



Summary of submissions

Long Term Plan 2021-2031

Date: 30 April 2021

Contents

Natural environment	5
What is your preferred option for addressing water health?	5
What is your preferred option for managing our water catchments?	14
What is your preferred option for protecting our biodiversity?	22
What is your preferred option for land-based biosecurity?	29
What is your preferred option for marine-based biosecurity?	36
Community resilience	41
Do you agree with our proposed option to undertake the following flood protection works?	41
Awanui River flood scheme upgrade	41
Otiria-Moerewa flood mitigation spillway	43
Kawakawa flood mitigation stopbank	45
Whangārei flood mitigation project	48
What is your preferred option for upgrading our tsunami warning system?	50
What is your preferred option for building a new emergency coordination centre?	54
What is your preferred option for climate change resilience?	59
What is your preferred option for improving water resilience?	68
What is your preferred option for harbour safety and navigation?	72
What is your preferred option for increasing CityLink services?	75
Regional leadership	79
What is your preferred option for Māori partnerships?	79
What is your preferred option for supporting work across council?	84
Other decisions	88
Do you agree with our proposed option for Oruku Landing?	88
Do you agree with our proposed option for funding economic development?	97
Do you agree with our proposed option on changes to rates?	101
Do you agree with our proposed option on reviewing financial reserves?	103
Do you agree with our proposed option on updates to policies?	106
Other comments	108
Regional Sporting Facilities	108
Funding for Emergency Services	110
Comments relevant to other Councils	112

GE / GMO provisions.....	114
Transport (including rail).....	117
LTP Process.....	119
Area-specific: algae at Waipū	121
Area-specific: Ngunguru sandspit	122
Area-specific: Other	123
Northland Inc / economic development.....	125
Financing and investment.....	128
Agrichemicals and toxins	130
Other: ungrouped	131
Rates and general	135
Rates and costs: concern	135
Rates support and general	138

Introduction

This document is a summary of the submissions received on the Long Term Plan 2021-2031. Consultation opened on Saturday 13 March 2021 and closed on Friday 16 April 2021, allowing 23 working days for submissions, or one calendar month as per the requirements of consulting under the Local Government Act.

We received a total of 171 submissions during this time.

This summary has been undertaken by staff with the purpose of providing an overview of the main points raised in submissions. It is not intended to be a comprehensive capture of all points made by submitters. In addition to the summary of submissions, the following information is also available to help inform deliberations and decisions:

- the full submissions;
- full transcribes of the notes taken at the 'Have your say' events; and
- staff recommendations.

This document roughly follows the structure of the Consultation Document.

Please note:

Submissions that were not made online have been summarised by staff against the relevant consultation points. While staff were able to summarise comments, they did not presume selection of an option unless it was very clear in the submission text. This is reflected in the number of "No response" comments, where people did not select a preferred option but still provided comment against a consultation point.

Natural environment

What is your preferred option for addressing water health?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	57.31%	-	98
Our proposed option	26.32%	45.92%	45
Another option	22.22%	38.78%	38
None of the above	8.77%	15.31%	15
[No Response]	42.69%	-	73
Total	100.00%	100.00%	171

Ninety-eight of 171 submitters responded to this question, with 45 choosing our proposed option, 38 choosing another option, 15 choosing none of the above and 73 not selecting an option but still making comment (please see note in Introduction).

Of submitters who chose our proposed option, three comments directly related to sewerage spills, two to council only undertaking the essential work regarding addressing water health, and two to keeping the rates increase low/manageable.

Of submitters who chose another option, many noted how important water quality is and its benefits, showing support for increased monitoring, testing and data collection. Some submitters showed support for Te Mana o Te Wai and more iwi/hapū involvement, and for improving water ways having positive impacts on climate change. Submitters also noted issues with allocation, stock, rubbish, wastewater discharges, chemicals and algae blooms.

Of submitters who chose none of the above, comments related to keeping costs down with no additional spend, and support for Te Mana o Te Wai, more lake monitoring and groundwater mapping.

Of submitters who didn't chose an option, comments noted the importance of clean water and access to this (including allocation issues), improving water quality and health, increased monitoring, support for community led groups, coordination with other agencies (eg. WDC, LAWA), fencing of water ways, planting more trees and protecting existing trees, and increased regulatory action. Concerns were also raised over the use of chemicals/pesticides.

WHAT IS YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR ADDRESSING WATER HEALTH?		
Name / Organisation	Reference	Comment
OUR PROPOSED OPTION (do the essentials)		
Ian Heape	LTP21_17	This has been considered for it to be a preferred option there for I accept your wisdom
Mrs Jan Pirihi	LTP21_24	Ensure no sewage spills into harbours after heavy rain Remediate for flooding - Takahiwai Road drains, and sea-level inundations with high tides at foot of hill
Laurie Copland	LTP21_28	Do what you have to do regulatory only as landowners are making changes to how their activities impact water quality. This is required by central government. It is a case of need to do to not want to do.
C Cotton	LTP21_81	Data collection is great but after sewerage and treatment plants are working 99% of the year.
E Metz	LTP21_100	Make sure the money isn't wasted on incompetence.

Mr Rihari Dargaville Chairman Ngati Manawa Hapū	LTP21_105	1. In the area of water body interests Kaitiaki must be integrated into the NRC management structure such as Omapere, Lake, appointments are made by the Trustees of the Lake 2. in other areas this may not be feasible hoe
Heather Tomason	LTP21_116	Proceed with the essentials. I understand Government is actively working on research and direction, so let's use this when it's more defined.
Louise Mischewski	LTP21_121	From my view, addressing water health and managing our water catchments are not dissimilar so I cannot understand why the priorities are separated. I would prefer my rates increase supplementing protecting our biodiversity.
Fiona King	LTP21_134	Take some serious action with urban sewage spills/ over flows from Local Council's schemes that are on land and ion water. Agriculture, industrial and commercial are hit with abatement notices & fines very quickly, why are Councils not treated the same.
Richard Morris	LTP21_142	We are broadly supportive of initiatives to improve water quality and biodiversity i.e. the first five initiatives listed in your consultation document.
Mr Harold Robinson	LTP21_168	We say do the essentials and keep the rate increase low.
Mr Richard Gardner Senior Policy Advisor Federated Farmers of NZ	LTP21_170	Please see the attached detailed submission. The rate increase must be reduced to a manageable level.
ANOTHER OPTION (do the essentials + some extras)		
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	Given the challenges and upcoming changes in the freshwater management area, it is prudent to allocate extra resources to be able to do more
Ian Reeves	LTP21_20	Water health is essential
Pamela Stevens	LTP21_23	Yes! Anything to do with improving water health.
Hone Popata	LTP21_25	There needs to be an agreement between Hapū and NRC for more resourcing to monitor, water testing of our lakes, waterways. Our hapū of Ngai Tohianga Oturu (Kaitaia) have the qualifications to carry out these water testings. (Staff comment: reported "Revitalisation of kaitiakitanga with our waterways within the Awanui River Catchment, Muriwhenua" attached to submission)
Kim Robinson	LTP21_30	This is an important area for Northland in all aspects - community, primary industries and tourism
Renee Dumas	LTP21_32	The councils have overallocated water usage to certain industries without proper scientific understanding and consultation with the public. This includes dairy farms, avocados grown in the wrong environment & too many horticulture industries.
Michael Drayton	LTP21_36	I'd like to see monitoring of waterways for horticulture chemicals so correct use of these chemicals can be enforced.
Tania Aslund	LTP21_39	As much monitoring and data collection/collation as possible, and as regularly/frequently as possible - we need good data. Make sure the appropriate parameters (horticulture chemicals, agriculture runoff etc) are measured so we have the data. And then the council must have the ways and means to act on the information. Note that polluted waterways emit significantly more greenhouse gas emissions than healthy streams, rivers and lakes, e.g. https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20210323-

		climate-change-the-rivers-that-breathe-greenhouse-gases. Cleaning up our waterways will enhance our response to climate change, plus beneficial to tourism, recreation, and biodiversity. It's a no-brainer.
Geoff Sharples	LTP21_73	<p>Cleaning the water ways is essential to the health of the coast. This should be a top priority. We still have a long way to go on the basics</p> <p>1) Stock effluent is going into the streams. The fencing requirement does not cover smaller streams and it is not enforced. Stock are standing in water next to the road and a blind eye is turned. Even with stock near streams the effluent runs into the stream through the fence. There is over grazing which causes erosion and run off. This seems so easy to monitor and fix yet it is not done. Simply follow the stream. If you see stock, get the owner to remove them and add a fence. If you see over grazing educate the landowner that they are choking the rivers and bays.</p> <p>2) there is rubbish thrown into the streams and rubbish thrown on the side of the road and on the beaches and in the ocean. This requires signage, enforcement and clean up. Rather than funding rangers to work on biodiversity, fund folks to do clean up and education that throwing trash in the river is a bad idea.</p> <p>3) Funding for these basics should be way before new boats, emergency centres or conference centres.</p>
Ms Sarah Cameron Senior Policy Analyst NZ Kiwifruit Growers Inc	LTP21_84	<p>Submitter notes that sustainability is a key driver in the NZ kiwifruit industry, and references the industry's water strategy, and what measures the industry is taking to manage water quality. Submitter notes the importance of water availability to the industry and supports the work of the Te Tai Tokerau Water Trust. Submitter supports the \$6.9M water health expenditure option.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Kelly Murphy	LTP21_106	I would like to see support of iwi led monitoring programmes used to upskill and build capacity at hapū level, whilst expanding the reach of the NRC monitoring programme. As well as establishing systems to share data.
Michael Paul Bowker	LTP21_118	As a Hokianga Resident of long standing. the quality of the water entering the Catchments of the Hokianga Harbour must be monitored and improved where possible. The game of diverting unpleasant or poor-quality fluids to the East or Western sides of the Northland peninsula should be prevented at the source of the problem. A few metres of water side planting may look good on a plan, but vast industrial dairy farming needs much more control. Often old flood plains have become valuable dairy land, but the outpouring of effluent is devastating to the eventual marine environment.
Anahita Djamali	LTP21_125	We need more investment in implementing Te Mana o te Wai than what has been proposed.
Ro Gravit	LTP21_127	I support: Increasing water quality monitoring, clearly identifying benchmarks and unacceptable testing results, publicly and promptly reporting results on social media, and identifying and penalising known polluters. Conducting a property survey to identify all water takes, consented or not. No further water takes should be consented until this is done, and unexercised consents should lapse after 5 years noting that building consents lapse after one year if not exercised. It's my understanding NRC has no comprehensive understanding of how many water takes there are in the region, or what litreage

