mapping plan change may be required to ensure a clear and consistent approach to hazard	Disallow	Amend	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				management throughout the region and Far North District.			
FS305.006	Dempsey Family Trust		Oppose	Any mapping that has potentially greater impacts on property needs to be fully tested and a full analysis and planning process is required to determine the best methods to address updated information. A further hazards mapping plan change may be required to ensure a clear and consistent approach to hazard management throughout the region and Far North District.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS325.033	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT supports the intent of providing direction that provides a clear statement of how communities will respond to climate change.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate wording.	Accept in part
FS570.1045	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
FS346.470	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
FS566.1059	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
FS569.1081	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
S559.027	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	Many of our Māori land blocks and marae are coastal or in low lying areas (Takou, Tapuaetahi, Te Tii) impacted by the new coastal hazard zones. The impacts of strict rules could have major consequences on our ability to live on our whenua and generate wealth.	Amend to align with submission #407 by Tapuaetahi Incorporation regarding the natural hazards and coastal environment chapters (inferred).		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS151.335	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.2217	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS348.054	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part
FS566.2231	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2253	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S521.006	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	A pop-out window in the PDP map, entitled News Feed - How to use the Eplan, points out that the coastal and flooding hazard maps in the draft plan are out of date, and asks users to check the updated NRC Natural Hazards Maps on NRC website. However, the sections of the PDP that refer to flooding and natural hazards do not provide the above warning to users. As a result, people may use out-of-date mapping information. The PDP section should refer specifically to the most recent NRC Natural Hazards maps, and PDP maps should be updated regularly, as soon as possible.	Amend PDP to apply the <i>precautionary approach</i> with regard to mapped inland flood and coastal hazards, areas to take account of longer-term changes expected from climate change, as well as the limitations in mapping.		Reject
FS243.009	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kāinga Ora seeks to support the delivery of market, affordable, papakāinga and other types of housing developments that are resilient to climate change impacts. Kāinga Ora original submission sought the River Flood Hazard Area maps be removed from the FNPDP and placed in a non-statutory layer available via a GIS viewer. This is a consistent approach to identify such hazards countrywide and provides for regular updates to hazard information	Allow in part	Amend	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				without the requirement to go through Plan Changes to update the planning maps. Kāinga Ora supports the use of the most updated data through GIS mapping. At the same time, further investigation is necessary to understand the hazard risk and mitigation measures planned or in place			
FS566.1716	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S529.052	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	A pop-out window in the PDP map, entitled News Feed - How to use the Eplan, points out that the coastal and flooding hazard maps in the draft plan are out of date, and asks users to check the updated NRC Natural Hazards Maps on NRC website. However, the sections of the PDP that refer to flooding and natural hazards do not provide the above warning to users. As a result, people may use out-of-date mapping information. The PDP section should refer specifically to the most recent NRC Natural Hazards maps, and PDP maps should be updated regularly, as soon as possible.	Amend PDP to apply precautionary approach with regard to mapped inland flood and coastal hazard areas, to take account of longer-term changes expected from climate change, as well as the limitations in mapping.		Reject
FS243.017	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kāinga Ora seeks to support the delivery of market, affordable, papakāinga and other types of housing developments that are resilient to climate change impacts. Kāinga Ora original submission sought the River Flood Hazard Area maps be removed from the FNPDP and placed in a non-statutory layer available via a GIS viewer. This is a consistent approach to identify such hazards countrywide and provides for regular updates to hazard information without the requirement to go through Plan Changes to update the planning maps. Kāinga Ora supports the use of the most updated data through GIS mapping. At the same time, further investigation is necessary to understand the hazard risk	Allow in part	Amend	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and mitigation measures planned or in place.			
FS570.1941	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1955	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1977	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S483.109	Top Energy Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	Top Energy supports the creation of resilient communities, responding to and managing risk from natural hazards to ensure the health, safety and wellbeing of Northland residents, and highlights the critical contribution which connection to electricity provides in terms of enabling this. Top Energy seeks a number of amendments to provisions in this chapter to facilitate this.	Amend wording to ensure adequate enablement of electricity infrastructure as set out in submission.		Accept in part
FS345.160	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
S601.004	Kingheim Limited	COASTAL HAZARD AREA	Oppose	Reference to Coastal Flood Hazard Zones 2 and 3 includes errors in the event horizon (it includes reference to water levels at 2080 including sea level rise, which should be corrected to refer to 2130 including sea level rise), for consistency with the T&T report as the origin document - Coastal Flood Hazard Assessment for Northland Region 2019-2020.	Amend definition of 'Coastal Hazard Area' so that the Coastal Flood HazardZone 2 and 3 relate to the 2130 timeline (as opposed to the 2080 timeline) as follows: means areas of coastal erosion hazard and coastal flooding hazard mapped by the Northland Regional Council and included in the District Plan maps as follows: 1. Coastal Flood Hazard Zone 1 (CFHZ1) - extent of the 50-year ARI static water level at 2080 including 0.6 m sea level rise (RCP8.5M)). 2. Coastal Flood Hazard Zone 2 (CFHZ2) -		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					extent of the 100-year ARI static water level at 2130 2080 including 1.2 m sea level rise (RCP8.5M). 3. Coastal Flood Hazard Zone 3 (CFHZ3) - extent of the 100-year ARI static water level at 2130 2080 including 1.5 m sea level rise (RCP8.5H+).	
S502.005	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	LAND SUSCEPTIBLE TO INSTABILITY	Support in part	Clarification is needed in regards to point 7. Does this mean if earthworks have occurred within 20m of a development area that the land automatically falls into this category? In the event this is captured we seek relief that this be further clarified as rule EW-S7 requires that earthworks must not result in any instability of land at or beyond the boundary of the property where the earthworks occur. This means that if you are undertaking earthworks within 20m of a site boundary which now includes digging a trench, putting in place a pile etc. that you cannot comply with this standard.	Amend the definition of Land Susceptible to Instability point 7 to clarify relationship with rule EW-S7	Accept in part
S561.007	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	RIVER FLOOD HAZARD AREA	Support in part	Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to this definition. While it is understood that the Council wish to clearly identify this natural hazard, Kāinga Ora seeks the removal of this hazard from the District Plan maps and its placement in a non-statutory layer available via a GIS viewer. This is a consistent approach to identify such hazards countrywide and provides for regular updates to hazard information without the requirement to go through Plan Changes to update the planning maps.	Amend the definition as follows: River Flood Hazard Area: means areas of river flooding mapped by the Northland Regional Council and included in the District Plan maps shown in the Council's publicly available online GIS viewer as follows: [remainder of definition to be retained as notified] Include the following Note beneath the definition: Note: The Council holds publicly available information showing the modelled extent of river flood hazard areas affecting specific properties in its GIS	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<p>viewer. The river flood hazard area map is indicative only although Council accepts its accuracy with regard to land shown on the floodplain map as being outside the floodplain. A party may provide the Council with a site specific technical report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced person to establish the extent, depth and flow characteristics of the floodplain. When taking account of impervious areas that would arise from changes in land use enabled by the policies and zonings of the Plan, recognition should be given to any existing or planned flood attenuation works either existing or planned in an integrated catchment management plan. Council will continually update the floodplain map to reflect the best information available.</p>		
FS32.061	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>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>			
FS23.279	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject
FS47.021	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	<p>The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.</p> <p>Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document</p>	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept
FS348.094	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S407.007	Tapuaetahi Incorporation	Overview	Support in part	The proposed approach will allow for more certainty for landowners within the coastal hazard zones on the site when rebuilding structures which meet the requirements of s10 and s20 of the Act [inferred].	Amend Natural Hazard overview to: Existing Use Rights Landowners have the ability to exercise existing use rights under s10 and s20 of the RMA in relation to re-building structures which meet the requirements of these parts of the Act.	Reject
S512.019	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Overview	Support in part	Wildfire can pose significant risk to property and life. Fire and Emergency support the mitigation measures FNDC have noted. However, we consider that this should not apply solely to new subdivisions but all development.	amend Overview Ensuring adequate water supplies are available for firefighting purposes, appropriate setbacks from vegetation and suitable access for firefighting in new subdivisions. Include reference to the Fire Plan for Northland, Te Hiku in the overview of the chapter.	Accept
S561.028	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Overview	Support in part	These definitions are more appropriate to be included in the Definitions chapter of the Plan, therefore it is sought that these are deleted from the Overview section of the Natural Hazards chapter. These should be included in the Definitions section of the Plan.	Amend the Overview section of the Natural Hazards chapter as follows: River Flooding Hazards Within areas of flooding, coastal erosion and coastal inundation mapped by the Northland Regional Council and included in the District Plan maps as follows: Flood Hazard Areas 1 in 10 Year River Flood Hazard Area the area potentially susceptible to river flooding in a 10% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) / 10Yr Average Return Interval (ARI) storm event. 1 in 100 Year River Flood Hazard Area the area potentially susceptible to river flooding in a 1% AEP / 100Yr ARI storm event plus climate change. Coastal Hazard Areas (including High Risk Coastal Hazard Area comprising of CFZ1 and CEZ1) Coastal Flood	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<p>Zone 1 (CFHZ1) – extent of the 50-year ARI static water level at 2080 including 0.6 m sea level rise (RCP8.5M). Coastal Flood Zone 2 (CFHZ2) – extent of the 100-year ARI static water level at 2080 including 1.2 m sea level rise (RCP8.5M). Coastal Flood Zone 3 (CFHZ3) – extent of the 100-year ARI static water level at 2080 including 1.5 m sea level rise (RCP8.5H+). Coastal Erosion Zone 1 (CEHZ1) – an area potentially susceptible to coastal erosion (66% probability) by 2080 with 0.33 m sea level rise from 2019 – (RCP 8.5M). Coastal Erosion Zone 2 (CEHZ2) – an area potentially susceptible to coastal erosion (5% probability) by 2130 with 0.85 m sea level rise from 2019 – (RCP 8.5M). Coastal Erosion Zone 3 (CEHZ3) – an area potentially susceptible to coastal erosion (5% probability) by 2130 with 1.17 m sea level rise from 2019 – (RCP 8.5H+). Land Instability Land that is susceptible to instability hazards. Land is identified at subdivision through the application of geological information, slope and other criteria as defined in Definitions. Wildfire Ensuring adequate water supplies are available for firefighting purposes, appropriate setbacks from vegetation and suitable access for firefighting in new subdivisions.</p>	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS32.082	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS349.008	Northland Regional Council		Oppose	<p>Removal of River Flood Hazard Maps from the Proposed District Plan would lead to land subject to hazards not being identified within the Plan. This could weaken the ability to appropriately manage development within flood affected areas. It would also be inconsistent with direction in the Regional Policy Statement.</p>	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS23.300	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</p>	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.			
FS47.042	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept in part
FS348.115	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part
S421.064	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Overview	Support	Federated Farmers supports the accurate mapping of the flood and coastal hazard areas and would expect engagement to occur to the relevant impacted landowners who are located within those areas. We support the use of the precautionary approach in respect of natural hazards. The approach taken by the Council is consistent with regional and national policy documents as well as what is being done internationally. Federated Farmers also supports the approach proposed by the Council that the focus will be placed on vulnerable activities (e.g., liveable dwellings) and it will be these activities that will have the more stringent plan controls	Retain the Overview or wording with similar effect		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				placed on them. Federated Farmers supports enabling non-liveable farm ancillary buildings as permitted activities within the natural hazard areas as long as this has been clearly communicated to the landowners along with the associated risks of doing so. This means the landowner is fully informed when they make the decision to locate ancillary buildings that have a functional need to be located in or around coastal and flood hazard areas.			
FS570.1296	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
FS346.298	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
FS566.1310	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
FS569.1332	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S601.002	Kingheim Limited	Overview	Support in part	The 'River Flooding Hazards' section of the Natural Hazard Chapter Overview would be more relevantly named 'Flooding Hazards' since its 'definitions' cover both fluvial and coastal flooding. (inferred)	Amend 'River Flooding Hazards' section of the overview of the Natural Hazards Chapter to be more relevantly named ' Flooding Hazards ' in the Natural Hazard Chapter Overview. (inferred)		Accept in part
S601.003	Kingheim Limited	Overview	Oppose	Reference to Coastal Flood Hazard Zones 2 and 3 includes errors in the event horizon (it includes reference to water levels at 2080 including sea level rise, which should	Amend the 'overview' section of the Natural Hazards chapter so that the Coastal Flood Hazard Zones 2 and 3 to relate to the 2130 timeline (as opposed to		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				be corrected to refer to 2130 including sea level rise), for consistency with the T&T report as the origin document - Coastal Flood Hazard Assessment for Northland Region 2019-2020.	the 2080 timeline) as follows: <i>Coastal Hazard Areas (including High Risk Coastal Hazard Area comprising of CFZ1 and CEZ1</i>	
S512.020	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Objectives	Support	Fire and Emergency have an interest in the natural hazards chapter insofar as to ensure that the District Plan adopts a risk-based approach to hazard management and manages land use in areas subject to natural hazard. Managing land use in relation to hazards and the consequences of climate change will reduce the incidence of, and associated risk to life and property, and prevent or limit injury, damage to property, land and the environment. This will enable Fire and Emergency to carry out its requirements under the Fire and Emergency Act more effectively	retain objectives	Accept in part
S516.004	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	Objectives	Support	Ngā Tai Ora support the creation of resilient communities, responding to and managing risk from natural hazards to ensure the health, safety and wellbeing of Northland residents. Ngā Tai Ora is generally supportive of the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter to the extent that they give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement (RPS) and take into account the long-term effects of climate change.	Retain the Objectives to the extent that they give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement and take into account the long-term effects of climate change	Accept in part
S516.043	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	Objectives	Not Stated	Ngā Tai Ora support the creation of resilient communities, responding to and managing risk from natural hazards to ensure the health, safety and wellbeing of Northland residents. Ngā Tai Ora is generally supportive of the Natural Hazards chapter to the extent that they give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement and take into account the long-term effects of climate change, including the influence	Amend Natural Hazards objectives, policies and rules to appropriately give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement which seeks to manage subdivision, use and development to minimise the risk from natural hazards.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of climate change on people. The PDP must acknowledge and minimise the risks and impacts of natural hazards, including the influence of climate change, on people, property and infrastructure, consistent with objective 3.13 Natural hazard risk of the Northland Regional Policy Statement.			
S483.110	Top Energy Limited	Objectives	Support	Top Energy supports the acknowledgement of the functional and operational need for infrastructure to be located in areas subject to natural hazards. However, Top Energy also seeks acknowledgment through an objective for the operation, maintenance, repair and upgrade requirements on existing infrastructure within hazard mapped areas to specifically acknowledge the need to provide for existing infrastructure within hazard mapped areas. Inclusion of such a policy will align with/provide a direct link to NH-P10	Insert new objective as follows (or to the same effect): Operation, maintenance, repair and upgrade of existing infrastructure is enabled to ensure a resilient and reliable network.		Reject
FS196.199	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Reject
FS36.051	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support	Supports the need for a new objective to provide for the operation, maintenance, repair and upgrade of existing infrastructure to ensure a resilient and reliable State Highway network.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS345.161	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
S407.008	Tapuaetahi Incorporation	NH-01	Support in part	The proposed approach will allow for more certainty for landowners within the coastal hazard zones on the site when rebuilding structures which meet the requirements of s10 and s20 of the Act [inferred].	Amend NH-01 to: The risks from natural hazards to people, infrastructure and property are managed, including taking into account the likely long-term effects of climate change, to ensure the health, safety and resilience of communities, noting that existing use rights may apply in certain situations.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S356.043	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NH-01	Support	not stated	Retain NH-01 as notified	Accept in part
S454.070	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	NH-01	Support	Transpower supports the inclusion of this policy in the FNPD.	Retain NH-01	Accept in part
S399.037	Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust	NH-01	Not Stated	Cultural and heritage sites are also at risk from natural hazards (for example coastal urupā or particular coastal trees). The maintenance of these sites is important to tangata whenua because they are seen as a physical connection to tūpuna.	Amend Objective NH-01 as follows: The risks from natural hazards to people, infrastructure and property and cultural and heritage resources are managed, including taking into account the likely long-term effects of climate change, to ensure the health, safety and resilience of communities.	Accept in part
FS51.274	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT fully supports the need to highlight that cultural and heritage places are also at risk and should be recognised and addressed.	Allow	Accept in part
S561.029	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-01	Support	The objective acknowledges the real impacts both natural hazards and climate change can have on any urban growth and development, enabling management tools to be put in place.	Retain NH-01 as notified.	Accept in part
FS32.083	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	Disallow Disallow the original submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>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>			
FS23.301	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part
FS47.043	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	<p>The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.</p> <p>Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document</p>	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject
FS348.116	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S421.065	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-01	Support	Federated Farmers supports objectives NH-01 to NH-04 as currently drafted.	Retain Objective NH-01 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept in part
FS534.012	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	WBFL agrees with retention of this objective, particularly the focus on "managing" natural hazard risk, rather than an outright avoidance approach.	Allow	Retain Objective NH-01	Accept in part
FS570.1297	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
FS346.299	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
FS566.1311	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
FS569.1333	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
S407.009	Tapuaetahi Incorporation	NH-02	Support in part	The proposed approach will allow for more certainty for landowners within the coastal hazard zones on the site when rebuilding structures which meet the requirements of s10 and s20 of the Act [inferred].	Amend NH-02 to: Land use and subdivision does not increase the risk from natural hazards or risks are mitigated, and existing risks are reduced where there are practicable opportunities to do so, noting that existing use rights may apply in certain situations.		Reject
S561.030	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-02	Support	This new approach by FNDC to address risks from natural hazards is supported. The increasing risk from natural hazards due to climate change must be managed	Retain NH-02 as notified.		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and this objective provides the framework for new provisions within the plan to address this risk.			
FS32.084	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject
FS23.302	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
FS47.044	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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			
FS348.117	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
S421.066	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-02	Support	Federated Farmers supports objectives NH-O1 to NH-O4 as currently drafted.	Retain Objective NH-O2 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept
FS534.013	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	WBFL agrees with retention of this objective, particularly the focus on "mitigating" natural hazard risk and reducing risk where practicable. These qualified directives are superior to an outright avoidance approach towards risk.	Allow	Retain Objective NH-O1	Accept
FS570.1298	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
FS346.300	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
FS566.1312	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
FS569.1334	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
S561.031	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-03	Support	This objective provides the framework to enable necessary infrastructure while balancing this need with the risk of natural hazards.	Retain NH-03 as notified.		Accept
FS32.085	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
FS369.316	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy supports the retention of this objective	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and seeks the inclusion of a new objective to provide for existing infrastructure			
FS23.303	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
FS47.045	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
FS348.118	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject
S356.044	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NH-03	Support	not stated	Retain NH-03 as notified		Accept
FS369.312	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy supports the retention of this objective and seeks the inclusion of a new objective	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				to provide for existing infrastructure			
S416.030	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	NH-03	Support	Recognition that in some instances there are operational and functional needs for activities to locate within hazard areas, is supported. The rail network has been in place for many years and for various operational reasons, is unable to be easily relocated to avoid such hazard areas.	Retain Objective NH-03		Accept
FS369.313	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy supports the retention of this objective and seeks the inclusion of a new objective to provide for existing infrastructure	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part
S421.067	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-03	Support	Federated Farmers supports objectives NH-01 to NH-04 as currently drafted. In particular, we support objective NH-03 which recognises that there may be a functional need for new infrastructure to be located within identified hazard areas.	Retain Objective NH-03 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept
FS369.314	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy supports the retention of this objective and seeks the inclusion of a new objective to provide for existing infrastructure	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part
FS570.1299	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
FS346.301	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
FS566.1313	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	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						inconsistent with our original submission	
FS569.1335	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
S454.071	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	NH-03	Support	Transpower supports the inclusion of this objective in the FNPDP.	Retain NH-03		Accept
FS369.315	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy supports the retention of this objective and seeks the inclusion of a new objective to provide for existing infrastructure	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part
S561.032	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-04	Support	Kāinga Ora support this objective which provides the framework for policies and rules supporting natural defenses above man-made defenses against hazard risks.	Retain NH-04 as notified.		Accept
FS32.086	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.			
FS23.304	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
FS47.046	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
FS348.119	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
S421.068	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-04	Support	Federated Farmers supports objectives NH-01 to NH-04 as currently drafted.	Retain Objective NH-04 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept
FS570.1300	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	
FS346.302	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
FS566.1314	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
FS569.1336	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
S512.021	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Policies	Support	Fire and Emergency have an interest in the natural hazards chapter insofar as to ensure that the District Plan adopts a risk-based approach to hazard management and manages land use in areas subject to natural hazard. Managing land use in relation to hazards and the consequences of climate change will reduce the incidence of, and associated risk to life and property, and prevent or limit injury, damage to property, land and the environment. This will enable Fire and Emergency to carry out its requirements under the Fire and Emergency Act more effectively	retain policies		Accept in part
S516.005	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	Policies	Support	Ngā Tai Ora support the creation of resilient communities, responding to and managing risk from natural hazards to ensure the health, safety and wellbeing of Northland residents. Ngā Tai Ora is generally supportive of the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter to the extent that they give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement (RPS)	Retain the Policies to the extent that they give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement and take into account the long-term effects of climate change		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and take into account the long-term effects of climate change.		