		<p>is being extracted. This survey could roll out from the most polluted catchments.</p> <p>Unconsented takes should be demonstrably penalised to act as a deterrent. I have been told of a property that sunk an unconsented bore and created a pond large enough for the owner to jet-ski in. Rather than prosecute the owner, the council officer permitted him to apply for a retrospective consent. This is clearly unacceptable and demonstrates a council willingness to overlook transgressions by agricultural and other land users e.g. forestry, a disregard for the RMA, for climate resilience and for te Mana o te Wai. I am not alone in being a rate-payer (or resident) confronted by the visible fact that te Mana o te Wai has not been prioritised by NRC and I would like to see healthy water and healthy relationships with mana whenua prioritised in the LTP with a clear set of actions, time-frames and KPIs. A time frame for riparian fencing needs to be set and publicised, with fines for noncompliance.</p>
Angus McCulloch	LTP21_135	More research to identify and understand the factors leading to algal blooms along our coastline. This research to inform an action plan to reduce any human factors.
Jessie McVeagh	LTP21_137	Improving water quality of our awa and moana is essential. We need to invest in taking action to do this work. We know what needs to be - widespread fencing and planting of waterways, monitoring and assessing data. This needs to be financially supported to enable the restoration of our waters.
Oliver Knox	LTP21_138	Community and iwi/hapū rely on water and this needs addressing as for the environment and tangata whenua to thrive we need access to clean water and healthy harbours.
Ms Janine McVeagh	LTP21_140	Wastewater systems are poorly monitored - need to be included.
Dean Baigent-Mercer	LTP21_145	Forest & Bird's support on the second option is conditional in that in all cases decision making is made in the context of climate change projections, e.g. restoration work on coastal dune lakes that are likely to be inundated by the sea makes little sense, but managed retreat of native species does. Also, micro-water storage projects make sense but large-scale water irrigation projects that will lead to increased fertiliser use (that makes its way to pollute aquifers and surface waterways) does not.
Mr Nick Chave Kauri Mountain Restoration Society	LTP21_157	We believe that environmental restoration is essential for our future and that it is more than worth the extra costs.
Dr Lily George Policy Analyst Nga Tai Ora	LTP21_172	<p>Submitter makes comment on topics relating to “addressing water health” and makes the following recommendations relevant to this consultation point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drinking water recommendations: That NRC jointly explores innovative methods through which to protect all water sources by developing guidelines for land use and farming. • Recreational water recommendations: That in line with Te Mana o te Wai, the NRC more actively involves tangata whenua in water health management. • Water resilience recommendations: That the Resource Management (Measurement and Reporting of Water Takes) Regulations 2020 are implemented and monitored to ensure that there is sufficient water available for all consent holders, including drinking water suppliers.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusion recommendation: that drinking water strategy aligns with ensuring security of safe, equitable supply and integrates the principles of Te Mana o te Wai; prioritise drought resilience in the context of climate change. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Ms Anna Curnow Acting Mayor Kaipara District Council	LTP21_177	KDC are supportive of NRC doing the essentials to address water health by implementing Te Mana o te Wai, more resourcing for lake monitoring and water analysis; modelling and mapping groundwater; land use and swimming sites; creating systems to manage the increasing quantities of data needed. KDC also support investing an additional \$500k a year providing the community and tangata whenua additional support for freshwater management.
Nora Shayeb	LTP21_192	<p>Submitter supports councils' proposal to invest more funding in science and research, to gain a better understanding of the environmental impacts of human activities by allocating \$6.9m. Submits that that work this includes:</p> <p>Monitoring water health consistently and extensively by including all commonly used pesticides in the National Survey of Pesticides in Ground Water and all regional fresh water sampling [staff note: examples of pesticides provided in submission], and make use of the data that is already available from other nations.</p> <p>Together with WDC, implementing an immediate moratorium on all aerial and roadside spraying with toxic chemical pesticides! Submission discusses the adverse effects of toxic pesticides/herbicides on water pollution and Climate Change, and raises concern that this is omitted from the conversation. Submission provides further discussion on the issue, including the connection with Covid-19.</p> <p>(Submission includes web references):</p> <p>Submission suggests that roadside maintenance contracts be assigned to each individual community to reduce the use of pesticides, that the method of least disturbance be practiced and weeds on roadsides be replaced with native vegetation.</p> {Staff summary; please see original submission}
NONE OF THE ABOVE		
Chris Claydon	LTP21_11	Focus on fixing sewerage treatment works and providing mains sewerage and mains water to more properties (including sewage pump out facilities at all jetties and marina berths). The councils are the biggest water polluters by far, we don't need to collect more data to show that. spend the money on pipes and treatment plants, not data collection.
Klaus Kurz	LTP21_21	what we have is good enough There is no need to improve water health where I live. Rather reduce costs of avoidable bureaucracy.
Mr Carl Mather	LTP21_27	Given that your organisation as well as the local councils have been in charge of the waterways and this has resulted in water so contaminated, I don't think you are the right organisations to be involved in any further interference in this.
Mr Guy Wilson	LTP21_29	Submitter disagrees with rates increases. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Tom Pasco	LTP21_64	Put all existing available resources into controlling runoff.

Mr Stephen Rush Environment Officer Te Runanga o Whangaroa	LTP21_67	<p>Stop further commercial growth that requires freshwater throughout Northland and specifically any further use of natural aquifers and natural water sources. Climate change has resulted in dry summers, low water levels causing eco systems and freshwater marine life to struggle. In addition an expansion of commercial ventures has compounded the problems and we think that they should be made responsible for supplying their own water from their own water capture and storage systems i.e. rain water stored in tanks. We support the implementation of Te Mana o Te Wai, comprehensive mapping of groundwater, modelling and monitoring of water analysis, land use and swimming sites.</p> <p>We ask for improvements to the current regime of consultation with Iwi and hapū on freshwater matters. Consultation needs to be comprehensive and timely. Greater regulation around the quality of in shore and harbour waterways needs to take place. Monitoring vessels for things like; on-board holding tanks for effluent and grey water, a review of the current distances from shore for discharges (current distances are not acceptable), accurate recording of discharges (when, where, how much). Water quality of harbour environments needs to be improved and reported on at regular intervals and where necessary dedicated work programmes and monitoring groups need to be established.</p>
Mr Peter Doel	LTP21_95	This is part of the 3 waters proposal and we should wait and see what that will do. We need to remember that this council is arrogant, self-serving and deceitful.
Harata Waetford	LTP21_97	Use existing budget to meet the essentials.
Kelly Maxwell	LTP21_120	We wish to comment on Biodiversity & Biosecurity only.
Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	Our proposed option: Do the essentials (implementing Te Mana o te Wai; more resourcing for lake monitoring and water analysis; modelling and mapping groundwater, land use and swimming sites; creating systems to co-manage with Maori to participate in gathering increased quantities of data we must gather for all of Northland around the aspirations of Te Mana o te Wai.
NO OPTION SELECTED		
Dr Mere Kepa	LTP21_48	<p>Submitter references the human right to water, and the requirement to adopt effective measures to realise the right to water without discrimination. Raises concern about the impacts of climate change on water availability, flooding and water contamination. Raises concern of impacts on renewable surface water and groundwater, and competition for water, and the far-reaching consequences of this. Raises concern about the impact of climate change on vulnerability to climatic events. Raises particular concern in relation to the potential for climate change to negatively impact Tangata Whenua, pushing them into poverty and death.</p> <p>Submitter requests that council implement proposed freshwater reforms that will limit synthetic nitrogen fertiliser and be beneficial to reducing climate emissions, and urges council to use the departure from business as usual as a result of Covid to redesign society to combat climate change.</p> <p>{Staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Ms Sophia Xiao-Colley	LTP21_93	5. Maintaining strong boundaries to protect our native clean environment.

Caron Mounsey-Smith Specialist Advisor Water Safety New Zealand	LTP21_165	<p>Poor water quality may cause or impact on water safety risks and/or drownings. To maintain water quality Council must advocate for (and in partnership with others) and carry out a number of activities such as maintenance/improvement to waste and storm water infrastructure; erosion control, flood protection and better understand and monitor the current state of the region's water health. WSNZ wants to see Council's continued investment in these activities as they help maintain the quality of water for recreation and sport users, and acknowledges: Council's 2020 achievements that will improve water quality such as the signed partnership agreement for Kaipara Moana (to reduce sediment going into Kaipara harbour), and completion of the Otuihau-Hatea water quality improvement project; Council's 2019 achievements such as the completion of the Kaipara hill erosion project to reduce sediment run-off into Kaipara harbour.</p> <p>WSNZ supports Council's recognition of the need to improve water health in the region, by growing knowledge and science to develop new approaches for all water (groundwater, lakes, rivers and the coast). We consider involvement of tangata whenua is this approach essential.</p>
Naomi James, Refining NZ (Mr Riaan Elliot)	LTP21_169	<p>Submitter supports further monitoring and associated resources to provide good data for evidence-based decision making. Submitter proposes that the assessment of groundwater resources be prioritized to ensure groundwater management systems are appropriately delineated and sustainable allocation limits determined, and that highly-allocated systems are prioritised for further investigation. The coastal aquifer system within which Refining NZ is located is cited as an example.</p> <p>Submitter discusses the development of plans and policies for environmental management and appropriate development, and notes issues with the current regulatory environment and suggests that the proposed measure for Planning and Policy be modified to include compliance with planning legislative requirements while providing for ongoing economic development.</p> <p>Submitter recommends that council consult with and collaborate with all sectors of the community in considering the way forward, and when making submissions to proposed national guidelines. Submitter notes the importance of getting future regulatory instruments right.</p> <p>Submitter recommends the further resources be allocated to the proposed changes in legislation, including the proposed repeal of the RMA and drafting of replacement legislation, and that this be a priority. for Council. Submitter does not support any proposal for a new coastal occupation charge for structures in the coastal marine area, and raises concerns about the existing charges.</p> <p>Submitter raises concern that the link between coastal structures and the proposed service delivery and focus of planning and policy work is poor and such a charge is not justified.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Mr David Lourie	LTP21_173	<p>I support allocating further funding for community group led water quality testing, either through providing test kits and training at cost or for free. I support assistance in setting up community water quality groups that tie into and support water quality work done by NRC.</p>

		<p>I support more funding allocated to monitoring and enforcement with at least two unannounced property inspections per year for urban and rural businesses that discharge to water courses or water bodies.</p> <p>I support a travelling water quality education team providing information to motor vehicle servicing businesses connected to waste and storm water systems to assist in the disposal of engineering waste products, with a focus on engine coolants and hydraulic oil disposal.</p> <p>I support education program aimed at householders and house maintenance contractors about the hazards of household cleaning products, paint and paint cleaning products, pesticides etc that wash into waste and storm water systems.</p> <p>I support projects similar to Otuihau-Hatea project. I support NRC working in tandem with WDC on the installation of sediment traps and reed bed swales at points of discharge so WDC projects meet and surpass freshwater standards.</p>
Ms Linda Kaye	LTP21_174	<p>5. On "addressing water health", you should co-ordinate with LAWA to extend monitoring of estuary quality beyond the current very limited seasonal sampling. You could enlist volunteers from local schools and communities to participate in better monitoring and recording.</p>
Ms Gail Aiken	LTP21_180	<p>We are really disappointed at the limited actions proposed for improving water quality, managing our water catchments, increasing flood protection, and increasing resilience to climate change. The way that land is used and managed has a huge impact on each of these areas. There was a reference to planting trees but that is nowhere near enough. We are experiencing a climate crisis and we need bold action not tinkering around the edges.</p>
Ms Zelka Grammer	LTP21_183	<p>Please ensure that protection and enhancement of Northland waterways (rivers, streams, lakes) is prioritized in the new LTP 2021/31. I urge council to ensure that farmers and other landowners fence their cattle/animals out of Northland waterways and the Coastal Marine Area (CMA). As a keen trumper, I have had too many negative experiences (while exiting public conservation land, sometimes on unformed paper roads) coming across cattle (in particular) trampling and defecating / urinating in our precious waterways and coastal areas.</p>
Mrs Nan Pullman	LTP21_185	<p>I agree that it is most important to have healthy waters, protect our native plants and animals and help communities to become resilient and adaptable. While I generally support the concept of planting more trees I also think it is important to protect and manage the existing native forests, shrublands and wetlands that we already have. If we are going to invest in planting more trees and protection then we also need to ensure that investment is protected into the future so what we have done cannot be undone. I also support the concept of Te Mana o te wai and the suggestion that this concept should be prioritised over all other uses.</p>
Ms Asha Andersen Flora and Fauna Aotearoa	LTP21_188	<p>NOTE: This submission received 22 submissions of support. Please see original submission for a list of supporting submitters. 1. Protect all Bodies of Water and Waterways. Waterways and soils are being deliberately polluted through poor practices and ignorance. We can no longer swim with confidence in our waterways, nor drink from them. Councils are responsible for much of this pollution through poor practices, non-existent regulatory action and the normalisation</p>

		<p>of the use of toxic chemicals throughout our environment.</p> <p>Solutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Honour the Water Quality Standards / Te Mana O Wai 6 Principles • Honour the Clean Air Standards • Honour the Hasno Act, Health Act 1956, RMA S 44A(7 & 8)
<p>Mr Jon Muller Secretary GE Free New Zealand</p>	LTP21_191	<p>"We applaud the detail and depth of your long term plan and support the understanding of the huge importance that improving the areas of biodiversity by tree planting, wetland and lake restoration and tackling soil erosion will have on the marine environment, ecosystem and water-ways. We also are pleased to see the forward thinking actions on climate change and empowering resilience in all sections of the communities across the Northland region."</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
<p>Ms Nora Shayeb Member Northland Toxin Awareness Group</p>	LTP21_193	<p>Submitter raises concern about the impact of aerial and roadside spraying on health, and requests a moratorium on spraying with toxic chemical pesticides.</p> <p>{Staff summary; please see original submission}</p>

What is your preferred option for managing our water catchments?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	55.56%	-	95
Our proposed option	21.05%	37.89%	36
Another option	22.22%	40.00%	38
None of the above	12.28%	22.11%	21
[No Response]	44.44%	-	76
Total	100.00%	100.00%	171

Ninety-five of 171 submitters responded to this question, with 36 choosing our proposed option, 38 choosing another option, 21 choosing none of the above and 76 not selecting an option but still making comment (please see note in Introduction).

Of submitters who chose our proposed option, support was noted for increased monitoring and mapping, community/hapū led projects (including funding of these), and protection of drinking water. Concerns were raised over the use of poplars, the effects of forestry, and the proposed rates increase.

Of submitters who chose another option, support was noted for extra funding/support for landowners/communities/hapū, improved water quality, increased planting, and farm plans. Concerns were raised over farming and wastewater, and the enforcement of farming practices.

Of submitters who chose none of the above, support was noted for increased funding for projects, farm plans (and the enforcement of them), planting native trees, and monitoring and mapping. Concerns were raised over deforestation, the use of poplars, the water health and catchment topics being separated, and the proposed rates increase – noting don't do more, use existing budgets with no increases.

Of submitters who didn't chose an option, support was noted for funding equity, riparian planting, our proposed initiatives, a broader focus (not just Kaipara), community education, more use of native species, ongoing investment into remediation of Kaipara Moana, and the protection of soils/existing native vegetation/mature trees. Concerns were raised over algae blooms at Waipū Cove, wastewater discharges, the limited actions council has proposed, and the use of chemicals/pesticides. Comments also noted that the greatest impacts for global warming are in land management.

WHAT IS YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR MANAGING OUR WATER CATCHMENTS?		
Name / Organisation	Reference	Comment
OUR PROPOSED OPTION (do all of this work)		
Ian Heape	LTP21_17	this has been considered for it to be a preferred option there for I accept your wisdom
Ben Tomason	LTP21_78	Poplars are highly invasive in my experience, they spread and you can't kill them easily. I'm sure the experts have this sorted, but I question the species being used.
Ms Sarah Cameron Senior Policy Analyst NZ Kiwifruit Growers Inc	LTP21_84	Submitter supports increased soil monitoring and mapping, and an increase to the landowners fund to protect waterways. Submitter supports the \$5.28M water catchments expenditure option over the next three years. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Mr Rihari Dargaville Chairman Ngati Manawa Hapū	LTP21_105	1. In large water Bodies such as Lake Omapere, there has to be representatives from the Trustees on the Management structure of NRC water authority 2. An appointed Kaitiaki from each regional district should be on this water authorities water group

Nicole Anderson	LTP21_133	Our Nga Ngaru o Hokianga Takiwa, a collection of 13 Marae of South Hokianga support for the establishment of a catchment restoration fund. It is critical that the fund support community/hapū catchment restoration projects. Those projects - many run by hapū, could then leverage off the capacity built by partnering with NRC, to access further funding externally. The other critical matter our Takiwa wishes to support - is a water tank grant scheme which would see free water tanks and plumbing provided to whanau who are in financial hardship.
Richard Morris	LTP21_142	We are broadly supportive of initiatives to improve water quality and biodiversity i.e. the first five initiatives listed in your consultation document.
Kirsty Edmonds	LTP21_144	Water tanks subsidy should be offered to all rate payers, including commercial properties. The plan just mentions guttering, tanks etc but no specific details. As a person who is about to settle on a property that will require another tank with the proposed rate increase and the issues in the Kaikohe area with droughts and water I would expect to be eligible to receive a significant subsidy promoted in the area to have more water tanks installed to decrease the pressure on current water systems. We should not be having to call in the army each summer.
Mr Harold Robinson	LTP21_168	We agree with proposed option but be mindful not all property owners will receive the same benefits for their increase in rates. There is a very urgent need to look at forestry sediment especially from the Maungakahia area forests washing down and reaching the upper Northern Wairoa River.
Mr Richard Gardner Senior Policy Advisor Federated Farmers of NZ	LTP21_170	Please see the attached detailed submission. The rate increase must be reduced to a manageable level.
Dr Lily George Policy Analyst Nga Tai Ora	LTP21_172	<p>Submitter makes comment on topics relating to 'managing our water catchments' and makes the following recommendations relevant to this consultation point:</p> <p>That NRC prioritises the protection and monitoring drinking water catchments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · That NRC work towards implementing the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Sources of Human Drinking Water) · That NRC work towards New Source Water Requirements proposed by the Water Services Bill: - NRC needs to be able to contribute to a source water risk management plan, based on the scale, risk and complexity of the supply - That NRC report on source water quality annually, and assess the effectiveness of ways to manage risks or hazards to source water every three years. · That NRC works in conjunction with other agencies to ensure that the gains made in water resilience are viable and sustainable i.e. there is a means of having maintenance and repair over the long term. <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Nora Shayeb	LTP21_192	<p>Submitter raises concern about the environmental impacts of pine forest plantation, particularly on air quality.</p> <p>Raises concern about the impact on aquatic systems and human health, and on soil quality and erosion. Raises concern about adverse impacts on air quality, noise pollution, and</p>