S516.044	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	Policies	Not Stated	Ngā Tai Ora support the creation of resilient communities, responding to and managing risk from natural hazards to ensure the health, safety and wellbeing of Northland residents. Ngā Tai Ora is generally supportive of the Natural Hazards chapter to the extent that they give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement and take into account the long-term effects of climate change, including the influence of climate change on people. The PDP must acknowledge and minimise the risks and impacts of natural hazards, including the influence of climate change, on people, property and infrastructure, consistent with objective 3.13 Natural hazard risk of the Northland Regional Policy Statement.	Amend Natural Hazards objectives, policies and rules to appropriately give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement which seeks to manage subdivision, use and development to minimise the risk from natural hazards.	Accept in part
S486.088	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	Policies	Support	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa would like to highlight that community adaptation to the effects of climate change, which should be part of the planning response to RMA s7(i). Possible methods of adaptation, such as managed retreat from hazard risk areas, are not addressed in the PDP. This new policy is intended to introduce those issues, and needs to be supported by methods of implementation, including an allocation of funding by council.	Insert a new policy as follows: 5 Adaptation to climate change. Increase the ability of the community to adapt to the effects of climate change by ensuring the potential environmental and social costs of climate change, including effects on indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage, mahinga kai, public health and safety, public access to the coast and waterway margins, and the built environment are known and addressed.	Reject
S390.074	Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust	Policies	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of a new policy as community adaptation to the effects of climate change, should be part of the planning response to RMA s7(i). Possible methods of adaptation, such as managed retreat from hazard risk areas,	Inserts a new policy to read as follows: NH-P15 Adaptation to climate change. Increase the ability of the community to adapt to the effects of climate change by ensuring the potential environmental and social costs of climate change, including effects on indigenous biodiversity, historic	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				are not addressed in the PDP. This new policy is intended to introduce those issues, and needs to be supported by methods of implementation, including an allocation of funding by council.	heritage, mahinga kai, public health and safety, public access to the coast and waterway margins, and the built environment are known and addressed.		
S498.075	Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngapuhi	Policies	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of a new policy as community adaptation to the effects of climate change, should be part of the planning response to RMA s7(i). Possible methods of adaptation, such as managed retreat from hazard risk areas, are not addressed in the PDP. This new policy is intended to introduce those issues, and needs to be supported by methods of implementation, including an allocation of funding by council.	Inserts a new policy to read as follows: NH-P15 Adaptation to climate change. Increase the ability of the community to adapt to the effects of climate change by ensuring the potential environmental and social costs of climate change, including effects on indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage, mahinga kai, public health and safety, public access to the coast and waterway margins, and the built environment are known and addressed.		Reject
FS151.121	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS151.122	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS23.243	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provisions are consistent with Treaty principles and recognise and provide for Māori interests, including (but not limited to) appropriate economic development of their land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject
S559.052	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
FS151.361	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.2242	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
FS348.079	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.2256	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
FS569.2278	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S45.013	Puketona Business Park Limited	General	Support	Generally support the provisions of the Hazards chapter of the PDP as notified.	Retain the provisions of the Natural hazards chapter.		Accept in part
S94.004	Lynley Newport	General	Oppose	It is confusing when reading the Natural hazards chapter. At the end of the policies, one of which relates solely to Coastal Hazards (NH-P7), there is the statement that 'Coastal Hazard Rules are located in the Coastal Environment Chapter'. I am of the opinion that all natural hazard objectives, policies and rules should be in one place - in this instance the Natural Hazards Chapter.	Amend the Natural hazards chapter to transfer any provisions from the Coastal Environment section relating to hazards to the Natural Hazards chapter		Accept in part
FS446.014	Omata Estate		Support	Support the change sought.	Allow	Amend the Natural hazards chapter to transfer any provisions from the Coastal Environment section relating to hazards to the Natural Hazards chapter	Accept in part
FS547.002	Heron Point Limited		Support	Support request to locate coastal hazard rules in Natural Hazards Chapter. This will assist future users with easily locating all natural hazards provisions	Allow	Allow the Submission, subject to appropriate drafting	Accept in part
FS305.002	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Support request to locate coastal hazard rules in Natural Hazards Chapter. This will assist future users with easily locating all natural hazards provisions	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
S561.033	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-P1	Support in part	Kāinga Ora support this policy however seek that hazard maps are removed from the FNPDP and placed in a non-statutory layer. At the same time, further investigation into flood risk particularly given the significant extent experienced in	Retain NH-P1 as notified. Wording is general - Map or define areas that are known to be subject to the following natural hazards, taking into account accepted estimates of climate change and sea level rise: a. flooding;		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				parts of the District. This review should address the depth of flood waters, velocity, timing of flooding to identify locations of high risk and low risk and amend zoning in those locations accordingly.	b. coastal erosion; c. coastal inundation; and d. land instability.		
FS32.087	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS23.305	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS47.047	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept in part
FS348.120	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part
S407.010	Tapuaetahi Incorporation	NH-P2	Support in part	The proposed approach will allow for more certainty for landowners within the coastal hazard zones on the site when rebuilding structures which meet the requirements of s10 and s20 of the Act [inferred].	Amend NH-P2 to: Manage land use and subdivision so that natural hazard risk is not increased or is mitigated, giving consideration to the following: I. consideration of existing use rights.		Reject
S331.033	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NH-P2	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the policy NH-P2 and acknowledges the risk which natural hazards can pose on people, property and the environment. However, at times the Ministry also have an operational need to provide educational facilities to existing communities in environments susceptible to the growing pressures of natural hazard risk and climate change.	Amend policy NH-P2 as follows: Manage land use and subdivision so that natural hazard risk is not increased or is mitigated, giving consideration to the following: a. the nature, frequency and scale of the natural hazard; b. not increasing natural hazard risk to other people, property, infrastructure and the environment beyond the site; c. the location of building platforms and vehicle access; d. the use of the site, including by vulnerable activities;		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					e. the location and types of buildings or structures, their design to mitigate the effects and risks of natural hazards, and the ability to adapt to long term changes in natural hazards; f. earthworks, including excavation and fill; g. location and design of infrastructure; h. activities that involve the use and storage of hazardous substances; i. aligning with emergency management approaches and requirements; j. whether mitigation results in transference of natural hazard risk to other locations or exacerbates the natural hazard; and k. reduction of risk relating to existing activities; and l. the operational need for the activity to be located near or within, an area identified as being affected by a natural hazard.		
FS36.052	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support	Waka Kotahi also has an operational need to provide access to communities through areas affected by natural hazards and transport network. Therefore, supports the recognition of the operational need for infrastructure to be located near or within, an area identified as being affected by a natural hazard.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS78.013	Transpower New Zealand Limited		Support	The submitter considers this addition to the policy gives effect to Policy 3 of the NPSET.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS243.065	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that will contribute to Te Tai Tokerau being more responsive and resilient to natural hazards, including as these hazards evolve because of climate change. Kāinga Ora recognises the operational need for infrastructure to be located near or within, an area identified as being affected	Allow	Amend policy NH-P2 as follows:	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				by a natural hazard and that such infrastructure may be necessary to service housing.			
FS369.317	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy supports the provision for the functional and operational need of infrastructure.	Allow in part	Allow	Accept in part
S561.034	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-P2	Support	This policy provides the framework for new provisions within the plan to address the risks from natural hazards.	Retain NH-P2 as notified.		Accept in part
FS32.088	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.</p> <p>The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS23.306	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	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.			
FS47.048	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept in part
FS348.121	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part
S561.035	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-P3	Support	This new approach by FNDC to address risks from natural hazards is supported. This policy sets up the framework for rules to manage land use and subdivision in locations of natural hazards more appropriately than under the Operative Plan.	Retain NH-P3 as notified.		Accept
FS32.089	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	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>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>			
FS23.307	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	<p>Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.</p>	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept
FS47.049	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</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
				consent applications..... etc see FS document			
FS348.122	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
S561.036	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-P5	Support	This new approach by FNDC to address risks from natural hazards is supported. This policy sets up the framework for rules to manage land use and subdivision in locations of natural hazards more appropriately than under the Operative Plan.	Retain NH-P5 as notified.		Accept
FS32.090	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS23.308	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
FS47.050	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
FS348.123	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
S159.042	Horticulture New Zealand	NH-P6	Support in part	Non-habitable buildings are less of a risk and should be provided for, e.g. farm sheds and artificial crop protection structures	Amend Policy NH-P6 to include provisions for non-habitable buildings		Reject
FS151.202	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.204	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.218	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.240	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S561.037	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-P6	Support	Policy NH-P6 is consistent with Objectives NH-O1 and NH-O2 and supports rules to appropriately address river flood hazards.	Retain NH-P6 as notified.		Accept
FS32.091	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
FS23.309	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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.			
FS47.051	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject
FS348.124	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject
S94.001	Lynley Newport	NH-P6	Oppose	Policy NH-P6 reads as a rule, not a policy. A policy cannot "require" anything because it is not a rule. Parroting the Regional Policy Statement is not valid. That document is not a rules document in the first instance. It is far too specific and directive as a policy. The Council should be placing reliance on rules to achieve compliance and where compliance is not possible or practicable, then to achieve remedy and/or mitigation.	Amend Policy NH-P6 - <i>Manage land use and subdivision in river flood hazard areas to avoid, remedy or mitigate the risk from flood hazard to protect the subject site and its development, and other property, by requiring:</i> <i>a. subdivision applications to identify building platforms that will not be subject to inundation and material damage (including erosion) in a 1 in 100-year flood event;</i> <i>b. a minimum freeboard for all</i>		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<p>buildings designed to accommodate vulnerable activities of at least 500mm above the 1 in 100 year flood event and at least 300mm above the 1 in 100 year flood event for other new buildings;c. commercial and industrial buildings to be constructed so they will not be subject to material damage in a 1 in 100 year flood event;d. buildings within a 1 in 10 Year River Flood Hazard Area to be designed to avoid material damage in a 1 in 100 year flood event;e. storage and containment of hazardous substances so that the integrity of the storage method will not be compromised in a 1 in 100 year flood event;f. earthworks (other than earthworks associated with flood control works) do not divert flood flow onto surrounding properties and do not reduce flood plain storage capacity within a 1 in 10 Year River Flood Hazard area;g. the capacity and function of overland flow paths to convey stormwater flows safely and without causing damage to property or the environment is retained, unless sufficient capacity is provided by an alternative method; and h. the provision of safe vehicle access within the site.</p>		
FS547.017	Heron Point Limited		Support		Allow	Amend	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS305.032	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Inappropriate plan drafting.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
S94.003	Lynley Newport	NH-P7	Oppose	Policy NH-P7 includes typographical error in the heading	Amend heading to Policy NH-P7 - Coastal hazard		Accept
S407.011	Tapuaetahi Incorporation	NH-P7	Support in part	The proposed approach will allow for more certainty for landowners within the coastal hazard zones on the site when rebuilding structures which meet the requirements of s10 and s20 of the Act [inferred].	Amend NH-P7 to: Manage new land use and subdivision in coastal hazard areas so that: h. Existing use rights are appropriately considered.		Reject
S561.038	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-P7	Support	This policy supports rules to address Coastal Hazard risk management and is supported.	Retain NH-P7 as notified.		Accept
FS32.092	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS23.310	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
FS47.052	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
FS348.125	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject
S94.002	Lynley Newport	NH-P7	Oppose	Policy NH-P7 reads as a rule or standard, not a policy. It is far too specific and directive as a policy. The Council should be placing reliance on rules to achieve compliance and where compliance is not possible or practicable, then to achieve remedy and/or mitigation.	Amend Policy NH-P7 - <i>Manage new land use and subdivision in coastal hazard areas to avoid, remedy or mitigate the risk from coastal hazard to the subject site and its development and other property so that a new subdivision avoids locating building platforms within High Risk Coastal</i>		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<p>Hazard areas and building platforms should be located outside other coastal hazard areas where alternative locations are available and it is practicable to do so;b. new buildings containing vulnerable activities are not located within High Risk Coastal Hazard areas unless:i. there is no other suitable location available on the existing site;ii. hazard risks can be mitigated without the need for hard protection structures.c. where a building or building platform is located with a coastal hazard area, it should be designed and constructed such that:i. the building platform will not be subject to inundation and /or material damage (including erosion) over a 100-year timeframe; and eitherii. the finished floor level of any building accommodating a vulnerable activity must be at least 500mm above the maximum water level in a 1 percent AEP flood event plus 1m sea level rise; oriii. the finished floor level of any other building must be at least 300mm above the maximum water level in a 1 percent AEP flood event plus 1m sea level rise.d. hazard risk is not transferred to, or increased on, other properties;e. buildings, building platforms, access and services are located and designed to minimise the need for hard protection</p>	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					structures;f. safe vehicle access within the site is provided; andg. services are located and designed to minimise the risk of natural hazards.		
FS547.018	Heron Point Limited		Support		Allow	Amend	Accept
FS305.033	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Rules relating to Natural Hazards should only apply to the portion of the site over which the overlay applies.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept
S364.028	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	NH-P7	Support in part	The heading of this policy has a spelling error.	Amend Policy NH-P7 to correct " costal hazard" to " coastal hazard".		Accept
FS570.1109	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.168	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS566.1123	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1145	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
S333.008	P S Yates Family Trust	NH-P9	Support in part	The policy on wildfire protection should be targeted towards vulnerable activities only, consistent with the methods that implement the policy (ie rules NH-R5 and NH-R6).	Amend Policy NH-P9 as follows: Manage land use and subdivision that may be susceptible to wildfire risk by requiring the following for vulnerable activities: a. setbacks from any contiguous scrub or		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					shrubland, woodlot or forestry; b. access for emergency vehicles; and c. sufficient accessible water supply for firefighting purposes	
S168.015	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NH-P9	Oppose	The policy on wildfire protection should be targeted towards vulnerable activities only, consistent with the methods that implement the policy (i.e. rules NH-R5 and NH-R6)	Amend Policy NH-P9 as follows: Manage land use and subdivision that may be susceptible to wildfire risk by requiring the following for vulnerable activities: a. setbacks from any contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry; b. access for emergency vehicles; and c. sufficient accessible water supply for firefighting purposes	Accept
S222.007	Wendover Two Limited	NH-P9	Oppose	The policy on wildfire protection should be targeted towards vulnerable activities only, consistent with the methods that implement the policy (ie rules NH-R5 and NH-R6).	Amend Policy NH-P9 as follows: Manage land use and subdivision that may be susceptible to wildfire risk by requiring the following for vulnerable activities: a. setbacks from any contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry; b. access for emergency vehicles; and c. sufficient accessible water supply for firefighting purposes	Accept
S167.008	Bentzen Farm Limited	NH-P9	Oppose	The policy on wildfire protection should be targeted towards vulnerable activities only, consistent with the methods that implement the policy (ie rules NH-R5 and NH-R6).	Amend Policy NH-P9 as follows: Manage land use and subdivision that may be susceptible to wildfire risk by requiring the following for vulnerable activities: a. setbacks from any contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry; b. access for emergency vehicles; and c. sufficient accessible water supply for firefighting purposes	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS176.17	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited		Oppose	It is not clear what is meant by vulnerable activities making the relief sought uncertain. As a manager of large areas of plantation forests, SFNZ is concerned about changes in climate increasing the risk of wildfire and NZ's history of large wildfires being started outside of and spreading into afforested areas.	Disallow		Reject
FS354.087	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The focus of the policy on wildfire should be on vulnerable activities.	Allow	Allow S167.008	Accept
FS566.370	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Reject
S187.008	The Shooting Box Limited	NH-P9	Oppose	The policy on wildfire protection should be targeted towards vulnerable activities only, consistent with the methods that implement the policy (ie rules NH-R5 and NH-R6).	Amend Policy NH-P9 as follows: Manage land use and subdivision that may be susceptible to wildfire risk by requiring the following for vulnerable activities: a. setbacks from any contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry; b. access for emergency vehicles; and c. sufficient accessible water supply for firefighting purposes		Accept
FS547.121	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Allow	Amend	Accept
S243.017	Matauri Trustee Limited	NH-P9	Oppose	The policy on wildfire protection should be targeted towards vulnerable activities only, consistent with the methods that implement the policy (i.e. rules NH-R5 and NH-R6).	Amend Policy NH-P9 as follows: Manage land use and subdivision that may be susceptible to wildfire risk by requiring the following for vulnerable activities: a. setbacks from any contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry; b. access for emergency vehicles; and c. sufficient accessible water supply for firefighting purposes		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.575	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
FS566.589	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
FS569.611	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
S483.111	Top Energy Limited	NH-P10	Support	Top Energy supports this policy but notes that 'minor upgrade' is not a term defined in the Proposed Plan, and considers that this term should be removed from the policy and the threshold in the chapter relied on instead to establish what scale is deemed appropriate.	Amend Policy NH-P10 as follows: Provide for the operation, maintenance, and minor upgrading of existing infrastructure in identified natural hazard areas.		Accept
FS196.200	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept
FS36.053	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support	Waka Kotahi has a responsibility to maintain safe and reliable access to communities which includes upgrading existing highway infrastructure. Waka Kotahi concurs that the term minor should be removed from the policy and threshold in the chapter should be relied upon to determine what scale is appropriate.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept
FS345.162	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept
S561.039	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-P10	Support	This policy is consistent with objective NH-O3 and provides the framework for rules to enable necessary infrastructure while balancing this need with the risk of natural hazards.	Retain NH-P10 as notified.		Accept in part
FS32.093	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the	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
				<p>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>			
FS369.319	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to amend the policy to remove the limitation of "minor" upgrading	Allow in part	Amend	Accept
FS23.311	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part
FS47.053	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	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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			
FS348.126	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part
S356.045	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NH-P10	Support	not stated	Retain NH-P10 as notified		Accept in part
FS369.318	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to amend the policy to remove the limitation of "minor" upgrading	Allow in part	Amend	Accept
S561.040	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-P11	Support	This policy is consistent with objective NH-O3 as discussed above.	Retain NH-P11 as notified.		Accept
FS32.094	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	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>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>			
FS369.322	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy seeks to retain this policy as notified	Allow	Retain	Accept
FS23.312	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
FS47.054	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	<p>The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.</p> <p>Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document</p>	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS348.127	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
S483.112	Top Energy Limited	NH-P11	Support	Top Energy supports this policy	Retain Policy NH-P11		Accept
FS351.023	A.W and D.M Simpson		Oppose	Top Energy appears to be seeking discretion to override existing constrains the PDP endeavours to use to protect Notable trees	Disallow	Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP.	Reject
FS371.023	Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and its associated Hapu, Ngati Kawa, Te Ngare Hauata, Te Matarahurahu, Te Whanaurara, Ngati Kaihoro, Ngati Rahiri		Oppose	Top Energy appears to be seeking discretion to override existing constrains the PDP endeavours to use to protect Notable trees.	Disallow	Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP.	Reject
FS449.022	The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation		Oppose	Top Energy appears to be seeking discretion to override existing constrains the PDP endeavours to use to protect Notable trees.	Disallow	Status Quo. No change to wording or PDP	Reject
FS345.163	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
S356.046	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NH-P11	Support	not stated	Retain NH-P11 as notified		Accept
FS369.320	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy seeks to retain this policy as notified	Allow	Retain	Accept
S454.072	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	NH-P11	Support	Transpower supports the inclusion of NH-P11 (inferred) in the FNPDP.	Retain NH-P11 (inferred)		Accept
FS369.321	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy seeks to retain this policy as notified	Allow	Retain	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S364.029	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	NH-P12	Support	The Director-General supports Policy NH-P12	Retain Policy NH-P12		Accept
FS570.1110	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
FS346.169	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS566.1124	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
FS569.1146	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
S356.047	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NH-P13	Support	not stated	Retain NH-P13 as notified		Accept
S364.030	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	NH-P13	Support	The Director-General supports Policy NH-P13 as it gives effect to Policy 25 of the NZCPS which seeks to discourage hard protection surfaces and promote the use of alternatives (including natural defences).	Retain Policy NH-P13		Accept
FS225.6	Pacific Eco-Logic		Support	The policy assists with implementing NZCPS Policy 25, which seeks to discourage hard protection surfaces and promotes alternatives.	Allow		Accept
FS570.1111	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
FS346.170	Royal Forest and Bird		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.			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.			
FS566.1125	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
FS569.1147	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
S561.041	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-P13	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the use of natural systems and features to protect from natural hazards where practicable over hard protection structures.	Retain NH-P13 as notified.		Accept
FS32.095	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</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.			