		<p>traffic when pine forests are harvested. Notes impact of pollen as an allergen.</p> <p>Submission includes media articles, excerpts from Regional Air Quality Plan and web links.</p> <p>“Solution: Pine forest plantations to be classed as a ‘not permitted activity’ of land use within a radius of a minimum of 40km from the coasts and any residential developments. Current leases in these areas should not be renewed. The ill-conceived plan to mitigate climate change by planting pine trees should be immediately revised and revoked. NRC driven programs should be developed to subsidise and support transition from pine plantations to native trees.”</p> <p>{Staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
ANOTHER OPTION (do the work and make extra funding available)		
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	Extra funding to support landowners will enhance collaboration and reduce opposition to water protection work
Ian Reeves	LTP21_20	Essential core work
Pamela Stevens	LTP21_23	I encourage anything that improves water quality and the strict enforcement of farming practises with that in mind.
Kim Robinson	LTP21_30	Such a huge project, and with govt funding plus extra NRC work we can make a difference. Landowners need help to achieve the improvements, especially assistance with understanding their land classes and changing land use to suit those classes. Historically they cleared all land but attitudes need changing and they need support to develop farm environment plans focussing on sediment and GHG reductions
Renee Dumas	LTP21_32	Too many dairy farms in the Far North bare and dry. Not only the animals are suffering in the intense heat but the soil is also too dry with erosion problems. Planting streams, top of hills and in between valleys, anywhere where farming is marginal should be proactively sought with each and every farmer.
Tania Aslund	LTP21_39	Include native plantings (as well as appropriate exotics). Tie in water catchment rehabilitation with Northland's climate change response. We must have long-term solutions to the problems of catchment damage and waterway pollution: land-use practices must adjust accordingly for the solutions to be sustainable.
Mr Stephen Rush Environment Officer Te Runanga o Whangaroa	LTP21_67	Plus explore targeted rates for specific communities e.g. Kaipara Moana Remediation Programme is a targeted rate for that community like the Whangaroa Catchment flooding targeted rate.
C Cotton	LTP21_81	Today's central government are changing landowners obligations and they need help to understand and implement the required strategies. It would be good if the various parties could have a co-ordinated approach and targets that don't change every few years.
Kelly Murphy	LTP21_106	Increase the amount of funding via a Catchment Restoration Fund to see more dollars invested in community/hapū groups to tackle water quality issues and improve the health of all Tai Tokerau waterways. Support for landowners with the new freshwater farm plans, to also look at regenerative land use plans - support for landowners to diversify their income streams, and / or implement regenerative practices.
Jessie McVeagh	LTP21_137	Water quality restoration must be supported across the North-the Hokianga catchment should be a priority here as the Harbour and all the tributaries are a taonga of National

		significance ecologically, culturally, historically and scientifically. Our waterways should be given the importance that our forests are as ecologies of significant biodiversity.
Oliver Knox	LTP21_138	More funding needs to go into managing water catchments as this is where it all starts
Ms Janine McVeagh	LTP21_140	Hokianga Harbour is a national taonga and at the moment has 4 wastewater systems sending semi-treated effluent into it. Te Mauri o te Wai is a local hapū -based group that is working with FNDC to change to a land-based system for Rawene, which should be a precedent for the other 3 systems. Regional Council needs to come to the party for Hokianga as well.
Dean Baigent-Mercer	LTP21_145	Forest & Bird supports the second option so long as farm plans are organized within the context of overall catchment plans. It's important to take on the recommendations of MfE report on land use: https://environment.govt.nz/news/new-report-shows-impact-of-demands-on-land-in-new-zealand/
NONE OF THE ABOVE		
Chris Claydon	LTP21_11	Deforestation in the catchment areas is causing the navigable waterways to clog up with silt. Create a targeted rate on all land in catchment areas of navigable waterways which is not native bush and spend the money on dredging out the silt from waterways. The rate will encourage replanting native bush to avoid paying.
Klaus Kurz	LTP21_21	what we have is good enough There is no need to improve water health where I live. Rather reduce costs of avoidable bureaucracy.
Hone Popata	LTP21_25	We need more funding and resources here in Kaitia for the Awanui River Restoration. We have a newly formed trust called Maunga Taniwha ki Rangaunu Trust who are ready to build nurseries, instigate catchment management plans to look after our waterways (Staff comment: reported "Revitalisation of kaitiakitanga with our waterways within the Awanui River Catchment, Muriwhenua" attached to submission)
Mr Carl Mather	LTP21_27	Given that your organisation as well as the local councils have been in charge of the waterways and this has resulted in water so contaminated, I don't think you are the right organisations to be involved in any further interference in this.
Mr Guy Wilson	LTP21_29	Submitter disagrees with rates increases. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Tom Pasco	LTP21_64	Use existing resources for implementing a rigid regime of inspections and enforcing compulsory freshwater farm plans.
Geoff Sharples	LTP21_73	I am all for getting the water clean. But it is unclear to me why landowners should get support. They own the land. If they can't farm or manage it sustainably, then they can sell the land to someone who can. (yes I am a landowner) Otherwise we are having people who might be in poverty paying rates so that wealthy people with farms are subsidized and affluent contractors are funded to do work. Often people keep stock to "pay the rates" and mow the lawn. Some of these are not farmers just getting by but affluent people with enjoying a lifestyle. Are poplar trees the correct trees to be planting - are they native? Why not expand to a native plant nursery?
Mr Neil Doherty	LTP21_85	Cut back further. I am currently restoring my own wetland, why must I pay for these "pet projects"? NRC is taking on more and more - where does it stop!! I can't afford rates increases.

Mr Peter Doel	LTP21_95	This is part of the 3 waters proposal and we should wait and see what that will do. We need to remember that this council is arrogant, self-serving and deceitful.
Harata Waetford	LTP21_97	Use existing budget to meet our water catchment needs.
E Metz	LTP21_100	Use existing resources for implementing a rigid regime of inspections and enforcing compulsory freshwater farm plans.
Kelly Maxwell	LTP21_120	We wish to comment on Biodiversity & Biosecurity only.
Louise Mischewski	LTP21_121	From my view, addressing water health and managing our water catchments are not dissimilar so I cannot understand why the priorities are separated. I would prefer my rates increase supplementing protecting our biodiversity.
Anahita Djamali	LTP21_125	I don't think any of these options are fit for purpose. The Regional Council should be promoting the planting of native trees and a poplar nursery should be privately run or more preferably run by tangata whenua. Where is the option to implement sustainable land management practices that are informed by mātauranga Māori and facilitated by hapū kaitiaki, this needs to be regional council's priority. The Hikurangi Repo is the kidney of the Kaipara Harbour, no effective remediation will take place if the repo is not restored. This needs to be central to any Kaipara Moana Remediation programme.
Fiona King	LTP21_134	keep same funding, No increases. Especially as the rating charges are on Land value. not per property. The amalgamation of the land Management rate and freshwater rate has increased by 30 %. Too higher increase in one year.
Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	We already have a model we just need your support. Waitangi Catchment Group is our Collective and feasibility report of our Catchment. Ko Waitangi te Awa Trust is our environmental arm for implementing Te Mana o te Wai; we need more resourcing for around our lake monitoring and water analysis; modelling and mapping groundwater, land use and swimming sites mahinga kai ; creating systems to co-manage with NRC to participate in gathering increased quantities of data we must gather for Waitangi Catchment around the aspirations of Te Mana o te Wai: https://environment.govt.nz/assets/Publications/Files/essential-freshwater-te-mana-o-te-wai-factsheet.pdf
NO OPTION SELECTED		
Melanie Gatfield	LTP21_70	I am primarily interested in mitigating algal blooms at Waipu beach and estuary. Areas of land around rivers and harbours have huge impact on health of waterways. We need to understand how this impacts on Waipu Estuary. Working to improve health of water ways and water quality. We need scientific data to understand why algal blooms are increasing in frequency and intensity to be able to plan a targeted response. Existing programmes already include managing wetlands, responding to new standards for fresh water and stock exclusion "Maybe we can borrow some of these ideas and those in Kaipara, and apply to Waipu? To provide greater assistance for restoration projects in other Northland harbour catchments. We need to identify what assistance we require scientifically.
Ms Sophia Xiao-Colley	LTP21_93	5. Maintaining strong boundaries to protect our native clean environment.
Mr Mike McGlynn	LTP21_107	Submitter expresses concerns relating to discharges from the Kerikeri Wastewater Scheme into wetlands within the Waitangi

		Wetlands Complex, particularly around the long-term effects of this given the population growth. Submitter recommends looking into alternative areas where artificial wetlands could be created. {Staff summary; please see original submission}
Ro Gravit	LTP21_127	I support Funding equity. The funding received by parties in the Kaipara Moana Remediation Plan has not been distributed to hapū and other environmental groups further up-catchment. This needs resolution as obviously there is discharge from the entirety of the catchments discharging ultimately into the Kaipara. This is an ambulance at the bottom of the cliff situation and I encourage NRC to urgently address this deficiency with the appropriate bodies. A time frame for riparian fencing needs to be set and publicised, with fines for noncompliance.
Caron Mounsey-Smith Specialist Advisor Water Safety New Zealand	LTP21_165	We also support Council's initiatives to manage water catchments, using partnerships in the Kaipara Moana remediation programme and through flood protection (such as the Awanui River scheme upgrade).
Naomi James, Refining NZ (Mr Riaan Elliot)	LTP21_169	Refining NZ supports this work but we believe the focus needs to be broader. There are issues in other catchments apart from the Kaipara such as Whangārei Harbour. This activity promotes an integrated approach to the current environmental issues at hand and as such moves away from the traditional focus on point source discharges which are typically captured through the consenting process. It is considered that the new proposed additional funding would seem appropriate, however apart from the Kaipara catchment there is little detail on how other funds are to be allocated to other catchments.
Mr David Lourie	LTP21_173	I support travelling community education workshops on water quality management at a catchment level. I support the work being done around the Kaipara catchment with Auckland Council. And support improving water quality and riparian margins for the catchments of other harbours and estuaries. I support extending sediment capture of the Kaipara project across the region and supporting landowners to participate. I support the Mata nursery having a greater diversity of native species that will do the erosion mediation work to improve biodiversity along with sediment control.
Ms Anna Curnow Acting Mayor Kaipara District Council	LTP21_177	An ongoing investment into the remediation of the Kaipara Moana is important to KDC. Funding makes an enormous difference to what many have wanted to achieve for years - a healthy and productive harbour, with improved water quality and biodiversity in the more than 10,000 km of streams across the catchment increasing funding via the Environment Fund and NRC's contribution to the remediation programme to support landowners carrying out sediment control and water protection work. KDC will co-invest with NRC in the expansion of New Zealand's digital spatial soil information system, Smap, across Te Tai Tokerau and the revision of Land Use Capability (LUC) mapping for the region. KDC recognises the step-change this is to update legacy natural resource information that underpins environmental modelling, management and economic investment uses. S-Map will be a valuable tool for the Kaipara Kai supporting landowners in their land diversification planning.
Ms Gail Aiken	LTP21_180	We are really disappointed at the limited actions proposed for improving water quality, managing our water catchments, increasing flood protection, and increasing resilience to climate change. The way that land is used and managed has a huge

		<p>impact on each of these areas. There was a reference to planting trees but that is nowhere near enough. We are experiencing a climate crisis and we need bold action not tinkering around the edges.</p>
Ms Zelka Grammer	LTP21_183	<p>Submitter states that some of the greatest impacts for global warming in New Zealand are in land management, and therefore the most pressing area for immediate constructive action by councils including NRC to address harmful climate change. Submitter requests that the protection of soils (particularly but not limited to first class volcanic soils) is detailed in the LTP as healthy soils underpin all primary production and are also important for indigenous biodiversity and ameliorating climate change.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Ms Zelka Grammer Secretary GE Free Tai Tokerau	LTP21_184	<p>The greatest impacts for global warming in New Zealand are in land management, and therefore the most pressing area for immediate constructive action by councils to address harmful climate change.</p>
Mrs Nan Pullman	LTP21_185	<p>Water health - I support the option for essential work plus extra work.</p> <p>Water catchments - while I support this work I would also like to see the council working more closely with agencies such as QEII National Trust to both identify and prioritise existing native vegetation that could be retired from production, fenced and legally protected. I think there is plenty of regenerating and existing native vegetation still to be protected in Northland rather than spending a lot of money on planting. I support the proposal to increase enviro funds to support landowners' efforts to protect our waterways, but would also like to see long term legal protection of such investments.</p>
Ms Asha Andersen Flora and Fauna Aotearoa	LTP21_188	<p>NOTE: This submission received 22 submissions of support. Please see original submission for a list of supporting submitters Submission outlines six recommendations, that are expanded on in the full submission, including: 1. Protect all Bodies of Water and Waterways 2. Stop the use of Toxic Chemicals in our Environment 3. Protect Mature Trees, Exotic and Native 4. Support Organic Agricultural and Horticultural Zones 5. Support Sustainable Non-toxic Biodiversity Care 6. Support Native and Mixed Species Forestry and Agroforestry</p>
Ms Lorna Douglas Whangārei Harbour Catchment Group	LTP21_190	<p>On behalf of the Whangārei Harbour Catchment Group, please accept this submission on council's LTP: Please continue to support and resource the implementation of the Whangārei Harbour Catchment Plan and the non-regulatory actions priorities by the group, including: Promotion of reduced gross pollutants in stormwater Support for innovative solutions to reducing contaminants reaching the harbour</p>
Mr Jon Muller Secretary GE Free New Zealand	LTP21_191	<p>"We applaud the detail and depth of your long term plan and support the understanding of the huge importance that improving the areas of biodiversity by tree planting, wetland and lake restoration and tackling soil erosion will have on the marine environment, ecosystem and water-ways. We also are pleased to see the forward thinking actions on climate change and empowering resilience in all sections of the communities across the Northland region."</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>

Ms Nora Shayeb Member Northland Toxin Awareness Group	LTP21_193	Submitter raises concern about the impact of aerial and roadside spraying on health, and requests a moratorium on spraying with toxic chemical pesticides. {Staff summary; please see original submission}
--	-----------	---

What is your preferred option for protecting our biodiversity?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	56.14%	-	96
Our proposed option	22.22%	39.58%	38
Another option	25.73%	45.83%	44
None of the above	8.19%	14.58%	14
[No Response]	43.86%	-	75
Total	100.00%	100.00%	171

Ninety-six of 171 submitters responded to this question, with 38 choosing our proposed option, 44 choosing another option, 14 choosing none of the above and 75 not selecting an option but still making comment (please see note in Introduction).

Of submitters who chose our proposed option, support was noted for regulatory functions only, a biodiversity plan and a regional biodiversity strategy (and starting with these, not taking them further), and prioritising the prevention of further decline of biodiversity and remediating where damage has already occurred. Concerns were raised over algae blooms at Waipū Cove, the rates increase as proposed, the effects of human activities and drought conditions, the use of chemicals/pesticides, forestry, commercial beehives, and rabbits/wild pigs/cats/dogs.

Of submitters who chose another option, strong support was noted for funding iwi-based kaitiaki rangers. Support was also noted for the ranger option to be open for all Northlanders, increased pest plant investment within high value areas, and funding for coastal care work/implantation of the NPS on Biodiversity. Submitters noted that this was essential work (protecting biodiversity).

Of submitters who chose none of the above, support was noted for increased monitoring for implementing and enforcing existing rules, improving service delivery, and Te Mana o Te Wai. Concerns were raised over writing new plans that would not be implemented/enforced, existing strategies not working, the proposed rates increase, and effects of Canadian geese/swans.

Of submitters who didn't chose an option, support was noted for funding to protect special sites with high biodiversity values and community led pest-control programmes, alignment with existing strategies in Northland, managing vehicles in coastal areas, development of a biodiversity strategy and action plan, and funding for legal protection of priority biodiversity sites. Concerns were raised over dog control rules, the health of ancient trees, wastewater discharges, and the use of chemicals/pesticides.

WHAT IS YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR PROTECTING OUR BIODIVERSITY?		
Name / Organisation	Reference	Comment
OUR PROPOSED OPTION (do the essentials)		
Ian Heape	LTP21_17	this has been considered for it to be a preferred option there for I accept your wisdom
Laurie Copland	LTP21_28	Do what you have to do regulatory only as landowners are making changes to how their activities impact water quality. This is required by central government. It is a case of need to do to not want to do.
Melanie Gatfield	LTP21_70	"Northland has unique ecosystems" How is Waipu estuary unique in comparison to others? (e.g. Fairy terns, dotterels, DOC bird reserve, eels, mullet, porori etc) "Working to improve coastal habitats" What can be done to mitigate algal blooms at Waipu estuary and beach "Extra resources going into Coastcare programmes" I think many locals would be happy to put the mahi into whatever

		measures were deemed helpful to stop/ reduce/manage algal blooms at Waipu...how do we qualify for extra resources?
Geoff Sharples	LTP21_73	I support a biodiversity plan. Much in NZ that has been done to fix one problem has just created the next. There needs to be a real blend of peer reviewed science and Te Ao Maori to get this right. It was not clear to me what the iwi-based kaitiaki rangers would actually do. Encouraging respect for local heritage seems like something that is a community effort, rather than a paid effort. Funding could go toward something that was more active like removing invasive species.
Ms Sarah Cameron Senior Policy Analyst NZ Kiwifruit Growers Inc	LTP21_84	NZKGI supports council's work in the development of a Regional Biodiversity Strategy and action plan. NZKGI supports the \$567k biodiversity expenditure option over the next three years
Heather Tomason	LTP21_116	Get a strategy and plan and employ staff and later in time take it further, after reviewing the outcome achieved from doing the plan.
Oliver Knox	LTP21_138	Start with the strategy and plan long term for protecting biodiversity. Its complex and very difficult to achieve biodiversity gains and keep them going, so needs a good plan first and foremost before putting resources into operational staff as its a long game and will take a huge amount of resources, so need to get it right.
Richard Morris	LTP21_142	We are broadly supportive of initiatives to improve water quality and biodiversity i.e. the first five initiatives listed in your consultation document.
Mr Harold Robinson	LTP21_168	We agree with doing essentials as the proposed option.
Mr Richard Gardner Senior Policy Advisor Federated Farmers of NZ	LTP21_170	Please see the attached detailed submission. The rate increase must be reduced to a manageable level
Dr Lily George Policy Analyst Nga Tai Ora	LTP21_172	<p>Submitter makes comment on topics relating to 'managing our biodiversity' and makes the following recommendations relevant to this consultation point:</p> <p>That NRC acknowledges in the LTP the current global crisis of nature's decline including biodiversity loss</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · That NRC prioritises the prevention of further declines of local natural ecosystems and undertakes remedial action where damage has already occurred. · That NRC partner with Māori in environmental governance, recognising the knowledge, innovations and practices, institutions and values inherent in Te Ao Māori and Mātauranga Māori · That NRC closely monitors use of agrichemicals to ensure minimal harmful effects on human, plant, aquatic and other environmental life · That NRC considers creation of more conservation areas on land and sea. <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Nora Shayeb	LTP21_192	<p>Submitter raises concern that "the 'NZ Predator Free' campaign is yet another example of blame shifting from humans to non-human species", that humans have the biggest impact on the environment, and that resources need to be focussed on the most critical issues.</p> <p>Submitter specifically raises concern about drought conditions, and that drought tolerance of plants should be taken into consideration when regenerating land.</p>