FS23.313	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept
FS47.055	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP 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
FS348.128	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
S561.042	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-P14	Support	This policy is supported as it will provide for necessary ongoing maintenance and upgrading of flood management schemes.	Retain NH-P14 as notified.		Accept
FS32.096	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	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>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>			
FS23.314	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
FS47.056	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</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
				other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document			
FS348.129	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject
S484.001	James Phillips	Rules	Support in part	The PDP nor any of its supporting documents refer to Section 10 or Section 20 of the RMA as they relate to existing use rights. A provision should therefore be provided to allow for people to exercise their existing use rights.	Insert an additional permitted activity provision which allows for development of a house, building or activity in accordance with Section 10 of the RMA where effects are the same or similar in character, intensity and scale despite the application of a hazard overlay.		Reject
S428.005	Kapiro Residents Association	Rules	Support in part	Inland flooding: Climate change is expected to make Northland drier overall, however heavy downpours are likely to become more extreme. This will increase the risk of inland flooding in areas near rivers/waterways. Flooding and rising groundwater are likely to affect houses, domestic wastewater tanks and disposal fields, roads and access ways to houses, and other structures built on former flood plains or land that has been drained. Coastal inundation: The average global sea level is expected to continue rising for several centuries in future as a result of long-lived emissions from past decades alone (irrespective of sea level rise due to future emissions). A report by the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment in 2015 estimated that 1 in 100-year high water level events would occur very frequently in future - for example, every 4 years at the port of Auckland and once a year at Wellington and Christchurch ports. Furthermore, storm surges can add several tens of centimetres to high tides.	Amend the PDP to include stronger rules, including 'no build' areas, to prevent new buildings, wastewater systems, accessways, roads and other infrastructure in areas that are likely to be impacted by sea level rise, storm surges, flooding.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S480.001	Debbie and Chris Fewtrell	Rules	Oppose	The PDP nor any of its supporting documents refer to Section 10 or Section 20 the RMA (as they relate to existing use rights).	Amend to enable, as a permitted activity, the ability for people to exercise their existing use rights, where rebuilding a house 'like for like' and which result in effects which are the same or similar in character, intensity, and scale.		Reject
S385.016	McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited	Rules	Not Stated	McDonald's understand the importance of ensuring community safety when it comes to natural hazards. However, McDonald's considers that appropriate consideration needs to be given to existing development in both the 1 in 100 and 1 in 10 River Flood Hazard Areas.	Amend Natural Hazards chapter to provide more flexibility to additions and alterations of an appropriate scale for existing infrastructure within River Flood Hazard areas.		Accept
S516.045	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	Rules	Not Stated	Ngā Tai Ora support the creation of resilient communities, responding to and managing risk from natural hazards to ensure the health, safety and wellbeing of Northland residents. Ngā Tai Ora is generally supportive of the Natural Hazards chapter to the extent that they give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement and take into account the long-term effects of climate change, including the influence of climate change on people. The PDP must acknowledge and minimise the risks and impacts of natural hazards, including the influence of climate change, on people, property and infrastructure, consistent with objective 3.13 Natural hazard risk of the Northland Regional Policy Statement.	Amend Natural Hazards objectives, policies and rules to appropriately give effect to the Northland Regional Policy Statement which seeks to manage subdivision, use and development to minimise the risk from natural hazards.		Accept in part
S93.013	Lynley Newport	Rules	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer the rules from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part
FS446.015	Omata Estate		Support	Support the change sought.	Allow	Transfer the rules from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect	
FS547.001	Heron Point Limited		Support	Support request to locate coastal hazard rules in Natural Hazards Chapter. This will assist future users with easily locating all natural hazards provisions Allow the submission, subject to appropriate drafting	Allow	Allow	Accept in part
FS305.001	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Support request to locate coastal hazard rules in Natural Hazards Chapter. This will assist future users with easily locating all natural hazards provisions	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
S516.046	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	Rules	Not Stated	Ngā Tai Ora support the creation of resilient communities, responding to and managing risk from natural hazards to ensure the health, safety and wellbeing of Northland residents. Policy NH-P8 seeks to avoid the use of land that is susceptible to land instability, without any rule to give effect to this policy. Ngā Tai Ora consider this to be a significant gap in the Natural Hazards chapter and could lead to risk to people and property.	Amend the Natural Hazards chapter to include appropriate rules to give effect to Policy NH-P8.		Reject
FS534.014	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support in part	WBFL agrees with retention of NH-P8 as notified and supports the provision in the policy for effects to be mitigated where they cannot be avoided.	Allow in part	Retain NH-P8 and supports the provision in the policy for effects to be mitigated where they cannot be avoided.	Accept in part
S215.024	Haigh Workman Limited	Rules	Support	There are two sides to managing - avoiding or controlling land use and subdivision in areas of identified natural hazard risk (including increased risks resulting from climate change); - avoiding or controlling activities that may cause or exacerbate a natural hazard on another property. the risk posed by natural hazards: These are addressed by objectives and policies in the Regional Policy Statement	Retain controls on buildings and access routes in natural hazard areas		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and District Plan, and rules in the District and Regional Plans. The Natural Hazard section of the District Plan controls buildings and access routes within natural hazard areas, addressing the first bullet point. The Subdivision rules control subdivision within Natural Hazard areas. For completeness, the Natural Hazards section should also refer to rules for earthworks and stormwater management elsewhere in the District and Regional Plans that control activities that may cause or exacerbate a natural hazard on another property			
FS570.513	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
FS566.527	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
FS569.549	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
S529.051	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Support in part	<p>Inland flooding: Climate change is expected to make Northland drier overall, however heavy downpours are likely to become more extreme. This will increase the risk of inland flooding in areas near rivers/waterways. Flooding and rising groundwater are likely to affect houses, domestic wastewater tanks and disposal fields, roads and access ways to houses, and other structures built on former flood plains or land that has been drained.</p> <p>Coastal inundation: The average global sea level is expected to continue rising for several centuries in future as a result of long-lived emissions from past decades</p>	Amend the PDP to include stronger rules, including 'no build' areas, to prevent new buildings, wastewater systems, accessways, roads and other infrastructure in areas that are likely to be impacted by sea level rise, storm surges, flooding.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				alone (irrespective of sea level rise due to future emissions). A report by the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment in 2015 estimated that 1 in 100-year high water level events would occur very frequently in future - for example, every 4 years at the port of Auckland and once a year at Wellington and Christchurch ports. Furthermore, storm surges can add several tens of centimetres to high tides			
FS570.1940	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1954	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1976	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S529.239	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Not Stated	Stormwater and wastewater should be fully managed to avoid sediment/pollutants being carried to waterways and wetlands, especially during high rainfall events which are expected to become more extreme due to climate change. Under s7(i) of the RMA, councils must have particular regard to the effects of climate change. In general, water sensitive and low impact designs should be a standard requirement, not just encouraged. For example, stormwater and water from wastewater disposal fields can carry pollutants and silt into waterways during high rainfall events. They should not be discharged directly into waterways but be retained in constructed wetlands (vegetated retention ponds) or other water sensitive and low impacts features.	Amend the plan so that water sensitive and low impact designs are a standard requirement		Reject
FS570.2126	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
FS566.2140	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2162	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S521.005	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Rules	Support in part	<p>Inland flooding: Climate change is expected to make Northland drier overall, however heavy downpours are likely to become more extreme. This will increase the risk of inland flooding in areas near rivers/waterways. Flooding and rising groundwater are likely to affect houses, domestic wastewater tanks and disposal fields, roads and access ways to houses, and other structures built on former flood plains or land that has been drained.</p> <p>Coastal inundation: The average global sea level is expected to continue rising for several centuries in future as a result of long-lived emissions from past decades alone (irrespective of sea level rise due to future emissions). A report by the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment in 2015 estimated that 1 in 100-year high water level events would occur very frequently in future - for example, every 4 years at the port of Auckland and once a year at Wellington and Christchurch ports. Furthermore, storm surges can add several tens of centimetres to high tides.</p>	Amend the PDP to include stronger rules, including 'no build' areas, to prevent new buildings, wastewater systems, accessways, roads and other infrastructure in areas that are likely to be impacted by sea level rise, storm surges, flooding.		Reject
FS566.1715	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S521.012	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	Amend PDP to require best practice water-sensitive, low-impact designs and measures for all stormwater and wastewater engineering, infrastructure and related development, to prevent problems associated with more extreme rainfall events in future, including provision to implement relevant parts of NPS-		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>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.</p>			
<p>FS566.1722</p>	<p>Kapiro Conservation Trust 2</p>		<p>Support</p>		<p>Allow</p>	<p>Allow the original submission</p>	<p>Reject</p>
<p>S443.005</p>	<p>Kapiro Conservation Trust</p>	<p>Rules</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Inland flooding: Climate change is expected to make Northland drier overall, however heavy downpours are likely to become more extreme. This will increase the risk of inland flooding in areas near rivers/waterways. Flooding and rising groundwater are likely to affect houses, domestic wastewater tanks and disposal fields, roads and access ways to houses, and other structures built on former flood plains or land that has been drained. Coastal inundation: The average global sea level is expected to continue rising for several centuries in future as a result of long-lived emissions from past decades alone (irrespective of sea level rise due to future emissions). A report by the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment in 2015 estimated that 1 in 100-year high water level events would occur very frequently in future - for example, every 4 years at the port of Auckland and once a year at Wellington</p>		<p>Amend the PDP to include stronger rules, including 'no build' areas, to prevent new buildings, wastewater systems, accessways, roads and other infrastructure in areas that are likely to be impacted by sea level rise, storm surges, flooding.</p>	<p>Reject</p>

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and Christchurch ports. Furthermore, storm surges can add several tens of centimetres to high tides.		
FS569.1750	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Reject
FS570.1730	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Reject
S187.009	The Shooting Box Limited	Notes	Oppose	Note 2 to the rule applies the requirement for a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer/instability assessment to activities and subdivision on the site as a whole, rather than just that part impacted by the identified natural hazard, imposing unnecessary cost. The amendments sought target the requirements just to the mapped hazard area.	Amend note 2 as follows: 2. Any application for a land use resource consent in relation to a site location that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion. Any application for a subdivision consent must additionally include an assessment of whether the site any new site to be created includes an area of land susceptible to instability.	Accept in part
S222.008	Wendover Two Limited	Notes	Support in part	Note 2 to the rule applies the requirement for a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer/instability assessment to activities and subdivision on the site as a whole, rather than just that part impacted by the identified natural hazard, imposing unnecessary cost. The amendments sought target the requirements just to the mapped hazard area.	Amend note 2 as follows: 2. any application for a land use resource consent in relation to a site location that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion. Any application for a subdivision consent must additionally include an assessment of whether the site any new site to be created	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					includes an area of land susceptible to instability.		
S167.009	Bentzen Farm Limited	Notes	Oppose	Note 2 to the rule applies the requirement for a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer/instability assessment to activities and subdivision on the site as a whole, rather than just that part impacted by the identified natural hazard, imposing unnecessary cost. The amendments sought target the requirements just to the mapped hazard area.	Amend note 2 as follows 2. Any application for a land use resource consent in relation to a site location that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion. Any application for a subdivision consent must additionally include an assessment of whether the site any new site to be created includes an area of land susceptible to instability.		Accept in part
FS143.4	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter agrees that Note 2 to this rule should only apply to just that part impacted by the identified natural hazard, otherwise the rule will impose unnecessary cost. The amendments sought by the submitter target the requirements just to the mapped hazard area.	Allow		Accept in part
FS566.371	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
S215.025	Haigh Workman Limited	Notes	Not Stated	For completeness, the Natural Hazards section should also refer to rules for earthworks and stormwater management elsewhere in the District and Regional Plans that control activities that may cause or exacerbate a natural hazard on another property	Insert reference to rules for earthworks and stormwater management elsewhere in the District and Regional Plans that control activities that may cause or exacerbate a natural hazard on another property		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS196.21	Joe Carr		Support	This matter is currently a gaping hole in the District and Regional Plans	Allow		Reject
FS570.514	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
FS566.528	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
FS569.550	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
S333.009	P S Yates Family Trust	Notes	Support in part	Note 2 to the rule applies the requirement for a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer/instability assessment to activities and subdivision on the site as a whole, rather than just that part impacted by the identified natural hazard, imposing unnecessary cost. The amendments sought target the requirements just to the mapped hazard area.	Amend note 2 as follows 2. Any application for a land use resource consent in relation to a site location that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion. Any application for a subdivision consent must additionally include an assessment of whether the site any new site to be created includes an area of land susceptible to instability.		Accept in part
FS446.016	Omata Estate		Support	Support the change sought to the extent that NH-S1 should only apply where activities or development is proposed within a specific mapped natural hazard area and where it is identified that the scale and nature of the proposal warrants a site-specific assessment.	Allow	Amend note 2 as follows 2. Any application for a land use resource consent in relation to a site location that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report	Accept in part

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

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

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

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					whether the site any new site to be created includes an area of land susceptible to instability.		
FS570.576	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
FS566.590	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
FS569.612	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
S483.113	Top Energy Limited	NH-R1	Not Stated	It is unclear to Top Energy how maintenance, repair or upgrade of infrastructure in a 1 in 10 year River Flood Hazard and it assumed that this would default to discretionary activity. Top Energy seek that this be provided for as a permitted activity where there is not increase to footprint	Amend Rule NH-R1 as indicated below to provide for maintenance, repair of upgrading of infrastructure in 1 in 10 year floods as indicated in submission.		Accept
FS196.201	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept
FS345.164	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept
S483.114	Top Energy Limited	NH-R1	Not Stated	While Top Energy appreciates the risk caused by natural hazards, it is considered that PER -1 (which requires no increase in above ground footprint) is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas and will require unnecessary resource consent applications. As currently written, the rule does not adequately 'provide for' upgrades (even to a minor degree) as is rightfully directed in NH-P10. Further, for above ground infrastructure, it	Amend Rule NH-R1 as follows (or the same effect): NH-R1 Maintenance repair, or upgrading of infrastructure, including structural mitigation assets 1 in 100 Year River Flood Hazard Areas 1 in 10 year River Flood Hazard Areas Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1The works are located in a 1 in 10 Year		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				is more restrictive than NH-R2 and NH-R3 (2) which relate to buildings and structures generally e.g. no enablement in acknowledgment of the importance of infrastructure.	<p>River Flood hazard area</p> <p>1. There is no increase to the footprint of any above ground infrastructure; and 2. Any works to maintain, repair or upgrade infrastructure do not alter or divert an overland flow path; and 3. Ground is reinstated to the equivalent state that existed prior to the works</p> <p>PER-2 The works are located in a 1 in 100 Year River Flood hazard area 1. Any works to maintain, repair or upgrade infrastructure do not result in an increase of footprint or GFA by more than 10m²; and 2. Any works to maintain, repair or upgrade infrastructure do not alter or divert an overland flow path; and 3. Ground is reinstated to the same ground level that existed prior to the works. PER-3 Ground is reinstated to the equivalent state that existed prior to the works</p>		
FS196.202	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept
FS345.165	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
S356.048	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NH-R1	Support	not stated	Retain NH-R1 as notified		Accept in part
FS369.323	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S421.069	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-R1	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of rules NH-R1, NH-2, NH-3, NH-5, NH-6, NH-7, NH-8, and NH-9 as currently worded in the proposed district plan.	Retain Rule NH-R1 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept
FS369.324	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas	Allow in part	Amend	Accept
FS570.1301	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
FS346.303	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
FS566.1315	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
FS569.1337	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
FS369.354	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified	Allow in part	Retain	Accept in part
S454.073	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	NH-R1	Support	Transpower supports the inclusion of NH-R1 in the FNPDP.	Retain NH-R1		Accept in part
FS369.325	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas	Allow in part	Amend	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S355.015	Wakaiti Dalton	NH-R2	Support in part	Part of our site is partially subject to flood hazard, and while we do not have any buildings located in this area, we have concerns regarding the approach taken to this hazard. Whirinaki area is subject to flood hazard with many number of the existing dwellings located in areas susceptible to flooding. In our view, it is considered that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for. Further, it is considered that the default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures, is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications.	Amend NH-R2 to provide for additional and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity.	Reject
S385.017	McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited	NH-R2	Support in part	McDonald's Kaitaia and mapped as being within a River Flood Hazard Area. This rule provides for extensions and alterations to buildings and structures where they result in no more than a 10m2 increase to Gross Floor Area. On review of the s32 analysis for Natural Hazards, it is unclear where this threshold has come from and how they are justified, particularly when considering the allowances that have been made for other structures (e.g; 30m2 for a deck and 100m2 for a structure ancillary to farming.) McDonald's seeks that the thresholds for non-habitable buildings and structures be re-considered to enable better flexibility for extensions and alterations to existing structures in both the 1 in 100 and 1 in 10 Flood Hazard Area.	Amend NH-R3 as follows (or to same effect) Activity status: Permitted 1 in 100 Year River flood hazard area 1 in 10 River flood hazard area Where: PER-1The works are located in a 1 in 10 Year River Flood hazard area and1. there is no increase to the GFA of the building or footprint of the structure that results in the building or structure exceeding the limits for new buildings or structures in NH-R3- PER 1 and new buildings or structures ancillary to farming activities in NH-R4 PER 1. PER-22.No part of the building or structure is enclosed in a manner that alters or diverts an overland flow path or reduces flood plain storage PER-2The works are located in a 1 in 100 Year River Flood hazard area and:1.The increase in GFA to any building or structure	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					is no more than 100m². No part of the building or structure is enclosed in a manner that alters or diverts an overland flow path or reduces flood plain storage		
S363.012	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	NH-R2	Not Stated	The considers that rule NH-R2 Extensions and alterations to existing buildings or structures, that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for. and that the default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures, is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications.	Amend rule NH-R2 Extensions and alterations to existing buildings or structures, to provide for additions and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity in the 1 in 10 and 1 in 100 River Flood Hazard Area.		Reject
S541.024	Elbury Holdings	NH-R2	Oppose	We do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement Policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.	Amend NH-R2 PER-1 to allow building extensions and alterations that increase GFA or footprint where the extension or alteration is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject
FS155.39	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject
FS196.22	Joe Carr		Support	the relief sought by the submitter is practicable and effects based, as it should be in such matters.	Allow		Reject
FS405.023	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS542.055	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations	Allow in part	amend to provide for extensions and alterations	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS406.045	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission.	Allow in part	amend NH-R2	Reject
FS361.0010	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S485.027	Elbury Holdings	NH-R2	Oppose	We seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.	Amend NH-R2 PER-1 to allow building extensions and alterations that increase GFA or footprint where the extension or alteration is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject
FS155.40	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject
FS405.022	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS542.053	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations	Allow in part	amend to provide for extensions and alterations	Reject
FS406.043	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission.	Allow in part	amend NH-R2	Reject
FS361.009	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				be recognised and provided for.			
S519.027	Elbury Holdings	NH-R2	Oppose	We seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.	Amend NH-R2 PER-1 to allow building extensions and alterations that increase GFA or footprint where the extension or alteration is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject
FS155.42	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject
FS542.054	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations	Allow in part	amend to provide for extensions and alterations	Reject
FS406.044	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission.	Allow in part	amend NH-R2	Reject
S342.007	Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust (now Fletcher Building Ltd)	NH-R2	Oppose	Both rules centre on the potential effect of a structure in terms of diverting or altering overland flows or reducing flood plain storage. This involves a design solution which can be assessed at the time of a Building Consent. This falls within the same context as Council requiring an earthquake report at the Building Consent stage. The threshold should be removed, and the rule be amended to allow the presentation of a report at the time of the Building Consent application. This is reflected in Rule NH-S1.	delete in relation to 10m2 threshold (inferred)		Reject
FS374.021	Waipapa Pine Limited		Support	The original submission reflects the position of Waipapa Pine Limited of support for the Heavy Industrial Zone with proposed changes to	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				rules that would better support heavy industrial activities.			
S257.021	Te Hiku Community Board	NH-R2	Oppose	Do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.	Amend NH-R2 PER-1 to allow building extensions and alterations that increase GFA or footprint where the extension or alteration is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject
FS405.017	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS542.044	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations. This aligns with its original submissions	Allow in part	amend to provide for extensions and alterations. This aligns with its original submissions	Reject
FS406.034	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations within this rule.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject
FS361.004	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S357.022	Sean Frieling	NH-R2	Oppose	We do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by	Amend NH-R2 PER-1 to allow building extensions and alterations that increase GFA or footprint where the extension or alteration is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.			
FS405.018	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS542.048	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations.	Allow in part	amend to provide for extensions and alterations.	Reject
FS406.038	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission	Allow in part	amend NH-R2	Reject
FS361.005	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S358.022	Leah Frieling	NH-R2	Oppose	We do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design	Amend PER-1 of Rule NH-R2 to allow building extensions and alterations that increase GFA or footprint where the extension or alteration is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject
FS405.019	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				recognised and provided for.			
FS542.049	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations	Allow in part	amend to provide for extensions and alterations	Reject
FS406.039	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission	Allow in part	amend NH-R2	Reject
FS361.006	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S543.026	LJ King Limited	NH-R2	Oppose	We seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design	Amend NH-R2 PER-1 to allow building extensions and alterations that increase GFA or footprint where the extension or alteration is designed so that it will not impede flood flows		Reject
FS405.020	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS542.056	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations	Allow in part	amend to provide for extensions and alterations	Reject
FS406.046	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission.	Allow in part	amend NH-R2	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS361.007	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2187	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
S472.022	Michael Foy	NH-R2	Support in part	We do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design	Amend NH-R2 PER-1 to allow building extensions and alterations that increase GFA or footprint where the extension or alteration is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject
FS405.021	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS406.042	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission.	Allow in part	amend NH-R2	Reject
FS361.008	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment sought within this submission point, on the basis that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S335.025	BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited	NH-R2	Support	Support the intent of the provisions in the Natural Hazards and seek that they are retained as drafted. They enable alterations to existing buildings and structures and new minor buildings and structures in flood hazard areas subject to performance standards.	Retain Rule NH-R2 as notified		Accept
FS405.024	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Oppose	Ballantyne & Agnew opposes the retention of NH-R2 on the basis that it does not provide for additional and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject
FS542.045	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this rule to provide for extensions and alterations.	Disallow	amend this rule to provide for extensions and alterations.	Reject
FS406.035	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's considers that this rule needs to be amended as outlined in its original submission.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject
FS361.011	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	Willowridge Developments Limited opposes the retention of NH-R2 on the basis that it does not provide for additions and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject
S421.070	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-R2	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of rules NH-R1, NH-2, NH-3, NH-5, NH-6, NH-7, NH-8, and NH-9 as currently worded in the proposed district plan.	Retain Rule NH-R2 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept
FS405.025	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Oppose	Ballantyne & Agnew opposes the retention of NH-R2 on the basis that it does not provide for additional and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject
FS542.050	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations	Disallow	amend to provide for extensions and alterations	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS406.040	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Oppose	McDonald's considers that this rule needs to be amended as outlined in its original submission.	Allow in part	disallow the original submission	Reject
FS361.012	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	Willowridge Developments Limited opposes the retention of NH-R2 on the basis that it does not provide for additions and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject
FS570.1302	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
FS346.304	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
FS566.1316	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
FS569.1338	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
S250.003	Willowridge Developments Limited	NH-R2	Not Stated	Existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for. The default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications.	Amend NH-R2 to provide for additions and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity.		Reject
FS542.043	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations. This aligns with its original submissions..	Allow	amend to provide for extensions and alterations. This aligns with its original submissions..	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS332.256	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Allowing an increase in GFA in hazard areas increases risk of legal action for Council.	Disallow in part	Disallow the submission in part.	Accept
FS406.033	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's supports the amendments to NH-R2.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS570.689	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
FS566.703	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
FS569.725	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
S339.022	Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd	NH-R2	Not Stated	TACDL's sites of interest listed in Figure 1 - 4 of the submission are subject to Flood hazards. TACDL considers that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for. Further, TACDL consider that the default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures, is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications.	Amend NH-R2 to provide for additional and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity.		Reject
FS542.046	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations. This aligns with its original submissions.	Allow	amend to provide for extensions and alterations. This aligns with its original submissions.	Reject
FS406.036	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S344.010	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate	NH-R2	Not Stated	The default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures is overly restrictive and will require	Amend NH-R2 to provide for additional and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd			unnecessary resource consent applications.			