		<p>Submitter requests acknowledgement of issues including that plant pest are much more of an issue than animal pests (ref pine forest comments), that the commercial honey industry is starving bird and insect life to death and the honey bee be categorised as 'livestock'.</p> <p>Raises concern that possums are not the major issue and have a role as pollinators and seed dispersers in some parts of NZ, that Mustelids contribute to the control of rodents, and that people are releasing pigs into the bush. Concern about rabbit issue, but that poisons such as Pindone should not be used, and electrocution is an option. Other pest control options discussed.</p> <p>Concern about lack of dog control and discusses solutions.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
ANOTHER OPTION (do the essentials + some extras)		
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	Funding iwi-based kaitiaki rangers and supporting their work will show a stronger commitment to biodiversity protection and extend the outreach of the programme and provide opportunities for education
Ian Reeves	LTP21_20	Absolutely essential
Pamela Stevens	LTP21_23	Wonderful idea supporting our iwi-bases rangers in their rohe. Long overdue can only benefit all of us.
Mrs Jan Pirihi	LTP21_24	Ensure staff are knowledgeable about biodiversity iwi-based kaitiaki rangers need knowledge and direction
Hone Popata	LTP21_25	YES, kaitiaki rangers in the Awanui Catchment Area. We are ready and willing (Staff comment: reported "Revitalisation of kaitiakitanga with our waterways within the Awanui River Catchment, Muriwhenua" attached to submission)
Tania Aslund	LTP21_39	This is essential work and potentially could provide employment in some of the more remote areas. Possum populations seem to be exploding - are there any business opportunities (e.g. pet food?) that could tie in with (and help fund) trapping programs?
Mr Stephen Rush Environment Officer Te Runanga o Whangaroa	LTP21_67	This is essential if gains are to be made and protection of our biodiversity to be achieved. Iwi based kaitiaki rangers are on the ground and know the whakapapa and what works best.
Ann Neill	LTP21_68	Enabling mana whenua to be involved in local biodiversity work and take a kaitiakitanga role is very important.
Catherine Johnson	LTP21_82	In regards to "Another Option"- Iwi should play a pivotal role but the opportunity should be open to all Northlanders who are appropriately skilled (both environmentally and culturally) thereby encouraging integration in Northland. Integrating communities will bring all round benefits.
Harata Waetford	LTP21_97	Fully supportive of kaitiaki rangers.
Kelly Murphy	LTP21_106	100% tautoko iwi based Kaitiaki rangers who could also be part of expanding monitoring programme.
Kelly Maxwell	LTP21_120	Weed Action Native Habitat Restoration Trust would like to see an increase in pest plant investment from NRC within HVA's. There seems to be strong commitments and investment for animal pest control, but limited investment for pest plant control. We would also like to see more personnel available to respond to HVA or other weed-based groups. Currently we find it difficult to get weed related support from NRC. We would also like to see the pool of Biofunds increase to include weed contractor input, especially for the buffer zones of areas of

		ecological significance. We would like to see a formula developed to ensure that all HVA community groups in Northland according to; size, length of time they have been operating, number of volunteers, proof of increased outputs and the increased funding from other sources, receive equitable funding levels and that a provision is made for a 20% increase pa. x 3 years (Rationale for this increased number of volunteers to service, community awareness more calls for advice/herbicide dispersal, increased administrative costs etc)
Louise Mischewski	LTP21_121	Iwi wants to collect GNS data and create its own baseline so they can measure outputs and or irregularities. There appears to be a reticence towards iwi plans or budgets.
Anahita Djamali	LTP21_125	Strongly support investment in hapū based kaitiaki rangers.
Jessie McVeagh	LTP21_137	Training, education and support for more hapū -based rangers / kaitiaki will be a positive step that will reap many rewards. This could strengthen obligations under Te Tiriti if done with correct engagement of mana whenua, mana moana.
Dean Baigent-Mercer	LTP21_145	The upcoming National Policy Statement on Biodiversity will require funding for implementation so this needs to be factored into this funding. Biodiversity work also needs to have an understanding of how this complements climate change outcomes i.e. native forests emit carbon as trees die and rot, and seedlings of future native forests are eaten by possums and pigs (and deer). Climate-focused nature restoration is essential.
Mr David Lourie	LTP21_173	I support the extras on biodiversity. I support the funding of coastal care work.
NONE OF THE ABOVE		
Chris Claydon	LTP21_11	Don't waste money writing more plans which will never been enforced or implemented. Spend the money on "hands on" monitoring, implementation and enforcement of the existing rules to protect biodiversity.
Klaus Kurz	LTP21_21	what we do is good enough Your biosecurity strategy doesn't work. Therefore any further action plan and even more staff wouldn't improve the situation as you refuse to accept facts.
Mr Carl Mather	LTP21_27	Given that your organisation as well as the local councils have been in charge of the waterways and this has resulted in water so contaminated, I don't think you are the right organisations to be involved in any further interference in this, and given your abysmal failure in this as well, I don't think your organisation should have any role to play in protecting bio-diversity. Furthermore, in some discussions I have had with your staff I seriously doubt you even understand the term 'bio-diversity'.
Mr Guy Wilson	LTP21_29	Submitter disagrees with rates increases. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Mr Neil Doherty	LTP21_85	Too many snouts in the trough cut back \$\$
Mr Peter Doel	LTP21_95	Continue current level of service. We need to remember that this council is arrogant, self-serving and deceitful.
Fiona King	LTP21_134	Concentrate on what you are involved with now and improve your service delivery to rate payers. Lots of improvements are needed. Remove the Canadian geese from land and harbours. They are fowling the land and waters ways. Also the Swan that are in the harbours. Each bird shits about a 2litre ice cream container each day. I had a pet one.

Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	<p>Te Mana o te Taiao Implementing Te Mana o te Taiao The release of Te Mana o te Taiao is just the first step towards finding better ways of working together to look after nature. A broad range of perspectives and expertise are needed to plan and implement the next steps, so iwi, hapū, whanau, central and local government, industry, science, NGOs and communities will be involved in this process. As well as setting an aspiration and direction, a strategy also needs to set out a pathway for how the goals and objectives can be met and who will be working on them.</p> <p>Now that Te Mana o te Taiao is in place, the next phase of strategy development will be to collaboratively design an implementation plan for 2021-2022. This implementation plan and Te Mana o te Taiao will together form the Aotearoa New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy. The first implementation plan will focus on establishing the systems and processes needed to support the effective delivery of Te Mana o te Taiao, as well as making progress on those actions that can begin immediately. Implementation planning will run on a 5-year cycle from 2025 onwards for the life of the strategy.</p> <p>Progress against the strategy and implementation plan will be regularly assessed and publicly reported on. Regular reviews will ensure that the strategy remains fresh, relevant and influential, and that we are measuring and accountable for our progress. Te Mana o te Taiao will need to be implemented at national, regional and local levels. Those actions that need to be implemented nationally will often be led by agencies or national organisations. Much of the regional and local implementation will be led by regional strategies and implemented by those who know their region best - councils, iwi/hapū, landowners and users, communities, and local people on the ground.</p> <p>The development of Te Mana o te Taiao was led by the Department of Conservation on behalf of Aotearoa New Zealand. It was built on the advice and ideas of Treaty partners, whanau, hapū, iwi, Māori organisations, communities, individuals, stakeholders, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), industry organisations, and central and local government - i.e. all those who will be vital to its success. https://www.doc.govt.nz/globalassets/documents/conservation/biodiversity/anzbs-2020-biodiversity-report.pdf</p>
NO OPTION SELECTED		
Mr Troy Churton Trustee Scrumptious Fruit Trust	LTP21_43	<p>Your biodiversity plan is promising but eventually FLAWED and will not give you the returns on proposed investment UNLESS you also ensure local authorities (FNDC/ WDC) REQUIRE dog control default rules , in dog control policies, to ensure dogs are ON leash on foreshore / beaches / fauna reserve areas. FNDC for example unlawfully changed its policy setting in 2018 to enable mostly OFF leash dog control default rules on beaches. Regardless, NRC MUST set a plan that uses ON LEASH controls as the benchmark.</p>
Mr Paul Gosling	LTP21_44	<p>Submitter raises concern about the health of Northland's ancient trees. Raises concern about the lack of data on old trees in land use management, and that therefore the situation is unsustainable and causing environmental degradation. Raises concern that only having voluntary mechanisms of protection isn't working. Notes that a key element of progress is a self-recognition for the need for environmental enhancement. Requests that NRC recognise the unsustainability and vulnerability of very old trees, and to</p>