FS542.047	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations. This aligns with its original submissions.	Allow	amend to provide for extensions and alterations. This aligns with its original submissions.	Reject
FS406.037	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission.	Allow	amend NH-R2	Reject
FS396.031	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S464.028	LJ King Ltd	NH-R2	Oppose	We seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.	Amend NH-R2 PER-1 to allow building extensions and alterations that increase GFA or footprint where the extension or alteration is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject
FS542.051	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations	Allow in part	amend to provide for extensions and alterations	Reject
FS542.058	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations.	Allow in part	amend to provide for extensions and alterations.	Reject
FS406.041	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS406.048	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission.	Allow in part	amend NH-R2	Reject
FS566.1571	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
S547.026	LJ King Limited	NH-R2	Oppose	We seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design	Amend NH-R2 PER-1 to allow building extensions and alterations that increase GFA or footprint where the extension or alteration is designed so that it will not impede flood flows		Reject
FS542.057	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs supports amendments to provide for extensions and alterations	Allow in part	amend to provide for extensions and alterations	Reject
FS406.047	McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited		Support in part	McDonald's support amendments to this rule for the reasons outlined in its original submission.	Allow in part	amend NH-R2	Reject
S217.021	New Zealand Defence Force	NH-R3	Support in part	TMTA may require the placement of temporary buildings and structures in flood hazard areas to enable realistic training, such as the placement of temporary bridges. It is appropriate that such structures used in military training are permitted in flood hazard areas due to their temporary nature.	Amend NH-R3 PER-1 to also permit temporary structures and buildings for TMTA as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is one of the following: 1. Above ground buildings or structures with a footprint of 10m ² or less; or 2. deck less than 30m ² and less than 1m in height; or 3. boardwalks or stairs that are less than 500mm above ground level and located within a public reserve or legal road; or 4. temporary building or structures associated with temporary military training activities.		Reject
S257.022	Te Hiku Community Board	NH-R3	Oppose	Do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large decks, for modifications to existing buildings". The rule should provide for flood risks to be	Amend NH-R3 PER-1 to allow new decks more than 30m ² and more than 1m in height where the deck is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting deck area and height. NH-R3 PER 1 does not fully implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.			
S541.025	Elbury Holdings	NH-R3	Oppose	We do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large decks, for modifications to existing buildings". The Rule (NH-R3) should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting deck area and height. NH-R3 PER 1 does not fully implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.	Amend NH-R3 PER-1 to allow new decks more than 30m2 and more than 1m in height where the deck is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject
FS155.41	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject
FS369.335	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject
S485.028	Elbury Holdings	NH-R3	Oppose	We seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large decks, for modifications to existing buildings". The rule should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting deck area and height. NH-R3 PER 1 does not fully implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.	Amend NH-R3 PER-1 to allow new decks more than 30m2 and more than 1m in height where the deck is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject
FS155.43	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject
FS369.333	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S519.028	Elbury Holdings	NH-R3	Oppose	We seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large decks, for modifications to existing buildings". The rule should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting deck area and height. NH-R3 PER 1 does not fully implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.	Amend NH-R3 PER-1 to allow new decks more than 30m2 and more than 1m in height where the deck is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject
FS155.44	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject
FS369.334	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject
S483.115	Top Energy Limited	NH-R3	Oppose	This rule should include a provision for new network utilities that is more enabling than PER-1, noting that infrastructure is not habitable. Top Energy seeks that all new underground structures be permitted, and that above ground infrastructure of an appropriate scale is provided for in acknowledgment of the critical importance of this infrastructure and that it is not habitable. Top Energy highlight that NH-R4 provides for structures ancillary to farming of up to 100m2 in area with no height threshold and seek similar enablement for new network utilities	Insert a new permitted rule for new infrastructure in the 1 in 100 Year Flood hazard zone as follows (or to the same effect): NH-RX New network utilities1 in 100 Year River Flood hazard areasActivity status permittedWhere :PER-1Any building or structure associated with the new network utility is one of the following:1.Underground; or2.Has a footprint that is less than 100m²:PER -2Any building or structure associated with the new network utility is not located within or does not alter or divert an overland flow path.Activity status where compliance with PER -1 and PER 2 is not achieved: Restricted DiscretionaryMatters of discretion are restricted to:a. the effects of flood hazards on the integrity of the building or structure to the extent that such effects are not		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					appropriately managed by the building consent process under the Building Act 2004;b. the effects of the building or structure on overland flow paths and flooding on surrounding sites; andc. the extent to which the risk to people and property from the flood hazard is avoided or managed.		
FS196.23	Joe Carr		Support	Provides for the sensible use of land for buildings in flood hazard zone, however the land owner should absolve the Council of any liability in such an instance.	Allow		Awaiting recommendation
FS196.203	Joe Carr		Support	Electricity is an essential service and this submission and other preceding ones are supported to enable the provision of a resilient and reliable electricity supply	Allow		Awaiting recommendation
FS345.166	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
S342.008	Waipapa Pine Limited and Adrian Broughton Trust (now Fletcher Building Ltd)	NH-R3	Oppose	Both rules centre on the potential effect of a structure in terms of diverting or altering overland flows or reducing flood plain storage. This involves a design solution which can be assessed at the time of a Building Consent. This falls within the same context as Council requiring an earthquake report at the Building Consent stage. The threshold should be removed, and the rule be amended to allow the presentation of a report at the time of the Building Consent application. This is reflected in Rule NH-S1.	delete in relation to 10m2 threshold (inferred)		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS374.022	Waipapa Pine Limited		Support	The original submission reflects the position of Waipapa Pine Limited of support for the Heavy Industrial Zone with proposed changes to rules that would better support heavy industrial activities.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS369.327	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject
S335.026	BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited	NH-R3	Support	Support the intent of the provisions in the Natural Hazards and seek that they are retained as drafted. They enable alterations to existing buildings and structures and new minor buildings and structures in flood hazard areas subject to performance standards.	Retain Rule NH-R3 as notified		Accept
FS369.326	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject
S357.023	Sean Frieling	NH-R3	Oppose	We do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design. We do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large decks, for modifications to existing buildings". The rule should provide for flood risks to be	Amend NH-R3 PER-1 to allow new decks more than 30m2 and more than 1m in height where the deck is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting deck area and height. NH-R3 PER 1 does not fully implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.			
FS369.328	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject
S358.023	Leah Frieling	NH-R3	Oppose	We do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large decks, for modifications to existing buildings". The rule should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting deck area and height. NH-R3 PER 1 does not fully implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.	Amend PER-1 of Rule NH-R3 to allow new decks more than 30m ² and more than 1m in height where the deck is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject
FS369.329	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject
S421.071	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-R3	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of rules NH-R1, NH-2, NH-3, NH-5, NH-6, NH-7, NH-8, and NH-9 as currently worded in the proposed district plan.	Retain Rule NH-R3 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept
FS369.330	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1303	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
FS346.305	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
FS566.1317	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
FS569.1339	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
S464.029	LJ King Ltd	NH-R3	Oppose	We seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large decks, for modifications to existing buildings". The rule should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting deck area and height. NH-R3 PER 1 does not fully implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.	Amend NH-R3 PER-1 to allow new decks more than 30m2 and more than 1m in height where the deck is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject
FS369.331	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject
FS566.1572	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S472.023	Michael Foy	NH-R3	Support in part	We do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large decks, for modifications to existing buildings". The rule should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting deck area and height. NH-R3 PER 1 does not fully implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design	Amend NH-R3 PER-1 to allow new decks more than 30m2 and more than 1m in height where the deck is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.		Reject
FS369.332	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject
S543.027	LJ King Limited	NH-R3	Oppose	We seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large decks, for modifications to existing buildings". The rule should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting deck area and height. NH-R3 PER 1 does not fully implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design	Amend NH-R3 PER-1 to allow new decks more than 30m2 and more than 1m in height where the deck is designed so that it will not impede flood flows		Reject
FS369.336	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject
FS566.2188	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
S547.027	LJ King Limited	NH-R3	Oppose	We seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large decks, for modifications to existing buildings". The rule should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by	Amend NH-R3 PER-1 to allow new decks more than 30m2 and more than 1m in height where the deck is designed so that it will not impede flood flows		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				limiting deck area and height. NH-R3 PER 1 does not fully implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design			
FS369.337	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seek amendments to this rule as it is overly restrictive for the 1 in 100 year River Flood Hazard Areas to provide for above ground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject
S159.043	Horticulture New Zealand	NH-R4	Oppose	Artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures should be provided for within Rule NH-R4 as they are open structures which water can flow through	Amend Rule NH-R4 to include: PER-4Artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures		Reject
FS151.203	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Awaiting recommendation
FS570.205	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Awaiting recommendation
FS566.219	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Awaiting recommendation
FS569.241	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Awaiting recommendation
S421.077	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-R4	Support in part	Federated Farmers supports the new buildings or structures (excluding residential activities) ancillary to farming buildings being classified as permitted activities. It is noted that the footprint is limited to less than 100m2 which is small for an ancillary building. It would be more appropriate to increase the size of the footprint to 250m2 which is the average size required for ancillary buildings such as hay barns.	Amend PER-1 of Rule NH-R4 to increase the threshold as follows: The building or structure has a footprint that is less than 100m² 250m² .		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS196.24	Joe Carr		Support	provides for the reasonable use of land, providing other standards are met.	Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1309	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.311	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
FS566.1323	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
FS569.1345	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
S355.016	Wakaiti Dalton	NH-R5	Support in part	NH-R5 and R6 require all new buildings and extensions or alterations to buildings that accommodate vulnerable activities to be set back a minimum of 20m from the dripline of any 'contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry', none of which are defined terms. This provision is very similar to that contained in Chapter 12 of the ODP and is often a trigger for resource consents, whereby FNDC typically request approval from Fire and Emergency NZ who assess whether there is adequate provision of fire sighting supply and access. There is considered to be adequate consideration of firefighting water supply within the NH-R5 and R6 PER-1 and TRAN-R3-PER-1. Therefore, it is considered unnecessary to include a setback requirement when there is already	Delete PER-2 from rule NH-R5		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				adequate provision of the firefighting supply and access requirements.		
S339.023	Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd	NH-R5	Not Stated	Rules NH-R5 and R6 require all new buildings and extensions or alterations to buildings that accommodate vulnerable activities to be set back a minimum of 20m from the dripline of any 'contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry', none of which are defined terms. This provision is very similar to that contained in Chapter 12 of the ODP and is often a trigger for resource consents, whereby FNDC typically request approval from Fire and Emergency NZ who assess whether there is adequate provision of fire sighting supply and access. There is considered to be adequate consideration of firefighting water supply within the NH-R5 and R6 PER-1 and TRAN-R3-PER-1. Therefore, it is considered unnecessary to include a setback requirement when there is already adequate provision of the firefighting supply and access requirements.	Delete PER-2 from Rules NH-R5 and NH-R6.	Accept in part
S167.010	Bentzen Farm Limited	NH-R5	Oppose	Non-conformity with the rule should be a restricted discretionary activity, rather than full discretionary, as the matters managed by the rule are confined to the single issue of fire risk. The matters of discretion sought to be added by this submission will appropriately direct decision making.	Amend the activity status in Rule NH-R5 where compliance is not achieved with PER-1 or PER-1 from Discretionary to Restricted Discretionary Activity. Add the following matters of discretion: a. The availability of water for fire-fighting; b. The scale of the extension or alteration; c. Alternative options for the location of the extension or alteration; d. The use of building materials to reduce fire risk; e. The extent and type of vegetation present and f. The nature and density of any planting to reduce fire risk, including use of low flammability species.	Accept
FS176.10	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited		Oppose	Any restriction of discretion must include a means of managing the risk of fire spread from the activity needing consent to any surrounding vegetation. Such means must include passive management and not rely solely on active management.	Disallow in part	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS405.026	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the amendment sought within this submission point to change the activity status to restricted discretionary, but notes that it has requested the amendment that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted in its original submission	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
FS361.013	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the amendment sought within this submission point to change the activity status to restricted discretionary, but notes that it has requested the amendment that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted in its original submission	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.372	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Reject
S95.001	Lynley Newport	NH-R5	Oppose	Surprised that the Council has considered it necessary to persist with a rule such as NH-R5 PER-2. The same rule in the Operative District Plan has not served any useful purpose, the issue being much better addressed through the Building Consent process and FENZ standards and guidelines, and is often in conflict with rules restricting the clearance of indigenous vegetation. In fact the proposed new wording is even worse than the existing wording in the Operative District Plan because it deletes the words "area of" and simply states contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry - meaning a single row of shelter planting is likely caught by the rule. Imposing a specific buffer distance is a nonsense. A fire is not going to follow the rule and know not to spread when the gap between building and dripline is 20.Sm, compared with spreading if the distance is 19.Sm. The emphasis	Delete Rule NH-R5 PER-2.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				should be on sensible and practical provision of the means by which fires can be extinguished - safe, sufficient and accessible water supply - and by providing homeowners with useful and practical advice in regard to plant species and building materials that might be suitable when building near or within areas of vegetation.			
FS196.25	Joe Carr		Support	because the submission is more practicable and effective	Allow		Accept in part
S479.010	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	NH-R5	Support in part	Requires all new buildings and extensions or alterations to buildings that accommodate vulnerable activities to be set back a minimum of 20m from the dripline of any 'contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry', none of which are defined terms. This provision is very similar to that contained in Chapter 12 of the ODP and is often a trigger for resource consents, whereby FNDC typically request approval from Fire and Emergency NZ who assess whether there is adequate provision of fire sighting supply and access. There is considered to be adequate consideration of firefighting water supply within the NH-R5 and R6 PER-1 and TRAN-R3-PER-1. Therefore, it is considered unnecessary to include a setback requirement when there is already adequate provision of the firefighting supply and access requirements.	Delete PER-2		Accept in part
FS196.184	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part
FS369.338	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified.	Disallow	Retain	Accept in part
S251.005	New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd	NH-R5	Support in part	NZMPL note that PDP has retained provisions to manage the risks of wildfire, including the requirements for buildings used for vulnerable activities to be setback a minimum of 20m from "the dripline of any contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or	Delete PER-2 of Rule NH-R5		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				forestry". Whilst it is recognised that this is a risk that requires management, it is considered that wildfire is suitably managed by the requirements to provide a dedicated firefighting water supply and access that accommodates firefighting appliances in PER-R1, clauses (1) and (2) of rule NH-R5. Further, the Transport and Subdivision Chapters also contain provisions that set minimum access and firefighting water supply standards. In NZMPL's view, the risk is sufficiently managed by these provisions and there is no requirement to apply the setback provisions. Furthermore, the phrase "the dripline of any contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry" that appears in the ODP already creates interpretation issues and is inconsistently applied as there are no determining thresholds in the standard.			
FS400.0010	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS396.0010	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility	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
				when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.			
S168.017	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NH-R5	Oppose	<p>Non-conformity with the rule should be a restricted discretionary activity, rather than full discretionary, as the matters managed by the rule are confined to the single issue of fire risk.</p> <p>There are circumstances where the rule cannot be met, and indeed such an outcome could be a compromise compared to wider landscape and biodiversity outcomes. For example, new dwellings where landscape mitigation close to the house is desirable or required as an existing condition of subdivision consent. In these circumstances, the matters of discretion sought to be added by this submission will appropriately direct decision making. These include the ability to consider the suitability of low flammability plant species as fire risk mitigation adjoining the house.</p>	<p>Amend the activity status in Rule NH-R5 where compliance is not achieved with PER-1 or PER-2 (inferred) from Discretionary to Restricted Discretionary Activity.</p> <p>Add the following matters of discretion:a. The availability of water for fire-fighting;b. The scale of the extension or alteration;c. Alternative options for the location of the extension or alteration;d. The use of building materials to reduce fire risk;e. The extent and type of vegetation present andf. The nature and density of any planting to reduce fire risk, including use of low flammability species.</p>		Accept
FS405.027	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the amendment sought within this submission point to change the activity status to restricted discretionary, but notes that it has requested the amendment that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted in its original submission	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
FS361.014	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the amendment sought within this submission point to change the activity status to restricted discretionary, but notes that it has requested the amendment that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted in its original submission.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S187.010	The Shooting Box Limited	NH-R5	Oppose	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision requested relating, but not limited to, change of activity status to restricted discretionary activity and matters managed by the rule are confined to the single issue of fire risk.	Amend the activity status in Rule NH-R5 where compliance is not achieved with PER-1 or PER-1 from Discretionary to Restricted Discretionary Activity . Add the following matters of discretion: a. The availability of water for fire-fightingb. The scale of the extension or alterationc. Alternative options for the location of the extension or alteration;d. The use of building materials to reduce fire risk. The extent and type of vegetation present; andf. The nature and density of any planting to reduce fire risk, including use of low flammability		Accept
FS405.028	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the amendment sought within this submission point to change the activity status to restricted discretionary, but notes that it has requested the amendment that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted in its original submission.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
FS361.015	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the amendment sought within this submission point to change the activity status to restricted discretionary, but notes that it has requested the amendment that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted in its original submission.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
S222.009	Wendover Two Limited	NH-R5	Oppose	Non-conformity with the rule should be a restricted discretionary activity, rather than full discretionary, as the matters managed by the rule are confined to the single issue of fire risk. There are circumstances where	Amend the activity status in Rule NH-R5 where compliance is not achieved with PER-1 or PER-1 from Discretionary to Restricted Discretionary Activity.		Accept

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				cannot be met, and indeed such an outcome would be a compromise compared to wider landscape and biodiversity outcomes. For example, new dwellings where landscape mitigation close to the house is desirable or required as an existing condition of subdivision consent. In these circumstances, the matters of discretion sought to be added by this submission will appropriately direct decision making	scale of the extension or alteration;c. Alternative options for the location of the extension or alteration;d. The use of building materials to reduce fire risk;e. The extent and type of vegetation present andf. The nature and density of any planting to reduce fire risk, including use of low flammability species.		
FS405.030	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the amendment sought within this submission point to change the activity status to restricted discretionary, but notes that it has requested the amendment that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted in its original submission.	Allow in part	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS361.017	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the amendment sought within this submission point to change the activity status to restricted discretionary, but notes that it has requested the amendment that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted in its original submission.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.577	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
FS566.591	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
FS569.613	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	
S333.010	P S Yates Family Trust	NH-R5	Support in part	Non-conformity with the rule should be a restricted discretionary activity, rather than full discretionary, as the matters managed by the rule are confined to the single issue of fire risk. There are circumstances where the rule can not be met, and indeed such an outcome would be a compromise compared to wider landscape and biodiversity outcomes. For example, new dwellings where landscape mitigation close to the house is desirable or required as an existing condition of subdivision consent. In these circumstances, the matters of discretion sought to be added by this submission will appropriately direct decision making. These include the ability to consider the suitability of low family plant species as fire risk mitigation adjoining the house as described in the following reference: https://fireandemergency.nz/home-and-community-fire-safety/flammability-of-plant-species/	Amend the activity status in Rule NH-R5 where compliance is not achieved with PER-1 or PER-1 from Discretionary to Restricted Discretionary Activity. Insert the following matters of discretion: a. The availability of water for fire-fighting;b. The scale of the extension or alteration;c. Alternative options for the location of the extension or alteration;d. The use of building materials to reduce fire risk;e. The extent and type of vegetation present andf. The nature and density of any planting to reduce fire risk, including use of low flammability species.		Accept
FS405.031	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the amendment sought within this submission point to change the activity status to restricted discretionary, but notes that it has requested the amendment that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted in its original submission.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
FS361.018	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the amendment sought within this submission point to change the activity status to restricted discretionary, but notes that it has requested the amendment that NH-R5	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				PER-2 should be deleted in its original submission.			