		develop a strategy to control the losses. Submitter attaches email on tree protection from 2005. {Staff summary; please see original submission}
Ms Sophia Xiao-Colley	LTP21_93	5. Maintaining strong boundaries to protect our native clean environment.
Mr Mike McGlynn	LTP21_107	Submitter expresses concerns relating to discharges from the Kerikeri Wastewater Scheme into wetlands within the Waitangi Wetlands Complex, particularly around the long term effects of this given the population growth. Submitter recommends looking into alternative areas where artificial wetlands could be created. {Staff summary; please see original submission}
Mr Jim Kilpatrick Chair Ngunguru Sandspit Protection Society	LTP21_124	None of the options proposed by NRC are favoured. NSaPS prefers the proposals in option 2 but with more extras than those listed in the consultation document. Further comments in this submission request funding to protect a special site with high biodiversity values: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Full sequence of habitats - estuary to wetlands, sandspit and forested mountain top · Unique forest, nationally significant: kawaka - kauri - pohutukawa · Numerous threatened plants, birds and other wildlife · Potentially a seabird nesting site
Codie McIntyre Northland Inc	LTP21_146	Just to note, when/if developing a regional biodiversity strategy, please consider and align with other strategies that already exist at a regional level, e.g. the Tai Tokerau Northland Destination Management Plan.
Naomi James, Refining NZ (Mr Riaan Elliot)	LTP21_169	Refining NZ supports work on managing vehicles in the coastal environment and the need to work collaboratively with District Councils across the region to ensure integrated management of vehicles above and below mean high-water springs. Misuse of vehicles along the coast surrounding the Refinery is undermining dune stability as well as endangering the coastal dune ecology. Damage by vehicles serves to aggravate coastal erosion because of sea level rise and climate change. Vehicle use below mean high-water springs also potentially impacts shellfish beds and needs to be managed appropriately. Refining NZ supports the proposed new funding for the Tai Tokerau Coastal Kaitiaki programme.
Ms Anna Curnow Acting Mayor Kaipara District Council	LTP21_177	KDC support boosting funding for community led pest-control programmes that help to establish a pest-free corridor between Mangawhai and the Kaipara Harbour.
Ms Kate Lindsay Policy Advisor QEII National Trust	LTP21_178	Submitter agrees with the development of a regional biodiversity strategy and action plan, and would like to be included in the stakeholder group for development of this strategy. Submitter notes that key to successful outcomes will be having resources and support for landowners, community groups and others to implement the plan. Submitter agrees with the level of service 'Indigenous biodiversity and ecosystems are maintained and enhanced, particularly around our rivers, lakes, wetlands and coastal margins.', and notes the importance of a focus on the 'maintenance' of biodiversity and ecosystems before investment into revegetation. Submitter states that the proposed measures and targets outlined for biodiversity in the LTP are not sufficient. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Mrs Nan Pullman	LTP21_185	Agree with the proposal to respond to a regional biodiversity strategy and develop and implement a biodiversity action plan but would like to see this happening with much more urgency

		and a commitment to work with other agencies, such as QEII, to achieve this. I'd like to see funding committed to assist with legal protection of priority biodiversity sites e.g. a commitment to QEII National Trust to match fencing and survey monies on an annual basis so that we start to see some of these prioritised sites protected. I'd like to see funding to directly support community-led projects in outcome monitoring and biodiversity research. Support the essentials but do not agree with iwi-based kaitiaki rangers - just rangers.
Mr Jon Muller Secretary GE Free New Zealand	LTP21_191	"We applaud the detail and depth of your long-term plan and support the understanding of the huge importance that improving the areas of biodiversity by tree planting, wetland and lake restoration and tackling soil erosion will have on the marine environment, ecosystem and water-ways. We also are pleased to see the forward-thinking actions on climate change and empowering resilience in all sections of the communities across the Northland region." {staff summary; please see original submission}
Ms Nora Shayeb Member Northland Toxin Awareness Group	LTP21_193	Submitter raises concern about the impact of aerial and roadside spraying on health, and requests a moratorium on spraying with toxic chemical pesticides. {Staff summary; please see original submission}

What is your preferred option for land-based biosecurity?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	55.56%	-	95
Our proposed option	17.54%	31.58%	30
Another option	30.41%	54.74%	52
None of the above	7.60%	13.68%	13
[No Response]	44.44%	-	76
Total	100.00%	100.00%	171

Ninety-five of 171 submitters responded to this question, with 30 choosing our proposed option, 52 choosing another option, 13 choosing none of the above and 76 not selecting an option but still making comment (please see note in Introduction).

Of submitters who chose our proposed option, support was noted for eradication of roadside weeds plus provisions for community groups to get involved, eradicating wild pigs in high value areas, concentrating on possums, eradicating wild kiwifruit, prevention of soil-borne pathogens with good hygiene practice, the use of hunters in place of traps, kaitiaki rangers, and encouraging landowners to practice sustainable and eco-friendly land management. Concerns were raised over the proposed rates increase, LAs not enforcing their own rules and regulations, and the effects of unleashed dogs.

Of submitters who chose another option, support was noted for possum control being priority plus wild pigs (noting leave deer alone), pest free corridors (linking mountains to sea) and community led projects, control of feral cats and educating cat owners, clearing weeds to allow space for plants to address erosion, support for volunteers, better coordination between LAs, further support for Piroa Brynderwyns, increased support for high value areas, and kaitiaki rangers. Concerns were raised over mitigating climate change, roadside and widespread aerial spraying, creating new problems as we fix existing ones, and the use of chemicals.

Of submitters who chose none of the above, support was noted for doing the essentials and no more, continuing with the current levels of service, and focusing on the framework of Te Mana o Te Taiao with a broad range of perspectives needed. Concerns were raised over existing strategies not working and the proposed rates increase.

Of submitters who didn't chose an option, support was noted for promotion/support for responsible cat ownership, a regional biodiversity strategy and action plan, increased resourcing and capacity for pest control, community-led programmes, priority for high values areas, prevention/minimising further incursions, sustainable non-toxic biodiversity care, the Tutukaka Coast being pest-free, and assisting landowners with pest suppression/eradication. Concerns were raised over the loss of biodiversity, disproportionate impacts of climate change on indigenous people, escalation of pest animals and plants, and the use of chemicals/pesticides.

WHAT IS YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR LAND-BASED BIOSECURITY?		
Name / Organisation	Reference	Comment
OUR PROPOSED OPTION (do the essentials)		
Ian Heape	LTP21_17	this has been considered for it to be a preferred option there for I accept your wisdom
Mrs Jan Pirihi	LTP21_24	Eradication of roadside weeds especially Woolly Nightshade. Concentrated attack to leave areas cleared. Provision of equipment and material so community groups can join the fight. Free provision of traps and removal of dead pests e.g. possums and stoats
Tom Pasco	LTP21_64	Include eradicating wild pigs at Cape Brett and Russell Forest and other high value areas

C Cotton	LTP21_81	Concentrate on the opossums.
Richard Morris	LTP21_142	We are broadly supportive of initiatives to improve water quality and biodiversity i.e. the first five initiatives listed in your consultation document.
Ms Sarah Cameron Senior Policy Analyst NZ Kiwifruit Growers Inc	LTP21_84	<p>Northland Regional Council has named wild kiwifruit (<i>Actinidia</i> spp.) as an eradication pest within the Northland Regional Pest and Marine Pathway Management Plan 2017-2027. Kiwifruit Vine Health (KVH), representing the kiwifruit industry, thanks Northland Regional Council staff and contractors for on-going surveillance, undertaking compliance when required, and for working in conjunction with KVH to eradicate all identified wild kiwifruit infestations in Northland region.</p> <p>KVH also supports work undertaken by Northland Regional Council, and assistance with collaborative programmes, to prevent any further spread of harmful soil-borne pathogens, such as kauri dieback.</p> <p>KVH supports programmes to raise awareness, prevent the movement or spread of soil which may contain harmful pathogens to the kiwifruit industry (such as <i>Phytophthora</i> species), including on footwear and machinery. KVH requests that Northland Regional Council continue to resource workstreams for wild kiwifruit eradication and promoting good hygiene practice (for people and machinery) to prevent the spread of soil-borne pests. NZKGI supports the \$2.5m bio security expenditure option over the next three years</p>
Harata Waetford	LTP21_97	Use hunters not just traps. Support community-led weed control.
Mr Richard Gardner Senior Policy Advisor Federated Farmers of NZ	LTP21_170	Please see the attached detailed submission. The rate increase must be reduced to a manageable level.
Nora Shayeb	LTP21_192	<p>Submitter raises concern about cycleway development and environmental impact, and NRC enforcing compliance for the cycleway development.</p> <p>Raises concern about threats to Kiwi as a result, and other environmental impacts.</p> <p>Submitter proposes:</p> <p>“Solution: I propose that the NRC enacts your vision and mission to protect our environment from such deliberate destruction, by holding WDC and other government agencies accountable. I would like to see much funding to go towards hiring Kaitiaki rangers, who patrol significant ecological areas, to encourage respect for the last of our precious natural world. Use modern technology like trail cameras to monitor such areas. Install clear signage that outlines the regulations in no uncertain terms. Introduce severe fines for infringements, such as not keeping your domestic animals under control, or not staying on designated tracks. This could add substantially to your financial resources. The Abuser pays! Other suggestions: I am a member of the Wild Life Land Trust, linked to the ‘Human Society International’. The objectives of such programs are to protect, preserve and regenerate ecosystems and wildlife habitat, completely on a voluntary basis. There are absolutely no costs or legal obligations involved, unlike WDC or QE II covenants which are serious financial commitments not many people are prepared to make. The vision of such programs is to encourage private landholders with a concern for wildlife and habitat protection to practice sustainable and eco-friendly land management, whilst preserving the valuable ecosystems and</p>