S502.043	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	NH-R5	Support in part	Provision is requested to allow sites which have access to a fire hydrant, to be excluded from the 20 metres setback requirement. This is due to the sites which have access to a fire hydrant being located in urban zones, with good quick access to fire fighting services, and a stable high pressure water supply. Generally urban sites with fire hydrants in the area trigger consent due to bush areas within the vicinity of their site, such as on a public reserve where they are unable to mitigate the effect. Consents are currently processed with comments from FENZ which stipulate that they have no issue given the fire hydrant connection. The 135m requirement is the FENZ standard.	Amend NH-R5 PER-2 PER-2 Any building used for a vulnerable activity (excluding accessory buildings) is set back at least 20m from the dripline of any contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry. Where the vulnerable activity is within 135m of a fire hydrant PER-2 does not apply.		Reject
FS405.032	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Oppose	Ballantyne & Agnew opposes the submission point to amend NH-R5 PER-2 as it considers that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS361.019	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	Willowridge Developments Limited opposes the submission by Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited to amend NH-R5 PER-2 as it considers that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS369.340	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified.	Allow in part	Retain	Accept in part
S484.002	James Phillips	NH-R5	Oppose	No specific reason provided.	Delete NH-R5 in respect to the General Residential Zone.		Accept in part
FS369.339	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified.	Disallow	Retain	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S512.022	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NH-R5	Support in part	Fire and Emergency support this rule as it will require vulnerable activities (including residential activities) to have adequate water for firefighting. However, demand on reticulated water systems can mean existing fire hydrants do not have sufficient pressure for firefighting	Amend NH-R5 Any building used for a vulnerable activity (excluding accessory buildings) either: 1. is located on a site that has suitable access to a fire hydrant(s) with sufficient water pressure and supply for firefighting as per the SNZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice ; or 2. provides for an alternative water supply and access to water supplies for fire fighting purposes in compliance with the SNZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice		Accept in part
FS369.341	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified.	Allow in part	Retain	Accept in part
S250.004	Willowridge Developments Limited	NH-R5	Support in part	It is considered that the risks to and of wild fire are suitably managed by the requirements to provide for a firefighting water supply in the Subdivision chapter. The Transport Chapter requires adequate standards for access for firefighting vehicles. It is not considered necessary to require a 20m setback from the dripline of bush areas, where the requirements of water supply and access are met.	Amend rule NH-R5 to remove PER-2		Accept in part
FS570.690	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
FS566.704	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.726	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
S283.040	Trent Simpkin	NH-R5	Support in part	Submitter wants to be clear that his interpretation of rule is correct - if submitter has a house that's within 20m of bush, and we are in compliance with NZS4509 (or have approval from FENZ - maybe this needs to be added as another PER item) then we don't require a resource consent? Submitter fully supports not requiring a resource consent if a structure is within 20m of bush and Fire and Emergency NZ have provided their approval.	Amend the rule to clarify the intent, that resource consent is not required if a structure is within 20m of bush and Fire and Emergency NZ have provided their approval.		Accept in part
FS570.854	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
FS566.868	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
FS569.890	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
S421.072	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-R5	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of rules NH-R1, NH-2, NH-3, NH-5, NH-6, NH-7, NH-8, and NH-9 as currently worded in the proposed district plan.	Retain Rule NH-R5 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept in part
FS570.1304	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
FS346.306	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)	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.			and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.			
FS566.1318	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
FS569.1340	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
S483.116	Top Energy Limited	NH-R5	Support	Top Energy supports that this rule only relates to non-habitable structures.	Retain Rule NH-R5		Accept in part
FS345.167	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
S333.011	P S Yates Family Trust	NH-R6	Support in part	Non-conformity with the rule should be a restricted discretionary activity, rather than full discretionary, as the matters managed by the rule are confined to the single issue of fire risk. There are circumstances where the rule can not be met, and indeed such an outcome would be a compromise compared to wider landscape and biodiversity outcomes. For example, new dwellings where landscape mitigation close to the house is desirable or required as an existing condition of subdivision consent. In these circumstances, the matters of discretion sought to be added by this submission will appropriately direct decision making. These include the ability to consider the suitability of low family plant species as fire risk mitigation adjoining the house as described in the following reference: https://fireandemergency.nz/home-and-communityfire-safety/flammability-of-plant-species/	Insert the following matter of discretion to rule NH-R6: f. The nature and density of any planting to reduce fire risk, including use of low flammability species.		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S484.003	James Phillips	NH-R6	Oppose	No specific reason provided.	Delete NH-R6 in respect to the General Residential Zone.	Accept
S355.017	Wakaiti Dalton	NH-R6	Support in part	NH-R5 and R6 require all new buildings and extensions or alterations to buildings that accommodate vulnerable activities to be set back a minimum of 20m from the dripline of any 'contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry', none of which are defined terms. This provision is very similar to that contained in Chapter 12 of the ODP and is often a trigger for resource consents, whereby FNDC typically request approval from Fire and Emergency NZ who assess whether there is adequate provision of fire sighting supply and access. There is considered to be adequate consideration of firefighting water supply within the NH-R5 and R6 PER-1 and TRAN-R3-PER-1. Therefore, it is considered unnecessary to include a setback requirement when there is already adequate provision of the firefighting supply and access requirements.	Delete PER-2 from rule NH-R6.	Accept in part
S168.018	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NH-R6	Support in part	Non-conformity with the rule should be a restricted discretionary activity, rather than full discretionary, as the matters managed by the rule are confined to the single issue of fire risk. There are circumstances where the rule cannot be met, and indeed such an outcome could be a compromise compared to wider landscape and biodiversity outcomes. For example, new dwellings where landscape mitigation close to the house is desirable or required as an existing condition of subdivision consent. In these circumstances, the matters of discretion sought to be added by this submission will appropriately direct decision making. These include the ability to consider the suitability of low flammability plant species as fire risk mitigation adjoining the house.	Insert the following matter of discretion to Rule NH-R6: f. The nature and density of any planting to reduce fire risk, including use of low flammability species.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S187.011	The Shooting Box Limited	NH-R6	Support in part	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision requested relating, but not limited to, matters managed by the rule are confined to the single issue of fire risk.	Insert the following matter of discretion to Rule NH-R6:f. The nature and density of any planting to reduce fire risk, including use of low flammability species.	Accept
S222.010	Wendover Two Limited	NH-R6	Support in part	As per submission point 9.	Insert the following matter of discretion to rule NH-R6:f. The nature and density of any planting to reduce fire risk, including use of low flammability species.	Accept
S339.024	Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd	NH-R6	Not Stated	Rules NH-R5 and R6 require all new buildings and extensions or alterations to buildings that accommodate vulnerable activities to be set back a minimum of 20m from the dripline of any 'contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry', none of which are defined terms. This provision is very similar to that contained in Chapter 12 of the ODP and is often a trigger for resource consents, whereby FNDC typically request approval from Fire and Emergency NZ who assess whether there is adequate provision of fire sighting supply and access. There is considered to be adequate consideration of firefighting water supply within the NH-R5 and R6 PER-1 and TRAN-R3-PER-1. Therefore, it is considered unnecessary to include a setback requirement when there is already adequate provision of the firefighting supply and access requirements.	Delete PER-2 from Rules NH-R5 and NH-R6.	Accept in part
S512.023	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NH-R6	Support in part	Fire and Emergency support this rule as it will require vulnerable activities (including residential activities) to have adequate water for firefighting. However, demand on reticulated water systems can mean existing fire hydrants do not have sufficient pressure for firefighting. Fire and Emergency support the inclusion of considerations around building materials	Amend NH-R6 Extensions or alterations that increase the GFA of a building used for a vulnerable activity (excluding accessory buildings) either: a. is located on a site that has suitable access to a fire hydrant(s) with sufficient waterpressure and supply for firefighting as perthe SNZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and vegetation types under the matters of discretion.	<p>FireService Firefighting Water Supplies Code ofPractice; or</p> <p>b. provides for an alternative water supply and access to water supplies for fire fighting purposes in compliance with the SNZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice. Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p>a. The availability adequacy (volume, pressure and access) of water for firefighting;</p> <p>b. The scale of the extension or alteration;</p> <p>c. Alternative options for the location of the extension or alteration;</p> <p>d. The use of building materials to reduce fire risk; and</p> <p>e. The extent and type of vegetation present</p>	
FS176.11	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited		Support	Clarifies what is required to adequately manage the requirements to fight a fire.	Allow	Accept in part
S479.011	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	NH-R6	Support in part	Requires all new buildings and extensions or alterations to buildings that accommodate vulnerable activities to be set back a minimum of 20m from the dripline of any 'contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry', none of which are defined terms. This provision is very similar to that contained in Chapter 12 of the ODP and is often a trigger for resource consents, whereby FNDC typically request approval from Fire and Emergency NZ who assess whether there is adequate provision of fire sighting supply and access. There is considered to be adequate consideration of firefighting water	Delete PER-2	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				supply within the NH-R5 and R6 PER-1 and TRAN-R3-PER-1. Therefore, it is considered unnecessary to include a setback requirement when there is already adequate provision of the firefighting supply and access requirements.			
FS196.183	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part
S251.006	New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd	NH-R6	Support in part	NZMPL note that PDP has retained provisions to manage the risks of wildfire, including the requirements for buildings used for vulnerable activities to be setback a minimum of 20m from "the dripline of any contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry". Whilst it is recognised that this is a risk that requires management, it is considered that wildfire is suitably managed by the requirements to provide a dedicated firefighting water supply and access that accommodates firefighting appliances in PER-R1, clauses (1) and (2) of rule NH-R6. Further, the Transport and Subdivision Chapters also contain provisions that set minimum access and firefighting water supply standards. In NZMPL's view, the risk is sufficiently managed by these provisions and there is no requirement to apply the setback provisions. Furthermore, the phrase "the dripline of any contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry" that appears in the ODP already creates interpretation issues and is inconsistently applied as there are no determining thresholds in the standard.	Delete PER-2 of Rule NH-R6		Accept in part
FS400.011	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.			
FS396.011	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S502.044	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	NH-R6	Support in part	Provision is requested to allow sites which have access to a fire hydrant, to be excluded from the 20 metres setback requirement. This is due to the sites which have access to a fire hydrant being located in urban zones, with good quick access to fire fighting services, and a stable high pressure water supply. Generally urban sites with fire hydrants in the area trigger consent due to bush areas within the vicinity of their site, such as on a public reserve where they are unable to mitigate the effect. Consents are currently processed with comments from FENZ which stipulate that they have no issue given the fire hydrant connection. The 135m requirement is the FENZ standard.	Amend NH-R6 PER-2 PER-2 Extensions or alterations that increase the GFA of a building used for a vulnerable activity (excluding accessory buildings) are set back at least 20m from the dripline of any contiguous scrub or shrubland, woodlot or forestry. Where the vulnerable activity is within 135m of a fire hydrant PER-2 does not apply.		Reject
FS405.033	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Oppose	Ballantyne & Agnew opposes the submission point to amend NH-R5 PER-2 as it considered that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS361.020	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	Willowridge Developments Limited opposes the submission by Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited to amend NH-R5 PER-2 as it considered that NH-R5 PER-2 should be deleted.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
S243.020	Matauri Trustee Limited	NH-R6	Support in part	Non-conformity with the rule should be a restricted discretionary activity, rather than full discretionary, as the matters managed by the rule are confined to the single issue of fire risk. There are circumstances where the rule cannot be met, and indeed such an outcome would be a compromise compared to wider landscape and biodiversity outcomes. For example, new dwellings where landscape mitigation close to the house is desirable or required as an existing condition of subdivision consent. In these circumstances, the matters of discretion sought to be added by this submission will appropriately direct decision making	Insert the following matter of discretion to rule NH-R6.f. The nature and density of any planting to reduce fire risk, including use of low flammability species.		Accept
FS570.578	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
FS566.592	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
FS569.614	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
S250.005	Willowridge Developments Limited	NH-R6	Support in part	It is considered that the risks to and of wild fire are suitably managed by the requirements to provide for a firefighting water supply in the Subdivision chapter. The Transport Chapter requires adequate	Amend rule NH-R6 to remove PER-2		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				standards for access for firefighting vehicles. It is not considered necessary to require a 20m setback from the dripline of bush areas, where the requirements of water supply and access are met.			
FS570.691	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
FS566.705	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
FS569.727	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
S421.073	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-R6	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of rules NH-R1, NH-2, NH-3, NH-5, NH-6, NH-7, NH-8, and NH-9 as currently worded in the proposed district plan.	Retain Rule NH-R6 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept in part
FS570.1305	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
FS346.307	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
FS566.1319	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
FS569.1341	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	
S483.117	Top Energy Limited	NH-R6	Support	Top Energy supports that this rule only relates to non-habitable structures.	Retain Rule NH-R6		Accept in part
FS345.168	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
S167.011	Bentzen Farm Limited	NH-R6	Support in part	Non-conformity with the rule should be a restricted discretionary activity as the matters managed by the rule are confined to the single issue of fire risk. The matter of discretion sought to be added by this submission will appropriately direct decision making.	Insert the following matter of discretion to rule NH-R6: f. The nature and density of any planting to reduce fire risk, including use of low flammability species.		Accept
FS566.373	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
S516.047	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	NH-R7	Support	Ngā Tai Ora support the concept of managing vulnerable activities within hazard areas.	Retain Rule NH-R7		Accept in part
S421.074	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-R7	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of rules NH-R1, NH-2, NH-3, NH-5, NH-6, NH-7, NH-8, and NH-9 as currently worded in the proposed district plan.	Retain Rule NH-R7 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept in part
FS570.1306	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
FS403.127	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora support this rule as notified.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora support this rule as notified.	Accept in part
FS346.308	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
FS566.1320	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
FS569.1342	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
S331.034	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NH-R7	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports in part rule NH-R7 New buildings, and extensions or alterations that increase the GFA of existing buildings, and acknowledges the risk which natural hazards can pose on people, property and the environment, particularly for vulnerable activities. However, NH-R7 RDIS-1 is not clear in its wording. The submitter interprets the rule as, where the new building, extension or alteration is or will be used for a vulnerable activity, it should not be located in the 1 in 10 year River Flood Hazard area (and where compliance is not achieved, it becomes a Non-Complying activity). The submitter supports that vulnerable activities should not be located in the 1 in 10 year River Flood Hazard area. This had already been reflected in NH-R12 and the Ministry recommends deletion from NH-R7 for clarity. Vulnerable activities should be allowed to establish in the 1 in 100 year flood hazard area as a restricted discretionary activity if they comply with the appropriate building standards (as set out in NH-R7).</p>	Amend rule rule NH-R7 New buildings, and extensions or alterations that increase the GFA of existing buildings, as follows: New buildings, and extensions or alterations that increase the GFA of existing buildings Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: RDIS-1 The new building, extension or alteration is not located in the 1 in 10 Year River Flood Hazard area. and is or will be used for a vulnerable activity. RDIS-2 The finished floor level of: a. any new building or extension or alteration to an existing building that will accommodate vulnerable activities must be at least 500mm above the maximum water level in a 1 in 100 year flood event; b. any extension or alteration that increases the GFA of a building that accommodates vulnerable activities must be at least 500mm above the maximum water level in a 1 in 100 year flood event; and c. all other new buildings, or extensions or alterations to existing buildings, must be at least 300mm above the maximum water level in a 1 in 100 year flood event.	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<p>RDIS-3 The new, extended or altered building does not divert an overland flow path onto other properties.</p> <p>RIDS-4 The building complies with standard: NH-S1 Information requirements Matters of discretion are limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the effects of flood hazards on the integrity of the building to the extent that such effects are not appropriately managed by the building consent process under the Building Act 2004; b. whether the works are likely to accelerate, worsen or result in material damage to that land, other land or any building or structure through inundation; c. the effects of the development, including earthworks, on overland flow paths and flood depths, velocity or frequency within the site or on surrounding sites; d. the ability to relocate the building or structure or adapt to the flood hazard over time or in response to direct effects of the hazard; e. the extent to which the risk to people and property from the flood hazard is avoided or managed; f. the nature of the activity being 	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					undertaken and its vulnerability to the potential effects of flooding; g. provision of safe access and egress to the building or structure during a flood event; h. whether there is a functional or operational need for the building, structure or activity to be located within the flood hazard area; i. the proposed use of, necessity for and design of engineering solutions (soft or hard) to mitigate the hazard; j. the resilience of the buildings or structures to the effects of the hazard; and k. the methods provided to manage activities and uses within the site, including safe egress from buildings or structures or the site and the management of people and property during a flood event. Activity status where compliance with RDIS-1 is not achieved: Non-complying (refer Rule NH-R12) Activity status where compliance with RDIS-2, RDIS-3 or RDIS-4 is not achieved: Discretionary		
FS403.126	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora support this rule as notified.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora support this rule as notified.	Accept in part
S516.048	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	NH-R8	Support	Ngā Tai Ora support the concept of managing vulnerable activities within hazard areas.	Retain Rule NH-R8		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S421.075	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-R8	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of rules NH-R1, NH-2, NH-3, NH-5, NH-6, NH-7, NH-8, and NH-9 as currently worded in the proposed district plan.	Retain Rule NH-R8 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept
FS570.1307	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
FS346.309	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
FS566.1321	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
FS569.1343	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
S454.074	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	NH-R9	Support	Transpower supports the inclusion of NH-R9 in the FNPDP.	Retain NH-R9		Accept
S421.076	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-R9	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of rules NH-R1, NH-2, NH-3, NH-5, NH-6, NH-7, NH-8, and NH-9 as currently worded in the proposed district plan.	Retain Rule NH-R9 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept
FS570.1308	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
FS346.310	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 give	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.			effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.			
FS566.1322	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
FS569.1344	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
S356.049	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NH-R9	Support	not stated	Retain NH-R9 as notified		Accept
FS403.128	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support	Te Whatu Ora support this rule as notified.	Allow	Te Whatu Ora support this rule as notified.	Accept
S516.049	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	NH-R12	Support	Ngā Tai Ora support the concept of managing vulnerable activities within hazard areas.	Retain Rule NH-R12		Reject
S93.014	Lynley Newport	Standards	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer the standards from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part
S333.012	P S Yates Family Trust	NH-S1	Support in part	The information requirement applies the need for a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer/instability to activities and subdivision on the site as a whole, rather than just that part impacted by the identified natural hazard, imposing unnecessary cost. The amendments sought target the requirements just to the mapped hazard area location.	Amend Information Requirement NH-S1 as follows: Any application for a resource consent in relation to a site location that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion		Accept in part
FS446.017	Omata Estate		Support	Support the change sought to the extent that NH-S1 should only apply where activities or development is proposed within	Allow	Amend Information Requirement NH-S1 as follows: Any application for a	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				a specific natural hazard area and where it is identified that the scale and nature of the proposal warrants a site-specific assessment.		resource consent in relation to a site location that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion	
FS547.016	Heron Point Limited		Support in part	Support the change sought to the extent that NH-S1 should solely be applicable where activities or development are proposed within a natural hazard area. The submitter seeks that Note 2 is amended to clarify that the special information requirement solely applies to activities being undertaken within a mapped natural hazard area. This removes ambiguity when interpreting the current wording with requires a report where a site is potentially affected by natural hazards.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part
S561.044	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-S1	Oppose	The reference to "potentially affected" is not specific and the comment should clarify that this relates to the mapped hazard areas.	Amend NH-S1 as follows: Information requirements Any application for a resource consent in relation to a site that is potentially affected by the mapped natural hazards (as noted in the Plan definitions) must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion.		Accept in part
FS446.018	Omata Estate		Support in part	Support the decision sought to the extent that NH-S1 should only be triggered where a proposed activity is to occur within a portion of a site is affected by mapped	Allow in part	amend Omata Estate seeks that the information requirements of NH-S1 solely apply to a resource	Accept in part

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

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

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				wording with requires a report where a site is potentially affected by natural hazards.			
S222.019	Wendover Two Limited	NH-S1	Support in part	The information requirement applies the need for a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer/instability to activities and subdivision on the site as a whole, rather than just that part impacted by the identified natural hazard, imposing unnecessary cost. The amendments sought target the requirements just to the mapped hazard area location.	Amend Information Requirement NH-S1 as follows: Any application for a resource consent in relation to a site location that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion.		Accept in part
FS547.013	Heron Point Limited		Support in part	Support the change sought to the extent that NH-S1 should solely be applicable where activities or development are proposed within a natural hazard area. The submitter seeks that Note 2 is amended to clarify that the special information requirement solely applies to activities being undertaken within a mapped natural hazard area. This removes ambiguity when interpreting the current wording with requires a report where a site is potentially affected by natural hazards.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part
S243.021	Matauri Trustee Limited	NH-S1	Oppose	The information requirement applies the need for a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer/instability to activities and subdivision on the site as a whole, rather than just that part impacted by the identified natural hazard, imposing unnecessary cost. The amendments sought target the requirements just to the mapped hazard area location	Amend Information Requirement NH-S1 as follows: Any application for a resource consent in relation to a site location that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion		Accept in part
FS547.014	Heron Point Limited		Support in part	Support the change sought to the extent that NH-S1 should solely be applicable where activities or development are	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				proposed within a natural hazard area. The submitter seeks that Note 2 is amended to clarify that the special information requirement solely applies to activities being undertaken within a mapped natural hazard area. This removes ambiguity when interpreting the current wording with requires a report where a site is potentially affected by natural hazards.			
FS570.579	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.593	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.615	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S548.005	Omata Estate	NH-S1	Oppose	site-specific engineering report should be dependent on the nature and scale of a proposal and the proximity of the proposal to an area identified as being potential affected by a natural hazard. Applying a blanket requirement to provide a site-specific engineering report for any resource consent applications for a site potentially affected by a natural hazard would result in undue cost constraints to applicant and does not meet the requirements of s32.	delete NH-S1		Reject
FS332.255	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Rule NH-S1 is relevant for this coastal site.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept
FS403.129	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora support the standard and seek to improve links in the standards table.	Disallow	Te Whatu Ora support the standard and seek to improve links in the standards table.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S483.118	Top Energy Limited	NH-S1	Not Stated	The information standard is not linked in the table and located at the end of the page making it easy to miss. The standard should be linked in the second column of the rules table to make it clear that where resource consent is required, compliance must be achieved with NH-S1.	Insert requirement to comply with Standard NH-S1 where resource consent is required in the activities table		Accept in part
FS345.169	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
S167.012	Bentzen Farm Limited	NH-S1	Oppose	The information requirement applies the need for a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer/instability to activities and subdivision on the site as a whole, rather than just that part impacted by the identified natural hazard, imposing unnecessary cost. The amendments sought target the requirements just to the mapped hazard area location.	Amend Information Requirement NH-S1 as follows: Any application for a resource consent in relation to a site location that is potentially affected by natural hazards must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion.		Accept in part
FS566.374	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part
S215.030	Haigh Workman Limited	SUB-R8	Support in part	The definition of 'Land Susceptible to Instability' appropriately includes a combination of geological units, overall ground slope and proximity to steeper land. The definition is useful as a mapping tool to indicate when land may be unstable and geotechnical advice should be sought, but it does not necessarily mean that the ground is unstable. This is quite different from the areas mapped by NRC as subject to flooding or coastal erosion where extensive analysis and modelling has been carried out and there is a high degree of certainty that the land is subject to the hazard. Under the definition, large portions of	Amend SUB-R8 so that Controlled Activity status apply to subdivisions where a geotechnical report by a qualified professional establishes that the land subject to subdivision is not prone to instability or can be engineered to be stable even though it falls within the definition of Land Susceptible to Instability'.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>Northland would be deemed 'Land Susceptible to Instability'. Under Rule NH-R10, a resource consent would be required for many new buildings or extensions to existing buildings in addition to the building consents required under the Building Act. Given that the Building Act process would require geotechnical design that addresses any instability issues, we wonder what the purpose is in having another statutory layer addressing the same issue.</p> <p>It seems probable that within the next 10 years, that a study will be carried out to more accurately define land susceptible to instability in the Far North District. As with flood mapping, ideally the definition would provide sufficient flexibility to allow the use of any published geotechnical assessment that more accurately maps land susceptible to instability.</p>			
FS289.4	Reuben Wright		Support in part	It is considered appropriate to require suitable engineering information to support any subdivision where a new building site and/or access is required, as a policy and rule for subdivision. However, the mapping of land stability across the district should be left as a matter to be addressed outside the District Plan.	Allow in part		Reject
FS570.519	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.533	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.555	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S512.031	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-R8	Support in part	Given Fire and Emergency's secondary function responding to natural hazard emergencies, Fire and Emergency support the approach of controlling development/subdivision in identified natural hazard areas. It is essential that emergency responders are able to access potential emergencies on these sites.	insert an additional matter of control/matter of discretion to SUB-R8 on having adequate access for emergency response to each lot created	Reject
S117.001	Lynley Newport	SUB-R8	Oppose	Rule SUB-R8 as written lacks clarity and could be interpreted as applying to the entire site. The words "proposed development area" are too vague. The amended wording will still require/enable assessment of build platforms and services in relation to areas of land instability.	Amend CON-1 of Rule SUB-R8 as follows: The proposed development area, including the building platforms and any area that is required for access and services associated with buildings, is are located wholly outside of any area on the site that is identified as being land susceptible to land instability.	Accept in part
FS196.73	Joe Carr		Support	as per submitter's reasons	Allow	Accept in part
FS403.139	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to amend rule SUB-R8 to locate building platforms, access and services in the least as risk portion of the parent site.	Allow in part Te Whatu Ora seek to amend rule SUB-R8 to locate building platforms, access and services in the least as risk portion of the parent site.	Accept in part
S516.056	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	SUB-R8	Not Stated	Ngā Tai Ora support the creation of resilient communities, responding to and managing risk from natural hazards to ensure the health, safety and wellbeing of Northland residents. Ngā Tai Ora consider that SUB-R8 is ineffective and inefficient. The rule requires building platforms, access and services to be located wholly outside of any area on site which is identified as land susceptible to land instability. Land susceptible to land instability is not mapped in the PDP, instead the PDP provides a complicated definition which requires applicants to undertake individual mapping of their own	Insert rules applying to areas of risk which are appropriately identified through further mapping of land instability and where the potential risk of land instability throughout the District is understood. Or alternatively: Amend the definition of land identified as susceptible to land instability, to be easily understandable and identifiable. Amend Rule SUB-R8 to locate building platforms, access and services in the least as risk portion of the parent site.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				site. Ngā Tai Ora, consider that this method is onerous, placing considerable cost on landowners particularly when provisions of affordable, safe and healthy housing is essential in the Far North District.			
FS243.085	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that will contribute to Te Tai Tokerau being more responsive and resilient to natural hazards, including as these hazards evolve because of climate change.	Allow in part	Insert rules applying to areas	Reject
S178.003	Reuben Wright	SUB-R8	Support in part	Rule SUB-R8 refers to 'Subdivision of a site containing land susceptible to land instability'. The definition of land instability in the Plan is very detailed and onerous and relies on information that will not be contained in the District Plan (ie. NZ Geology Web Map). All subdivisions are required to be assessed against Section 106 of the RMA which includes consideration of any significant risk of natural hazards. There does not appear to be a need to address land instability via a rule where it is addressed directly by statute.	[Amend to delete SUB-R8] and alternatively Rule SUB-R2 could include a requirement to define a suitable building site on each vacant lot by way of engineering report or certificaion to confirm stability.		Reject
FS403.140	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to amend rule SUB-R8 to locate building platforms, access and services in the least as risk portion of the parent site.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to amend rule SUB-R8 to locate building platforms, access and services in the least as risk portion of the parent site.	Reject
S204.001	Thomson Survey Ltd	SUB-R8	Oppose	The rule as written lacks clarity and could be interpreting as applying to the entire site.	Amend CON-1The p-Proposed building platforms and any area that is required for access and services associated with buildings are development area, including the building platform and any area that is required for access and services, is located wholly outside of any area on the site that is		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					identified as being land susceptible to land instability.		
FS403.141	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to amend rule SUB-R8 to locate building platforms, access and services in the least as risk portion of the parent site.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to amend rule SUB-R8 to locate building platforms, access and services in the least as risk portion of the parent site.	Accept in part
S193.001	Thomson Survey Ltd	SUB-R11	Oppose	The rule is overly restrictive. There are a host of methods available to land owners to ensure they can remedy or mitigate the risk of material damage from flooding when building. Council should be more interested in assessing the suitability of subdivisions in regard to the 1 in 10 year event. The rule does not accurately reflect the requirements of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland.	Amend SUB-R11 to default to non-complying activity status for the 1 in 10 year flood event and default to discretionary activity status for the 1 in 100 year flood event.		Reject
S512.032	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-R11	Support in part	Given Fire and Emergency's secondary function responding to natural hazard emergencies, Fire and Emergency support the approach of controlling development/subdivision in identified natural hazard areas. It is essential that emergency responders are able to access potential emergencies on these sites.	Include an additional matter of control/matter of discretion to SUB-R11 on having adequate access for emergency response to each lot created.		Reject
S502.084	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	SUB-R11	Support in part	The spatial extent of the 1:100 year flood plain refers to the mapped extent of a flood plain. In some cases river control works or earthworks consented by the regional council have been undertaken to ensure that a building platform can be established outside of this mapped flood hazard area. Where this is the case the proposal should also be able to achieve a Restricted Discretionary Activity status as opposed to being a Non-Complying activity. As such item 1 has been updated to reflect this scenario.	Amend SUB-R11 RDIS-1 RDIS -1 1. Building platforms are located wholly outside the spatial extent of the 1 in 100 year floodplain, or a site specific report has been provided by a suitably qualified and experienced practitioner which confirms that the building platform is located outside of the 1 in 100 year floodplain: 2. Newly created allotments must be located		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					and designed to not divert flood flow onto other properties or otherwise result in any increase in flood hazard beyond the site; 3. Any private roads, right of ways or accessways must be located where the depth of flood waters in a 1 in 100 year flood event does not exceed 200mm above ground level.		
S215.031	Haigh Workman Limited	SUB-R11	Support	We support subdivisions in natural hazard areas being much more restricted than subdivisions outside these areas. Subdivisions that result in development in flood hazard areas should be avoided.	Retain Restricted Discretionary and Non-Complying status for subdivisions in natural hazards areas.		Accept
FS44.31	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support in part	Provision should be made for sites which have obtained a site specific report has been provided which confirms a building platform is located outside of the 1 in 100 year floodplain	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS570.520	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
FS566.534	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
FS569.556	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
S115.001	Lynley Newport	SUB-R11	Oppose	Rule SUB-R11 is overly restrictive, not necessarily in its wording or activity status, but what it defaults to if RDIS-1 cannot be met. Given that there are a host of methods available to landowners to ensure they can remedy or mitigate the risk of	Amend Rule SUB-R11 to be less restrictive by reserving the default to a non-complying activity status for the 1 in 10-year flood event and default to discretionary activity status for the 1 in 100-year flood event.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>material damage from flooding when building, I believe non-complying status to be overly restrictive and believe discretionary activity status to be adequate to enable the Council to assess for risk appropriately. The rule addresses the 1 in 100-year event - a 1% likelihood of occurring every year. It would seem to me that the Council should be more interested in assessing the suitability of subdivisions in regard to the 1 in 10-year event - where there is at least a 10% chance of flooding occurring every year - a higher risk of occurring.</p> <p>The rule does not accurately reflect the requirements of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland either. That document refers to a '100 year flood event' and a '10 year flood event' whereas the Proposed District Plan uses the terminology "spatial extent of the 1 in 100 year floodplain". The latter infers reliance to ascertain compliance with the rule is on maps regardless of whether a report is provided refuting the accuracy of those maps; whereas the former infers an ability for an assessment from a suitably qualified person to confirm compliance.</p>			
FS196.68	Joe Carr		Support	as per submitter's reasoning	Allow		Reject
S561.049	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-R11	Support	Rule SUB-R11 is part of the natural hazard framework contained within the Proposed Plan ensuring land unsuitable for development is removed from development potential.	Retain Rule SUB-R11 as notified.		Accept
FS32.103	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</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>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>			
FS403.142	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support	Te Whatu Ora seek to amend SUB-R11 and SUB-R12 to be a permitted activity where building platforms and associated access for each allotment is located wholly outside the spatial extent of the Coastal Hazard Area.	Allow in part	Seek provision details as above ...	Accept in part
FS23.321	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
FS47.063	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	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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			
FS348.136	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
S344.011	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	SUB-R11	Not Stated	As proposed, rule SUB-R11 is inefficient and ineffective. Coastal and flood hazard areas are mapped overlays, rules and constraints apply to the mapped location. These rules will result in any subdivision of any site containing a portion of identified coastal hazard as a restricted discretionary activity no matter what the potential risk is.	Amend SUB-R11 to provide for subdivision of land mapped as a coastal or flood hazard area as a restricted discretionary activity.		Accept in part
FS396.032	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S205.001	Thomson Survey Limited	SUB-R12	Oppose	The rule is overly restrictive and not consistent with the Regional Policy Statement for Northland. Whilst a default to non-complying activity status when not meeting the restricted discretionary status would appear reasonable if it isn't possible to identify building platforms outside the high risk coastal hazard areas, I believe a default to	Amend SUB-R12 to default to non-complying activity status for the high risk coastal hazards; and default to discretionary activity status for the lesser risk (likelihood) coastal hazard events.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				discretionary activity status is more appropriate where the risk is not as high.		
S512.033	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-R12	Support in part	Given Fire and Emergency's secondary function responding to natural hazard emergencies, Fire and Emergency support the approach of controlling development/subdivision in identified natural hazard areas. It is essential that emergency responders are able to access potential emergencies on these sites.	Include an additional matter of control/matter of discretion to SUB-R12 having adequate access for emergency response to each lot created.	Reject
S516.057	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	SUB-R12	Not Stated	As proposed, rules SUB-R11 and SUB-R12 are inefficient and ineffective. Coastal and flood hazard areas are mapped overlays, rules and constraints apply to the mapped location. These rules will result in any subdivision of any site containing a portion of identified coastal hazard as a restricted discretionary activity no matter what the potential risk is. Ngā Tai Ora, consider that this method is onerous, placing considerable cost on landowners particularly when provisions of affordable, safe and healthy housing is essential in the Far North District.	Amend Rule SUB-R12 to be a permitted activity where building platforms and associated access for each allotment is located wholly outside the spatial extent of the Coastal Hazard Area.	Reject
S113.001	Lynley Newport	SUB-R12	Oppose	The rule is overly restrictive, and not completely consistent with the Regional Policy Statement for Northland. The latter requires subdivision plans to identify that building platforms are located outside high risk coastal hazard areas where as SUB-R12 just says 'coastal hazard area' regardless of level of risk. My understanding is that there is a distinction in the NRC's on-line coastal hazard mapping between levels of risk and these maps I believe have been brought into the PDP. Whilst a default to non complying activity status when not meeting the restricted discretionary status would appear reasonable, if it isn't possible to identify building platforms outside the high	Amend the rule to be less restrictive. Council could reserve the default to non complying activity status for the high risk coastal hazards; and default to discretionary activity status for the lesser risk (likelihood) coastal hazard events.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				risk coastal hazard areas, I believe a default to discretionary activity status is more appropriate where the risk is not as high.			
FS196.66	Joe Carr		Support	AS PER SUBMITTER	Allow		Reject
S561.050	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-R12	Support	Rule SUB-R12 is part of the natural hazard framework contained within the Proposed Plan ensuring land unsuitable for development is removed from development potential.	Retain Rule SUB-R12 as notified.		Accept
FS32.104	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
FS403.143	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to amend SUB-R11 and SUB-R12 to be a permitted activity where building platforms and associated access for	Allow in part	Seek provision details as above	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				each allotment is located wholly outside the spatial extent of the Coastal Hazard Area.			
FS23.322	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
FS47.064	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
FS348.137	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
S29.006	Bayswater Inn Ltd	SUB-R12	Oppose	Subdivision of 40 Marsden Road, Paihia, would be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity but the building platform and access must be outside the Coastal Hazard Area	Amend SUB-R12 as it applies to 40 Marsden Road, Paihia, as the rule is not appropriate for the site given its frontage and existing use rights which make it impractical to achieve the requirement.		Reject
FS400.027	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	The submission opposes the Paihia Heritage Overlay which seeks to depart from the Environment Court	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				2005/2006 decision. The decision of the Environment Court should be retained.			
S215.032	Haigh Workman Limited	SUB-R12	Support	We support subdivisions in natural hazard areas being much more restricted than subdivisions outside these areas. Subdivisions that result in development in flood hazard areas should be avoided.	Retain Restricted Discretionary and Non-Complying status for subdivisions in natural hazards areas.		Accept
FS570.521	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
FS566.535	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
FS569.557	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
S344.012	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	SUB-R12	Not Stated	As proposed, rule SUB-R12 is inefficient and ineffective. Coastal and flood hazard areas are mapped overlays, rules and constraints apply to the mapped location. These rules will result in any subdivision of any site containing a portion of identified coastal hazard as a restricted discretionary activity no matter what the potential risk is	Amend SUB-R12 to provide for subdivision of land mapped as a coastal or flood hazard area as a restricted discretionary activity.		Accept in part
FS396.033	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S493.009	William Goodfellow	CE-R10	Oppose	The submitter also considers that the activity status and standards imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on setback for buildings from MHWS, and limitations over the area, height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Amend the provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part
FS67.116	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.113	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS361.062	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendments as they consider that the default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures is overly restrictive, but notes that CE-R10 should be provided for as a permitted activity.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
S496.007	Philip Thornton	CE-R10	Oppose	The submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Amend the provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS411.007	Omarino Residents Association		Support	The Omarino residents association considers that these areas should be excluded from the ONL overlay and associated controls as anticipated by the subdivision consent, particularly given that the design conditions imposed by the subdivision consent render such controls nugatory.	Allow	remove the ONL overlay from all of the areas specified in Condition 9 of the subdivision consent as attached.	Accept in part
FS361.064	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendments as they consider that the default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures is overly restrictive, but notes that CE-R10 should be provided for as a permitted activity	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
S251.009	New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd	CE-R10	Support in part	The PDP seeks to manage the risk from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure. NZMPL's site of interest is subject to Coastal Flood hazards, while NZMPL appreciate the importance of managing risk from natural hazards, it considers that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for. NZMPL consider that the default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures, is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications	Amend Rule CE-R10 to provide for additional and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity.		Accept in part
FS400.014	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against	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
				the urban environment values and existing environment.			
FS396.014	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS449.029	The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation		Support in part	The PDP seeks to manage the risk from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure. NZMPL's site of interest is subject to Coastal Flood hazards, while NZMPL appreciate the importance of managing risk from natural hazards, it considers that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for. NZMPL consider that the default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures, is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part
S431.044	John Andrew Riddell	CE-R10	Not Stated	Not stated	Amend the 'matters of discretion' in Rule CE-R10 to refer to Rule CE-R16 instead of Rule CE-R17		Reject
FS332.044	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
S250.016	Willowridge Developments Limited	CE-R10	Support in part	Consider that existing activities and buildings should be recognised and provided for. The default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications.	Amend CE-R10 to provide for additional and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity.		Accept in part
FS332.263	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Allowing an increase in GFA in hazard areas increases risk of legal action for Council.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept in part
FS570.702	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
FS566.716	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
FS569.738	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
S494.009	Ian Jepson	CE-R10	Oppose	Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include the identification of farming and forestry as discretionary activities, and imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Amend the provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part
FS361.063	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendments as they consider that the default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures is overly restrictive, but notes that CE-R10 should be provided for as a permitted activity	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S497.007	Mark John Wyborn	CE-R10	Support in part	The imposition of controls intended to manage development make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained (inferred).	Amend the provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part
FS361.065	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendments as they consider that the default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures is overly restrictive, but notes that CE-R10 should be provided for as a permitted activity	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
S344.019	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	CE-R10	Not Stated	The default performance standard of no increase in GFA or footprint of structures is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications.	Amend CE-R10 to provide for additional and alterations to existing activities as a permitted activity.		Accept in part
FS396.040	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S93.001	Lynley Newport	CE-R10	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer Rule CE-R10 from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part
S93.002	Lynley Newport	CE-R11	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the	Transfer Rule CE-R11 from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		
S431.045	John Andrew Riddell	CE-R11	Not Stated	Not stated	Amend the 'matters of discretion' in Rule CE-R11 to refer to Rule CE-R16 instead of Rule CE-R17		Reject
FS332.045	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
FS369.470	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain rule CE-R11 as notified	Disallow		Accept
S483.176	Top Energy Limited	CE-R11	Support	Top Energy supports the permitted activity status for this activity where there is no increase in footprint for above ground infrastructure and does not direct coastal inundation. Top Energy also supports the restricted discretionary activity status for non-compliance with this rule.	Retain Rule CE-R11		Accept
FS345.227	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
S516.060	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	CE-R12	Support	Ngā Tai Ora support the concept of managing vulnerable activities within hazard areas.	Retain Rule CE-R12		Accept
S431.046	John Andrew Riddell	CE-R12	Not Stated	Not stated	Amend the 'matters of discretion' in Rule CE-R12 to refer to Rule CE-R16 instead of Rule CE-R17		Reject
FS332.046	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
FS403.154	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R12.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R12.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S344.020	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	CE-R12	Not Stated	CE-R12 as drafted will not enable the development of any form of new building, change of use of buildings or extension of existing buildings of appropriate size without the requirement to obtain a resource consent. This is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications.	Amend CE-R12 to provide new buildings and structures within urban zoned land as a permitted activity.		Reject
FS396.041	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS403.152	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R12.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R12.	Accept in part
S407.002	Tapuaetahi Incorporation	CE-R12	Support in part	It is contended that a provision should be provided within the PDP which enables, as a permitted activity, the ability for people to exercise their existing use rights, where rebuilding a house 'like for like' and which result in effects which are the same or similar in character, intensity, and scale.	Amend CE-R12 to: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The building or structure is one of the following: i. above ground buildings and structures with a footprint of 10m ² or less and are not used for a vulnerable activity. ii. decks less than 30m ² and less than 1m in height. PER 2 The building or structure including any associated earthworks, does not direct coastal inundation onto other properties. PER 3 All standards of the relevant zone applying to the activity are met. Exemption: A building or structure which is developed in accordance with s10 and s20 of the RMA.		Reject
FS403.153	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R12.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R12.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S93.003	Lynley Newport	CE-R12	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer Rule CE-R12 from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.	Accept in part
FS369.471	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain rule CE-R11 as notified	Disallow	Accept in part
S93.004	Lynley Newport	CE-R13	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer Rule CE-R13 from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.	Accept in part
S502.021	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	CE-R13	Support in part	If you need consent for any other rule in a zone then you also breach this standard. This should be removed for this reason as it triggers unnecessary consent.	Delete PER-5 of Rule CE-R13 If similar wording remains, we ask that an assessment of the district is completed to ensure that there are no special zones or lifestyle zoning which may lie outside of the Rural environment which would trigger this rule.	Accept
S503.019	Waitangi Limited	CE-R13	Not Stated	If you need consent for any other rule in a zone then you also breach this standard. This should be removed for this reason as it triggers unnecessary consent.	Delete PER-5 of Rule CE-R13 If similar wording remains, we ask that an assessment of the district is completed to ensure that there are no special zones or lifestyle zoning which may lie outside of the Rural environment which would trigger this rule.	Accept
S516.061	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	CE-R14	Support	Ngā Tai Ora support the concept of managing vulnerable activities within hazard areas.	Retain Rule CE-R14	Accept
S493.010	William Goodfellow	CE-R14	Oppose	The submitter also considers that the activity status and standards imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on setback for buildings from MHWS, and limitations over the area, height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Amend the provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.	Accept in part
FS67.117	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with	Disallow	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.			
FS68.114	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS403.157	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Accept in part
S496.008	Philip Thornton	CE-R14	Oppose	The submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Amend the provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part
FS411.008	Omarino Residents Association		Support	The Omarino residents association considers that these areas should be excluded from the ONL overlay and associated controls as anticipated by the subdivision consent, particularly given that the design conditions imposed by the subdivision consent render such controls nugatory.	Allow	remove the ONL overlay from all of the areas specified in Condition 9 of the subdivision consent as attached.	Accept in part
FS403.159	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Accept in part
S344.021	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP	CE-R14	Not Stated	CE-R14 as drafted will not enable the development of any form of new building, change of use of buildings or extension of existing buildings of appropriate size without the requirement to obtain a resource consent. This is overly restrictive	Amend CE-R14 to provide new buildings and structures within urban zoned land as a permitted activity.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Management Ltd			and will require unnecessary resource consent applications.			
FS396.042	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS403.156	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Accept in part
S93.005	Lynley Newport	CE-R14	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer Rule CE-R14 from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part
FS403.155	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Accept in part
S494.010	Ian Jepson	CE-R14	Oppose	Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include the identification of farming and forestry as discretionary activities, and imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Amend the provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part
FS403.158	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Accept in part
S497.008	Mark John Wyborn	CE-R14	Support in part	The imposition of controls intended to manage development make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained (inferred).	Amend the provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part
FS403.160	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora seek to retain rule CE-R14	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S93.006	Lynley Newport	CE-R15	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer Rule CE-R15 from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part
S344.022	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	CE-R15	Not Stated	CE-R15 as drafted will not enable the development of any form of new building, change of use of buildings or extension of existing buildings of appropriate size without the requirement to obtain a resource consent. This is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications.	Amend CE-R15 to provide new buildings and structures within urban zoned land as a permitted activity.		Reject
FS396.043	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S93.007	Lynley Newport	CE-R16	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer Rule CE-R16 from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part
S344.023	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	CE-R16	Not Stated	CE-R16 as drafted will not enable the development of any form of new building, change of use of buildings or extension of existing buildings of appropriate size without the requirement to obtain a resource consent. This is overly restrictive and will require unnecessary resource consent applications.	Amend CE-R16 to provide new buildings and structures within urban zoned land as a permitted activity.		Reject
FS396.044	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.			
S516.062	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	CE-R17	Oppose	The provision duplicates Rule HS-R8, Ngā Tai Ora support the activity status of HS-R8.	Delete Rule CE-R17		Accept
S93.008	Lynley Newport	CE-R17	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer Rule CE-R17 from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part
FS403.161	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek to delete this rule to avoid duplication with HZ-R8.	Disallow	Te Whatu Ora seek to delete this rule to avoid duplication with HZ-R8.	Accept in part
S502.022	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	CE-R17	Support in part	seek that the hyperlinking is checked to ensure CE-R17 is covering the right information	Amend to ensure that the hyperlinking in CE-R17 is covering the right information		Reject
FS403.162	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek to delete this rule to avoid duplication with HZ-R8.	Disallow	Te Whatu Ora seek to delete this rule to avoid duplication with HZ-R8.	Accept
S516.063	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	CE-R18	Oppose	The provision duplicates Rule HS-R8, Ngā Tai Ora support the activity status of HS-R8.	Delete Rule CE-R18		Accept
S93.009	Lynley Newport	CE-R18	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer Rule CE-R18 from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part
FS403.163	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek to delete this rule to avoid duplication with HZ-R8.	Disallow	Te Whatu Ora seek to delete this rule to avoid duplication with HZ-R8.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S502.023	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	CE-R18	Oppose	CE-R18 is a copy of CE-R17	Delete CE-R18		Accept
FS403.164	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora seek to delete this rule to avoid duplication with HZ-R8.	Disallow	Te Whatu Ora seek to delete this rule to avoid duplication with HZ-R8.	Accept in part
S93.010	Lynley Newport	CE-R19	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer Rule CE-R19 from the Coastal Environment chapter (rules section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part
S344.024	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	CE-R19	Oppose	CE, HNCA, ONCA and Coastal Hazards are overlays in the district plan, management of land use and activities is more appropriately managed via the underlying zone. It is considered that a catch all default of discretionary activity is inappropriate and restrictive.	Delete Rule CE-R19		Reject
FS396.045	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S93.011	Lynley Newport	CE-S4	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer Standard CE-S4 from the Coastal Environment chapter (standards section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part
S562.001	RS Eng Ltd	CE-S4	Not Stated	Standard CE-S4 is incorrectly worded and could be misinterpreted. The standard also requires minimum floor levels which are greater than required by	Amend Standard CE-S4 to separate new buildings from subdivision.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the building code. New buildings only require a design life of 50 years, and thus 0.5m of sea level rise. Whilst subdivisions require planning timeframes of 100 years, so the 1m sea level rise is correct.			
FS348.022	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept
S93.012	Lynley Newport	CE-S5	Support in part	Support the need to manage development within coastal hazard areas but believe all hazard provisions should be located in the Natural Hazards chapter. A cross reference in the Coastal Environment back to the Natural hazards chapter can be included.	Transfer Standard CE-S5 from the Coastal Environment chapter (standards section addressing coastal hazards) into the Natural Hazards chapter. Consequently, insert a cross reference within the Coastal Environment chapter to this effect.		Accept in part
S168.080	Setar Thirty Six Limited	CE-S5	Oppose	As drafted, the standard may trigger the need for an engineering report for a resource consent for an activity anywhere on a site subject to a coastal hazard overlay. In most instances, the coastal hazard overlays are limited in area on a property. The related rules in this section consistently refer to 'location' which limits the assessment to the location of the activity sought, relative to the overlay. The standard should also refer to location to avoid this potential interpretation	Amend standard CE-S5 as follows: Any application for a resource consent in relation to a site location that is potentially affected by a coastal hazard must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion.		Accept in part
S187.071	The Shooting Box Limited	CE-S5	Oppose	As drafted, the standard may trigger the need for an engineering report for a resource consent for an activity anywhere on a site subject to a coastal hazard overlay. In most instances, the coastal hazard overlays are limited in area on a property. The related rules in this section consistently refer to 'location' which limits the assessment to the location of the activity sought, relative to the overlay. The standard should also refer to location to avoid this potential interpretation.	Amend standard CE-S5 as follows: Any application for a resource consent in relation to a site location that is potentially affected by a coastal hazard must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S222.074	Wendover Two Limited	CE-S5	Support in part	As drafted, the standard may trigger the need for an engineering report for a resource consent for an activity anywhere on a site subject to a coastal hazard overlay. In most instances, the coastal hazard overlays are limited in area on a property. The related rules in this section consistently refer to 'location' which limits the assessment to the location of the activity sought, relative to the overlay. The standard should also refer to location to avoid this potential interpretation.	Amend standard CE-S5 as follows: Any application for a resource consent in relation to a site location that is potentially affected by a coastal hazard must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion.	Accept in part
S167.082	Bentzen Farm Limited	CE-S5	Oppose	As drafted, the standard may trigger the need for an engineering report for a resource consent for an activity anywhere on a site subject to a coastal hazard overlay. In most instances, the coastal hazard overlays are limited in area on a property. The related rules in this section consistently refer to 'location' which limits the assessment to the location of the activity sought, relative to the overlay. The standard should also refer to location to avoid this potential interpretation.	Amend standard CE-S5 as follows: Any application for a resource consent in relation to a site location that is potentially affected by a coastal hazard must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion.	Accept in part
FS143.35	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter agrees with the submission point because as drafted, the standard may trigger the need for an engineering report for a resource consent for an activity anywhere on a site subject to a coastal hazard overlay (rather than just within the overlay itself).	Allow	Accept in part
FS566.444	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Accept in part
S333.072	P S Yates Family Trust	CE-S5	Support in part	As drafted, the standard may trigger the need for an engineering report for a resource consent for an activity anywhere on a site subject to a coastal hazard overlay. In most instances, the coastal hazard overlays are limited in area on a	Amend Standard CE-S5 as follows: <i>Any application for a resource consent in relation to a site location that is potentially affected by a</i>	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				property The related rules in this section consistently refer to 'location' which limits the assessment to the location of the activity sought, relative to the overlay. The standard should also refer to location to avoid this potential interpretation.	report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion		
FS547.020	Heron Point Limited		Support	Support the decision sought to the extent that NH-S1 should only be triggered where a proposed activity is to occur within a portion of a site is affected by mapped natural hazard. The submitter seeks that the information requirements of NH-S1 solely apply to a resource consent application where an activity is proposed on land affected by a mapped natural hazard.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part
FS305.018	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The rule should only be applicable where activities or development are proposed within a natural hazard area.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
S548.004	Omata Estate	CE-S5	Oppose	a site specific engineering report should be dependent on the natural and scale of a proposal and the proximity of the proposal to an area identified as being potential affected by the coastal hazard. Applying a blanket requirement to provide a site-specific engineering report for any resource consent applications for a site potentially affected by a coastal hazard would result in undue cost constraints to applicants and does not meet the requirements of s32.	delete CE-S5		Reject
FS547.021	Heron Point Limited		Support	Support the decision sought to the extent that NH-S1 should only be triggered where a proposed activity is to occur within a portion of a site is affected by mapped natural hazard. The submitter seeks that the information requirements of NH-S1 solely apply to a resource consent application where an	Allow	Delete CE-S5	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				activity is proposed on land affected by a mapped natural hazard.			
FS332.254	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Rule CE-S5 is relevant for this coastal site.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept
S243.100	Matauri Trustee Limited	CE-S5	Oppose	As drafted, the standard may trigger the need for an engineering report for a resource consent for an activity anywhere on a site subject to a coastal hazard overlay. In most instances, the coastal hazard overlays are limited in area on a property. The related rules in this section consistently refer to 'location' which limits the assessment to the location of the activity sought, relative to the overlay. The standard should also refer to location to avoid this potential interpretation.	Amend standard CE-S5 as follows: Any application for a resource consent in relation to a site location that is potentially affected by a coastal hazard must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion		Accept in part
FS570.658	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
FS566.672	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
FS569.694	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
S282.007	Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The current drafting of this section applies to telecommunications infrastructure. The application of natural hazard rules to telecommunications infrastructure is not supported given that telecommunications operators can make their own decisions around where it is appropriate and necessary to site cabinets given that these structures are not expected to exacerbate existing hazards. The NES-TF specifically disapplies natural hazard rules in District	Amend the Natural Hazards section of the Plan to not apply to telecommunications infrastructure.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Plans to regulated activities under NESTF Regulation 57, following a consideration of the risk profile of this type of equipment in making the regulations.		
S282.008	Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Policies	Oppose	The current drafting of this section applies to telecommunications infrastructure. The application of natural hazard rules to telecommunications infrastructure is not supported given that telecommunications operators can make their own decisions around where it is appropriate and necessary to site cabinets given that these structures are not expected to exacerbate existing hazards. The NES-TF specifically disapplies natural hazard rules in District Plans to regulated activities under NESTF Regulation 57, following a consideration of the risk profile of this type of equipment in making the regulations.	Amend the Natural Hazards section of the Plan to not apply to telecommunications infrastructure.	Accept in part
S282.009	Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Rules	Oppose	The current drafting of this section applies to telecommunications infrastructure. The application of natural hazard rules to telecommunications infrastructure is not supported given that telecommunications operators can make their own decisions around where it is appropriate and necessary to site cabinets given that these structures are not expected to exacerbate existing hazards. The NES-TF specifically disapplies natural hazard rules in District Plans to regulated activities under NESTF Regulation 57, following a consideration of the risk profile of this type of equipment in making the regulations.	Amend the Natural Hazards section of the Plan to not apply to telecommunications infrastructure.	Accept in part
S74.005	Brownie Family Trust	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Support	Coastal erosion hazards do need to be managed to ensure long term viability of development.	Retain the Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3) overlays as notified	Accept
S259.020	Nicole Wooster	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Support in part	We accept that coastal hazards exist and will change over time as sea level rises. However if any issue is established with the mapping we want the coastal	Amend coastal hazard maps as appropriate to ensure that they are correctly identifying current and future risk.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				hazards identified on our property reviewed and amended as appropriate.		
S358.038	Leah Frieling	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	<p>Change the mapping of the Coastal Erosion hazard 2 zone adjacent to 275 Foreshore Road, Ahipara (Lot 1 DP 431209) to be reflective of geology, as it is clear that different substrates erode at different rates, and also that the site contains gabion baskets that have lifted the site well above the surrounding properties, and has been established by a geotechnical engineer - PK engineering, in June 2017</p> <p>A generic approach has been taken, instead of looking at the geology of the site, and therefore if it will erode or not. The report from PK engineering specifically has considered potential erosion of the substrate, and it is clear that blue rock will not erode such as sand or other sedimentary rock may do so</p>	Amend the Coastal Erosion hazard 2 line adjacent to 275 Foreshore Road, Ahipara (Lot 1 DP 431209).	Reject
S357.031	Sean Frieling	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	The coastal erosion hazard 2 line maps are not drawn and established relative to the gabion basket heights. Change the maps for the coastal erosion hazard 2 line maps to be reflective of geology, as it is clear that different substrates erode at different rates, and also that the site contains gabion baskets that have lifted the site well above the surrounding properties, and has been established by a geotechnical engineer - PK engineering, in June 2017. See submission.	Amend the coastal erosion hazard 2 line where it runs past this site to reflect the PK engineering assessment that was also provided to Toby Kay at NRC when the coastal hazard mapping was done by NRC (13.6.17).	Reject
S547.012	LJ King Limited	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	The coastal Erosion Hazard 2 line maps are not drawn and established relative to the gabion basket heights.	Amend Coastal Erosion Zone 2 Line to be reflective of geology at 2 Panorama Lane, 4 Panorama Lane and 5 Panorama Lane, Ahipara (as per engineering assessment in submission).	Reject
S541.012	Elbury Holdings	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	The coastal Erosion Hazard 2 line maps are not drawn and established relative to the gabion basket heights.	Amend Coastal Erosion Zone 2 Line to be reflective of geology at 2 Panorama Lane, 4 Panorama Lane and 5 Panorama Lane, Ahipara (as per engineering	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					assessment in submission).	
FS155.81	Fiona King		Support	have already shown NRC that these lines are incorrect. Please correct Panarama land Ahipara	Allow	Reject
S519.013	Elbury Holdings	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	The coastal Erosion Hazard 2 line maps are not drawn and established relative to the gabion basket heights	Amend Coastal Erosion Zone 2 Line to be reflective of geology at 2 Panorama Lane, 4 Panorama Lane and 5 Panorama Lane, Ahipara (as per engineering assessment in submission).	Reject
FS155.82	Fiona King		Support	The gabion baskets are not the level . It is the rock base that sits behind them and further up the hill. Notice the land contours rise from the beach front up to the Panarama road entrance and is blue rock that is the base there. Engineer reported this already.	Allow	Reject
S485.013	Elbury Holdings	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	The coastal Erosion Hazard 2 line maps are not drawn and established relative to the gabion basket heights.	Amend Coastal Erosion Zone 2 Line to be reflective of geology at 2 Panorama Lane, 4 Panorama Lane and 5 Panorama Lane, Ahipara (as per engineering assessment in submission).	Reject
FS155.83	Fiona King		Oppose	see reasons attached as above and in the original report from the engineer that was attached to the submission .	Allow	Reject
S472.039	Michael Foy	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	A generic approach has been taken, instead of looking at the geology of the site, and therefore if it will erode or not. The report from PK engineering specifically has considered potential erosion of the substrate, and it is clear that blue rock will not erode such as sand or other sedimentary rock may do so. evidence by way of letter.	amend coastal erosion hazard 2 line maps for Gabion Basket heights, 275 Foreshore road , Ahipara.	Reject
FS258.8	logan king		Support		Allow	Reject
FS259.12	Leah Frieling		Support		Allow	Reject
S543.012	LJ King Limited	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	The coastal Erosion Hazard 2 line maps are not drawn and established relative to the gabion basket heights	Amend Coastal Erosion Zone 2 Line to be reflective of geology at 2 Panorama Lane, 4 Panorama Lane and 5 Panorama Lane, Ahipara (as per engineering assessment in submission).	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS259.2	Leah Frieling		Support		Allow		Reject
FS566.2173	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
S464.012	LJ King Ltd	Coastal Erosion (Zones 1-3)	Oppose	A generic approach has been taken, instead of looking at the geology of the site, and therefore if it will erode or not. A report from PK engineering specifically has considered potential erosion of the substrate, and it is clear that blue rock will not erode such as sand or other sedimentary rock may do so.	Amend the Coastal Erosion Zone 2 line as it applies to 2, 4 and 5 Panorama Lane, Ahipara to reflect the geology of the area.		Reject
FS566.1557	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
S74.049	Brownie Family Trust	Coastal Flood (Zones 1-3) : 50 Year Scenario)	Support	Coastal hazards do need to be managed to ensure long term viability of development.	Retain the Coastal Flood (Zones 1-3) overlays as notified		Accept
FS323.5	Nicole Wooster		Support in part	Not all coastal hazards will have been identified correctly in the plan, and there should be scope for landowners to demonstrate their property is not affected by a hazard or the scale of hazard identified.	Disallow in part		Reject
S486.097	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	Coastal Flood (Zones 1-3) : 50 Year Scenario)	Oppose	All flood risk maps included in the PDP were created at a scale of 1:250,000. This means there is insufficient accuracy to identify at-risk areas of an individual land parcel. This will place heavy financial burdens on tāngata whenua to gain expert analysis of each site and case by case. It would be more efficient for the Council to undertake these assessments alongside tāngata whenua.	Amend the planning maps to improve the accuracy of all flood risk maps by surveying and ground truthing the at-risk areas before the plan becomes operative in collaboration with tāngata whenua.		Reject
FS405.092	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendments sought in this submission point as it is	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				considered that flood risk would be more efficiently managed if it was adequately mapped and clearly identified.			
FS361.075	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendments sought in this submission point as it is considered that flood risk would be more efficiently managed if it was adequately mapped and clearly identified.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S486.098	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	River Flood Hazard Zone (10 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	All flood risk maps included in the PDP were created at a scale of 1:250,000. This means there is insufficient accuracy to identify at-risk areas of an individual land parcel. This will place heavy financial burdens on tāngata whenua to gain expert analysis of each site and case by case. It would be more efficient for the Council to undertake these assessments alongside tāngata whenua.	Amend the planning maps to improve the accuracy of all flood risk maps by surveying and ground truthing the at-risk areas before the plan becomes operative in collaboration with tāngata whenua.		Reject
S390.084	Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust	River Flood Hazard Zone (10 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	The submitter opposes all flood risk maps included in the PDP were created at a scale of 1:250,000. This means there is insufficient accuracy to identify at-risk areas of an individual land parcel. This will place heavy financial burdens on tāngata whenua to gain expert analysis of each site and case by case. It would be more efficient for the Council to undertake these assessments alongside tāngata whenua.	Improve the accuracy of all flood risk maps by surveying and ground truthing the at-risk areas before the plan becomes operative in collaboration with tāngata whenua.		Reject
S498.085	Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngapuhi	River Flood Hazard Zone (10 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	The submitter opposes all flood risk maps included in the PDP were created at a scale of 1:250,000. This means there is insufficient accuracy to identify at-risk areas of an individual land parcel. This will place heavy financial burdens on tāngata whenua to gain expert analysis of each site and case by case. It would be more efficient for	Improve the accuracy of all flood risk maps by surveying and ground truthing the at-risk areas before the plan becomes operative in collaboration with tāngata whenua.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the Council to undertake these assessments alongside tāngata whenua.			
FS151.132	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS23.253	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provisions are consistent with Treaty principles and recognise and provide for Māori interests, including (but not limited to) appropriate economic development of their land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject
S561.001	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	River Flood Hazard Zone (10 Year ARI Event)	Support in part	Kāinga Ora seek that River Flood Hazard Area maps are removed from the FNPDP and placed in a non-statutory layer available via a GIS viewer. This is a consistent approach to identify such hazards countrywide and provides for regular updates to hazard information without the requirement to go through Plan Changes to update the planning maps. At the same time, further investigation needs to be carried out into flood risk particularly given the significant flooding extent experienced in parts of the District. This review should address the depth of flood waters, velocity, timing of flooding to identify locations of high risk and low risk and amend zoning in those locations accordingly.	Delete all River Flood Hazard Area maps from the FNPDP and placed in a non-statutory layer available via a GIS viewer.		Reject
FS32.055	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	<p>The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>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>			
FS23.273	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject
FS47.015	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	<p>The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan.</p> <p>Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document</p>	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept
FS348.088	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA		
S65.005	Imerys Performance Minerals Asia Pacific	River Flood Hazard Zone (10 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	The Natural Hazard Maps seem to have, in error, covered an existing operational clay dam within the Landholdings. This is detailed below It is clear that this is an operational dam on the Landholdings and it is unclear how this is implicated by a River Flood Hazard event. The overlay should be removed.	delete river flood hazard zone (10 year ARI event) from Matauri Bay Road - ROT NA18D/1020 (Lot 1 DP 62019); - ROT NA31B/294 (Pt Lot 1 DP 54194); - ROT NA93D/602(Pt Lot 1 DP 50232) [In part] ; - ROT NA15D/1478 (Pt Lot 5 DP 50235) [In part] ; - ROT 501460 (Mahimahi E 5)	Accept
FS346.811	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Forest & Bird agrees that there is some uncertainty created by the use of overlay vs zoning, as set out in paragraph 8 of its original submission. However, Forest & Bird opposes any relaxation of the rules/provisions relating to mineral extraction activities, particularly where that would lessen the protection afforded to areas of indigenous biodiversity, natural character or outstanding natural landscapes. Forest & Bird also opposes the extension of the MEO.	Disallow Disallow in part the original submission	Reject
S259.002	Nicole Wooster	River Flood Hazard Zone (100 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	The flood hazard maps incorrectly identify a river flood hazard next to the submitter's house that was built in 1970s and at most this is an overland flow path in heavy rain which is very shallow and disappears immediately. The property has been in the family since 1902 and is not affected by river flooding. The mapping identifies much larger areas of flooding than what actually occurs. It is over representing the flood areas. The orchard areas do not flood for example, nor does much of the farmland due to the drainage networks in place even in extreme weather events.	Amend river flood hazards maps in consultation with submitter to correct and take into account existing drainage and other flood mitigation infrastructure.	Reject
S486.099	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	River Flood Hazard Zone (100 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	All flood risk maps included in the PDP were created at a scale of 1:250,000. This means there is insufficient accuracy to identify at-risk areas of an individual land parcel. This will place heavy financial	Amend the planning maps to improve the accuracy of all flood risk maps by surveying and ground truthing the at-risk areas before the plan becomes operative in collaboration with tāngata whenua.	Reject

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

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>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>			
FS23.274	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject
FS47.016	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</p>	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document			
FS348.089	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept
S65.006	Imerys Performance Minerals Asia Pacific	River Flood Hazard Zone (100 Year ARI Event)	Oppose	The Natural Hazard Maps seem to have, in error, covered an existing operational clay dam within the Landholdings. This is detailed below It is clear that this is an operational dam on the Landholdings and it is unclear how this is implicated by a River Flood Hazard event. The overlay should be removed	delete river flood hazard zone (100 year ARI event) from Matauri Bay Road - ROT NA18D/1020 (Lot 1 DP 62019); - ROT NA31B/294 (Pt Lot 1 DP 54194); - ROT NA93D/602(Pt Lot 1 DP 50232) [In part] ; - ROT NA15D/1478 (Pt Lot 5 DP 50235) [In part] ; - ROT 501460 (Mahimahi E 5)		Accept
FS346.812	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Forest & Bird agrees that there is some uncertainty created by the use of overlay vs zoning, as set out in paragraph 8 of its original submission. However, Forest & Bird opposes any relaxation of the rules/provisions relating to mineral extraction activities, particularly where that would lessen the protection afforded to areas of indigenous biodiversity, natural character or outstanding natural landscapes. Forest & Bird also opposes the extension of the MEO.	Disallow	Disallow in part the original submission	Reject
S428.006	Kapiro Residents Association	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	A pop-out window in the PDP map, entitled News Feed - How to use the Eplan, points out that the coastal and flooding hazard maps in the draft plan are out of date, and asks users to check the updated NRC Natural Hazards Maps on NRC website. However, the sections of the PDP that refer to flooding and natural hazards do not provide the above warning to users. As a result, people may use out-of-date mapping information. The PDP section should refer specifically to the most recent NRC Natural	Amend PDP to apply the <i>precautionary approach</i> with regard to mapped inland flood and coastal hazards, areas to take account of longer-term changes expected from climate change, as well as the limitations in mapping.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Hazards maps, and PDP maps should be updated regularly, as soon as possible.			
S359.013	Northland Regional Council	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	<p>Understand a constraints mapping approach has been undertaken to provide underlying guidance as to which are the most appropriate zonings across the district, by excluding those areas where more intensive development and subdivision should be restricted due to constraints such as highly versatile soils, flood and coastal hazards, ONLs and ONFs, historic/cultural heritage sites and areas.</p> <p>The proposed maps appear to rezone a number of areas to provide greater development intensity in areas at risk from natural hazards or that are unserved (e.g. lack three waters infrastructure). Do not support further intensification in flood plains given storm/flood events are predicted to intensify with climate change.</p> <p>Enabling further development in areas prone to flooding is at odds with direction in the RPS Policy 7.1.2 and Method 7.1.7</p> <p>It appears that some areas with potential flood hazards allow for intensive development. Applying a hazard overlay does not fully address this issue as the underlying zoning can create a development expectation. This is of particular concern for industrial zones with the potential for hazardous chemical storage, but is also relevant to sensitive activities such as residential development, education facilities, visitor accommodation etc.</p>	Amend the planning maps to ensure that areas prone to natural hazards are not zoned for intensification.		Defer consideration until Hearing 15D
FS25.079	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	Defer consideration until Hearing 15D

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						detailed assessment in appropriate circumstances.	
FS25.136	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the intention of managing zoning to avoid natural hazard risks, subject to appropriate identification of areas at risk and consideration of whether risk can be appropriately managed in other ways.	Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to appropriate wording.	Defer consideration until Hearing 15D
FS325.053	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT further submits that greenfield development is a more appropriate and more cost-effective way of meeting housing demands. Retrofitting networks to service infill development can be problematic and costly, particularly where existing development has already established infrastructure.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Defer consideration until Hearing 15D
FS325.081	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT supports the intention of managing zoning to avoid natural hazard risks, subject to appropriate identification of areas at risk and consideration of whether risk can be appropriately managed in other ways.	Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to appropriate wording and mapping.	Defer consideration until Hearing 15D
FS243.208	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora original submission sought that further investigation is carried out into flood risk particularly given the significant flooding extent experienced in parts of the district. This review should address the depth of flood waters, velocity, timing of flooding to identify locations of high risk and low risk and amend zoning in those locations accordingly. Where the natural hazard review indicates high risk, then the NRC submission point is agreed with. However, until that time, intensification should be enabled in key locations.	Disallow	Amend the planning maps to ensure that areas prone to natural hazards are not zoned for intensification.	Defer consideration until Hearing 15D
FS570.1049	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Defer consideration until Hearing 15D
FS346.474	Royal Forest and Bird		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA	Allow	Allow the original submission	Defer consideration until Hearing 15D

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.			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			
FS566.1063	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Defer consideration until Hearing 15D
FS569.1085	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Defer consideration until Hearing 15D
S250.030	Willowridge Developments Limited	General / Miscellaneous	Support	The definition proposed to identify and manage Land Susceptible to Land Instability is complex. It is considered that this risk would be more efficiently managed if it was mapped and clearly identified, ensuring consistent application of the definition and management of the hazard.	Insert map of land instability as a non statutory information layer showing areas of low, medium and high instability.		Reject
FS570.716	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
FS566.730	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
FS569.752	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
S443.006	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	A pop-out window in the PDP map, entitled News Feed - How to use the Eplan, points out that the coastal and flooding hazard maps in the draft plan are out of date, and asks users to check the updated NRC Natural Hazards Maps on NRC website. However, the sections of the PDP that refer to flooding and natural hazards do not provide the above warning to users. As a result, people may use out-of-date mapping information. The PDP section should refer	Amend PDP to apply the <i>precautionary approach</i> with regard to mapped inland flood and coastal hazards, areas to take account of longer-term changes expected from climate change, as well as the limitations in mapping.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				specifically to the most recent NRC Natural Hazards maps, and PDP maps should be updated regularly, as soon as possible.		
FS569.1751	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Reject
FS570.1731	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Reject
S588.001	WALTER (Wally) HICKS	Coastal Flood Hazard - Te Werahi Beach	Support	The Coastal flood hazard mapping (inferred) acknowledges Climate Change, Sea-Level Rise and Weather Event Emergencies	Retain coastal flood hazard mapping layer as notified for Plan Variation 1	Accept
S588.002	WALTER (Wally) HICKS	Coastal Flood Hazard - Kokota	Support	The coastal flood hazard mapping acknowledges Climate Change, Sea Level Rise and Weather Event Emergencies	Retain coastal flood hazard mapping layer as notified for Plan Variation 1	Accept
S588.003	WALTER (Wally) HICKS	Coastal Flood Hazard - Rangaunu Harbour and surrounding areas	Support	The coastal flood hazard mapping acknowledges Climate Change, Sea Level Rise and Weather Event Emergencies	Retain coastal flood hazard mapping layer as notified for Plan Variation 1	Accept
S591.001	Tristan Williams	Coastal Flood Hazard - Rangaunu Harbour and surrounding areas	Oppose	Submitter opposes changes because they consider there is no context or explanation of what the change is or why, therefore rejects any changes without prior understanding and agreement. Submitter notes that Council doesn't own the land and as landowner they provide no authority to unexplained changes.	Delete flood hazard mapping layer from land at 3 Matarau Road, Awanui (inferred). Reject all proposed changes in Plan Variation 1 relating to this property without an understanding of the ramifications.	Reject
S594.001	David Travers	Coastal Flood Hazard - Rangaunu Harbour and surrounding areas	Oppose	The Coastal Flood layer should be removed from the plan as there is a paper road around the bottom of 23 Ronas Place, therefore flood hazards (inferred) should not affect the property at all.	Delete the Coastal Flood Hazard Layer from the property at 23 Ronas Place, Kaingaroa.	Reject
S599.001	ZOE Maginn	Coastal Flood Hazard - Rangaunu Harbour and surrounding areas	Oppose	These zones have been modelled using 'extremes' and may not be 'likely' effects, as required in New Zealand Law. The hazard maps and zones must remain correct and current. This can only be done by monitoring and reviewing their accuracy in line with real data and events. The models may be shown to be inaccurate	Delete (or do not update) the Coastal Flood Hazard Zone/Layer and River Flood Hazard Zone/Layers at Rangaunu Harbour To amend the Coastal Flood Hazard Zone/Layer and River Flood Hazard Zone/Layer on land at 409A Rangiputa Road, Karikari Peninsula. To review actual flooding incidences and sea levels (real data), and compare them to the modelled data. To amend models and hazard zones based on actual	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>when compared to actual data, and therefore irrelevant. Future effects of this plan, and decisions based on it, could be totally wrong if based on old modelling and data.</p> <p>The hazard maps and zones must be accurate for each property, rather than applied in a blanket fashion as they have far reaching consequences for each individual property.</p> <p>We are concerned that these hazard layers are based on predicted and modelled scenarios. We do not believe that these scenarios are backed up by actual evidence of inundation and sea level rise on the ground. Has there been a detailed verification of the modelled scenarios using historical information from the area?</p> <p>The assumptions on which the modelling and the coastal hazard assessments are based must be based on likely effect of climate change (as required by NZ law) and not on unlikely or improbable scenarios.</p> <p>We are aware of the community on the Kapiti Coast that have recently engaged their own Coastal Hazard assessment which has found significant issues in the work done by the Council's consultant (in this instance Jacobs). It found that basing their assumptions on MFE guidelines resulted in improbable and even implausible scenarios.</p> <p>Council must ensure that work done by consultants and the underlying assumptions do not fall significantly short as they have in the case of Kapiti District Council's consultant's work, before new hazard layers are included in the Plan.</p> <p>We are extremely concerned that the</p>	<p>data and events, in a structured and periodic manner. This may be yearly, for example. So that hazard zones remain relevant and current.</p> <p>To review modelling accuracy to ensure based on likely scenarios (and not extreme or unlikely scenarios) - as required by New Zealand law.</p>	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>Coastal Hazard Layers you are proposing to add will have significant implications on property LIMs, values, uses, ability to insure and to secure loans for properties. This being the case we believe it is absolutely essential that these maps are based on actual and probable scenarios not on extreme or improbable scenarios.</p> <p>The coastal flood hazard and river flood hazard layers cover approximately 90% of our property, which may make it impossible to build on the property. We should have the right to build on our property, and the council may make it impossible to do that by imposing these hazard zones. I don't believe the council should be able to potentially remove that right based on modelling using extreme scenarios that are imposed and not monitored. We have owned the property for over 13 years, and there has been no major flooding that reflects the hazard maps in any way. The previous owner has confirmed there was no flooding in the previous 27 years that his family owned it. That is no flooding that reflects the hazard maps in any way in the last 40 years.</p> <p>We therefore strongly object to these Coastal Hazard Maps being added, unless they are reviewed, corrected and applied accurately based on real data, that is reviewed and updated.</p>		
S604.001	Rangiputa Community Incorporated	Coastal Flood Hazard - Rangaunu Harbour and surrounding areas	Oppose	We are concerned about Plan Variation 1 and the addition of the Coastal Flood Hazard layers specifically in relation to Rangaunu Harbour and surrounding areas, particularly Karikari Peninsula. We are concerned that these hazard layers are based on predicted and modelled scenarios and do not believe they are backed up by	Delete or amend coastal flood hazard layer in relation to Rangaunu Harbour until Council has gone through a thorough process including (1) Calibrating scenarios against actual historical evidence of sea level rise in the area (2) Taking the learning from the Kapiti situation and applying these, and (3) Working with the affected community and determining exactly the impacts on individuals affected.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				actual evidence of inundation and seal level rise on the ground. This being the case we believe it is absolutely essential that these maps are based on actual and probable scenarios not on improbable scenarios. We are concerned the Coastal Hazard Layers will have significant implications on people LIMs, their property values and uses and abilities to insure and secure loans for their properties.		
S605.001	Elbury Holdings, LJ King, Fiona King, LJ King LTD, West Coast Farms, Leah Frieling	Coastal Flood Hazard - Rangaunu Harbour and surrounding areas	Oppose	Maps are inaccurate, inconsistent and too old. Inundate model only of Rangaunu Harbour and no maps for Taipa or other large rivers. No work has been done on other river catchments to date and only using LIDAR.	Amend mapping and geotech to improve accuracy before labeling peoples properties at risk if they are not (inferred).	Reject
S605.003	Elbury Holdings, LJ King, Fiona King, LJ King LTD, West Coast Farms, Leah Frieling	Coastal Flood Hazard - Rangaunu Harbour and surrounding areas	Oppose	189 State highway 1 is higher than the Awanui main street which isn't within the flood zone mapping, therefore the property shouldn't be within the flood zone. (Inferred)	Delete the coastal flood hazard layers from 189 State highway 1 Awanui (Inferred).	Reject
S605.004	Elbury Holdings, LJ King, Fiona King, LJ King LTD, West Coast Farms, Leah Frieling	Coastal Flood Hazard - Ranganunu Harbour and surrounding areas	Oppose	It appears the coastal hazards were prepared expecting all rivers from the Ranganunu Harbour to rise without consideration for the stopping banking done by NRC recently. The maps are too old and do not take account of the new work completed.	Amend maps to account for new buildings sites, work completed and the stopping banks done by NRC.	Reject
S605.005	Elbury Holdings, LJ King, Fiona King, LJ King LTD, West Coast Farms, Leah Frieling	Coastal Flood Hazard - Rangaunu Harbour and surrounding areas	Oppose	The Whangatane spillway - Kumi Road/Pairatahi river that is below state highway 10 does not show flooding in this area, only coastal flood hazard.	Amend the maps at Whangatane spillway to show flooding in this area. (inferred)	Reject
S605.006	Elbury Holdings, LJ King, Fiona King, LJ King LTD, West	Coastal Flood Hazard - Rangaunu Harbour and surrounding areas	Oppose	It appears that no consideration has been given to the Kaitaia drainage scheme channels and drains rated for by FNDC, or the improvements they have had on drainage. Please correct in the modelling.	Amend the flood hazard modeling to reflect the drainage work. (Inferred)	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Coast Farms, Leah Frieling					
S588.004	WALTER (Wally) HICKS	Coastal Flood Hazard - Karikari Peninsula	Support	The coastal flood hazard mapping acknowledges Climate Change, Sea Level Rise and Weather Event Emergencies. Supports Future Coastal Retreat provisions.	Retain coastal flood hazard layer as notified for Plan Variation 1	Accept
S601.001	Kingheim Limited	Coastal Flood Hazard - Karikari Peninsula	Oppose	There is an incompatibility between the modelling plans being used (NRC maps) and the written words of the Coastal Hazard policy NH-P7, which considers the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood hazard plus 1m of sea level rise. If the intent is for NH-P7 to relate the 1% AEP storm flood level plus the stated 1m, then there is no relevance to defining anything other than the Coastal Flood Hazard Zone 0 in the River Flooding Hazards section, since all other flood elevations cannot be related to the policy requirement. (Inferred)	Amend the coastal hazard flood mapping to include Coastal Flood Hazard Zone 0 for design referencing and Coastal Flood Hazard Zone 1 & Coastal Flood Hazard Zone 2 mapping for information only. Coastal Flood Hazard Zone 3 should not be included or referenced in the plan variation or Proposed District Plan (inferred)	Reject
S605.009	Elbury Holdings, LJ King, Fiona King, LJ King LTD, West Coast Farms, Leah Frieling	Coastal Flood Hazard - Karikari Peninsula	Oppose	Does the Pukehe hill lakes discharge sometimes under the inland road out to Whatwhiwhi beach in high water table levels. It is not showing on the maps. I believe Coastal inundation of Pukehe will probably cross the road and flow onto Tokerau Beach.	Insert the coastal flood layers for the Whatwhiwhi areas. (inferred)	Reject
S588.005	WALTER (Wally) HICKS	Coastal Flood Hazard - Ngārui-o-te-Marangai Beach	Support	The coastal flood hazard mapping acknowledges future Climate Change, Sea Level Rise and Weather Event Emergencies	Retain coastal flood hazard layer as notified for Plan Variation 1	Accept
S588.006	WALTER (Wally) HICKS	Coastal Flood Hazard - Areas of Te Puna Inlet	Support	Supports future Climate Change, Sea Level Rise and Weather Event Emergencies actions	Retain coastal flood hazard layer as notified for Plan Variation 1	Accept
S598.001	Karen Barrow	Coastal Flood Hazard - Areas of Te Puna Inlet	Oppose	Submitter requests that 213 McKenzie Road, Kerikeri is excluded from the Coastal Flood Hazard Layer. The reasons are that I have lived at 213 McKenzie Road, Kerikeri for approximately 50 years. There has been no noticeable change to the high	Delete the Coastal Flood Hazard layer from the land at 213 McKenzie Road, Kerikeri.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				tide mark during this period. The property has never flooded. The submitter notes that the area of the property identified with the Coastal Hazard layer is minor and they would be able to take steps to mitigate/reduce any affect to the area.		
S588.007	WALTER (Wally) HICKS	Coastal Flood Hazard - Kerikeri Inlet	Support	Supports future actions on Climate Change, Sea Level Rise & Weather Event Emergencies	Retain coastal flood hazard layer as notified for Plan Variation 1	Accept
S589.001	Kathy Davies	Coastal Flood Hazard - Kerikeri Inlet	Oppose	<p>The various LINZ and NRC maps used to create the Coastal Hazard maps are not correct for this area of the Hauparua Inlet - possibly why the area is not shown in the Provisions selection.</p> <p>The LINZ maps currently show a lot of our existing property as 'hydro', which is not correct. This has likely been used as a base starting point.</p> <p>The NRC hazard maps (I assume used to generate the updated FNDC maps) are incorrect as very inconsistent with the NZ Searise data and maps - which I assume are a base point for all Councils. If NZ Searise is not the base data set for Coastal Hazard modelling could you please let me know what data has been used?</p> <p>The new maps show all land up to 2m above sea level as being in Coastal Hazard in the 50 year plan. The NZ Searise data shows the median estimate of sea level rise at .39m for this property by 2070 and this includes the vertical land level change estimated. At 100 years (2120) the NZ Searise shows the rise at this property at .82m</p> <p>The 'sea' / water at this end of the estuary is protected by an extremely narrow entry ('the narrows') to the basin of water. Mountains rising steeply to 50m elevation</p>	Delete the proposed new coastal hazard maps (notified as part of Plan Variation 1) or correct them for the property at 22 Quinces Landing, located at the end of Hauparua Inlet.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>on Wharau Rd surround the basin providing shelter from wind. Hence it is very protected and there is no 'wave action' to be considered. The flood zone should equate to the sea level rise estimates along with vertical land level changes which equal .39m at 2070 and .82m at 2120 on the NZ Searise site.</p> <p>Why then do the maps show hazard zones up to and over 2m? It is obviously very incorrect to map coastal hazard to this level at 50 years and still actually incorrect at the 100 year projection.</p> <p>I note that the current flood zone assessment on the NRC maps shows some existing flooding hazard where the current district plan shows none. I can confirm that during our ownership we have never seen flooding on the land and this includes time during cyclone Gabriel when winds were at a maximum and a tree was downed on our road. Also no flooding during the tsunami warning a few years ago that saw the evacuation of the area and in which social media notes from people on the Kerikeri Inlet that they noticed high water levels. We noticed none as we watched on our cameras from afar.</p> <p>This submission is in relation to Variation 1 of PDP which says changes are minor and insignificant. The proposed changes are not at all insignificant to this property.</p>		
S595.001	Tim Brandon	Coastal Flood Hazard - Kerikeri Inlet	Oppose	<p>To oppose the new plan variation 1 that proposes to zone the Hauparua Lane area as a flood plain, as it clearly is NOT. There are no rivers in the vicinity and having lived here for 21 years and have experienced significant rainfall over short periods of time, there has never been a flood! There has never been a flood, even in severe downpours.</p>	Delete the coastal flood hazard layer from the Hauparua Lane area (inferred).	Reject

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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				resulting in less flooding effects to the region.		