		<p>native species on their land. Guidance from ecologists is made available to land owners, to regenerate degraded land, as well as some financial assistance to buy and plant trees, or fence wetlands etc. There are a few programs like this in Australia and all around the world, but we have nothing here in NZ. I could see this as an educational program run by NRC, to inspire and engage the community in learning more about how our ecosystems function.”</p> <p>{Staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Mr David Brereton	LTP21_161	Plus more support for pest control volunteers (currently volunteers pay for poison/bait)
ANOTHER OPTION (do the essentials + some extras)		
Chris Claydon	LTP21_11	Possum control should be a priority
Pamela Stevens	LTP21_23	Yes to corridors and supporting community driven projects with expertise and practical equipment and resources. I encourage the support of numerous community groups that tackle weeds and the goal to make Whangārei pest free. I encourage any work that can be done to control feral cats and educate cat owners and the damage they do to our birds.
Graham Gallagher	LTP21_61	Leave the deer alone and concentrate on wild dogs and possums.
Mr Stephen Rush Environment Officer Te Runanga o Whangaroa	LTP21_67	Communities are best placed to respond to local issues and need to be supported.
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	Given how dire the situation has become, doing more and involving the community to a greater extent is desirable. A pest-free corridor would be a great start, to establish an effective barrier, and then move outwards to increase pest-free land north and south across all of Northland.
Ian Reeves	LTP21_20	Great progress is being made, I understand. Expediting pest control will have great positive impacts
Robyn Skerten	LTP21_22	<p>Submitter raises concern as Leader of Puke Kopipi Native Plant Restoration Group about mitigating climate change, clearing weeds to make space for annual winter plants, and more planting to address erosion. Requests assistance from a council volunteer coordinator and acknowledges NRC input.</p> <p>Raises concern about indiscriminate broad spraying of roadsides, and asks if council can advise and help Private Landowners who have large weed infestation.</p> <p>Raises concern about widespread aerial spraying with toxic herbicides which may well be a serious health hazard, and supports Nora Shayeb's Submission.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Renee Dumas	LTP21_32	Better coordination between the district and regional councils in terms of the type of industry granted to enhance the district instead of depleting resources is required.
Tania Aslund	LTP21_39	Nature corridors linking mountains-to-sea (ideally, coast-to-coast linking to marine reserves) coupled with comprehensive pest-control is a great idea - we need as many as possible, linking Northlands unique ecosystems, such as dune lakes, Rangaunu and Parengarenga Harbours, a corridor between Hokianga Harbour and, say, Whangaroa Harbour via Puketi Forest...
Ann Neill	LTP21_68	NRC's financial and staff support for HVAs like the Piroa Brynderwyns has laid an excellent foundation to get the

		management and governance group established. There is an ongoing need to build and extend the work to cover more of this extensive hilly and bushy area that serves as a frontier or gateway into Northland. This will provide safer habitat for the kiwi present and future as the population grows and disperses along with a number of other threatened or endangered species in the hills, lowlands and on the coastal edges.
Geoff Sharples	LTP21_73	We invited the animals here. Now we have to get rid of them. Let's just make sure we are not creating the next problem as we fix this one. Example Glyphosate is widely used and it is detrimental to human health, animals streams and water. 1080 is also suspect. Glyphosate should be banned or only used in very special circumstances. Use of these chemicals should be based on peer reviewed science from international sources. - the data is already available.
Kelly Murphy	LTP21_106	Establish pest free corridor and then connect all the areas for a predator free Tai Tokerau.
Kelly Maxwell	LTP21_120	<p>Weed Action Native Habitat Restoration Trust would like to see an increase in pest plant investment from NRC within HVA's. There seems to be strong commitments and investment for animal pest control, but limited investment for pest plant control. We would also like to see more personnel available to respond to HVA or other weed-based groups. Currently we find it difficult to get weed related support from NRC.</p> <p>We would also like to see the pool of Biofunds increase to include weed contractor input, especially for the buffer zones of areas of ecological significance. We would like to see a formula developed to ensure that all HVA community groups in Northland according to; size, length of time they have been operating, number of volunteers, proof of increased outputs and the increased funding from other sources, receive equitable funding levels and that a provision is made for a 20% increase pa. x 3 years (Rationale for this - increased number of volunteers to service, community awareness more calls for advice/herbicide dispersal, increased administrative costs etc)</p>
Anahita Djamali	LTP21_125	Invest in kaitiaki rangers to manage land-based biosecurity
Jessie McVeagh	LTP21_137	The pest-free corridor should extend from Kaipara north to the Waipoua, Mataraua, Waima and all forests of Hokianga.
Mr Harold Robinson	LTP21_168	We say do the essentials plus some extra. Need to work closer with communities, landowners and others, including local councils and monitor the work to be done. This includes invasive and noxious weeds especially on road sides and reserves and close to schools and eradicate them completely. Landowners do not want these pests infiltrating into their farmland. Councils need to do a better job in overseeing this growing problem.
Dean Baigent-Mercer	LTP21_145	Also look for other funding sources via central Government or NEXT etc to co-fund or fund the corridor project.
Mr David Lourie	LTP21_173	I support the extras for biosecurity and marine biosecurity. I support the funding for predator control traps, and additionally have a more systematic way of evaluating the effectiveness of the pest control management to make sure resources are being used in most appropriate fashion.
NONE OF THE ABOVE		
Klaus Kurz	LTP21_21	what we do is good enough Your biosecurity strategy doesn't work. Therefore any further action plan and even more staff wouldn't improve the situation as you refuse to accept facts.

Hone Popata	LTP21_25	<p>We (Oturū Marae, Kaitiāia) have had many meetings with NRC to develop strategies to tackle many problems in the environment area. And still nothing. We are proposing again to resource us properly setup river rangers here in Kaitiāia to look after our waterways</p> <p>{Staff comment: reported "Revitalisation of kaitiakitanga with our waterways within the Awanui River Catchment, Muriwhenua" attached to submission}</p>
Mr Carl Mather	LTP21_27	<p>Given that your organisation as well as the local councils have been in charge of the waterways and this has resulted in water so contaminated, I don't think you are the right organisations to be involved in any further interference in this, and given your abysmal failure in this as well, I don't think your organisation should have any role to play in protecting bio-diversity. Furthermore, in some discussions I have had with your staff I seriously doubt you even understand the term 'bio-diversity'. i.e. keep well out of this area.</p>
Mr Guy Wilson	LTP21_29	<p>Submitter disagrees with rates increases.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Mr Neil Doherty	LTP21_85	<p>Cut back. Die back in kauri is here to stay. I do my own pest control - no help from anyone. You and others are sending me broke!!</p>
Fiona King	LTP21_134	<p>Do the essentials + no more</p>
Mr Peter Doel	LTP21_95	<p>Continue current level of service. We need to remember that this council is arrogant, self-serving and deceitful.</p>
Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	<p>Submitter supports implementation of Te Mana o te Taiao. Notes that a broad range of perspectives and expertise are needed to plan and implement the next steps - iwi, hapū, whanau, central and local government, industry, science, NGOs and communities.</p> <p>Submitter notes that a strategy also needs to set out a pathway for how the goals and objectives can be met and who will be working on them. Discusses implementation plan and reviews of the strategy.</p> <p>Submission includes link to doc website.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
NO OPTION SELECTED		
Dr Mere Kepa	LTP21_48	<p>Submitter raises concern about the impact of environmental degradation, including climate change, emissions and sea-level rise to contribute to the loss of biodiversity. Highlights the rights of indigenous peoples in relation to the conservation and protection of the environment, the value of indigenous peoples traditional knowledge and practices in responding and adapting to environmental pressures, and raises concern of the disproportionate impact of climate change on indigenous peoples. Submitter recognises that land biosecurity work offers a platform to serve to strengthen the knowledge and practices of Tangata Whenua to address climate change. Raises concern about the escalation of pest animals and plants in native forests and the impact on local communities including tangata whenua. Requests that council supports local initiatives to pest control such as the "Pest Strategy: Takahiwai Hills and Forest"</p> <p>{Staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Ms Sophia Xiao-Colley	LTP21_93	<p>5. Maintaining strong boundaries to protect our native clean environment.</p>

Ms Judy Plain	LTP21_96	<p>Submitter requests that council support and promote responsible cat ownership by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting the WDC to introduce new bylaws mandating desexing, microchipping and registering (on NZCAR) of companion cats, and; Helping the community achieve this by providing regular annual funding to the Whangārei SPCA so 'snip n chip' programmes can be made available annually. <p>Submission includes summary of the current issues with cats, approaches taken by other councils, SPCA statistics, and the NZ national Cat Management Strategy.</p> <p>Submission requests that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The WDC and NRC to acknowledge there is a problem, and work with the community and relevant agencies to help resolve the problem. The NRC to support the WDC to mandate that all companion cats are microchipped by the age of 6 months and the cat's microchip registered with the NZCAR (NZ Companion Animal Register) - a once in the cat's lifetime cost. The NRC to support the WDC to mandate that all companion cats born from a given date (e.g. 1 January 2022) are de-sexed by the age of 6 months. Registered breeders apply for an exemption. Local government to allocate funding annually to the Whangārei SPCA: i. for de-sexing surgery and microchipping of cats and kittens in their care that are suitable for re-homing ii. for annual 'snip n chip' programmes for cat owners in the Whangārei District The priority of any cat management plan is to de-sex and microchip owned cats and re-home unowned, lost or abandoned cats and kittens. <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Dr Lily George Policy Analyst Nga Tai Ora	LTP21_172	<p>Submitter makes comment on topics relating to 'biosecurity': In addition to supporting the government's 30 year pest free targets we commend NRC for its proposals for a regional biodiversity strategy to allow it to further develop and implement a biodiversity action plan.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Ms Kate Lindsay Policy Advisor QEII National Trust	LTP21_178	<p>We are excited to see that the Council is proposing to boost funding for biosecurity. It is great to see proposed increased resourcing and capacity for pest plant control in the region and a recognition that a similar level of support for pest plants is needed to what the Council currently provides for community-led pest animal control. Both pest plants and animals are a key threat to the sustainability of QEII covenants, and indigenous biodiversity more generally in the Region.</p> <p>The continuing spread of many existing weeds and the establishment of novel weeds are hindrances for private landowners and ongoing management comes at a significant cost to landowners. We strongly support increased investment into this area and suggest that the Council prioritise this funding towards priority areas identified as high value for indigenous biodiversity.</p>
Ms Zelka Grammer Secretary GE Free Tai Tokerau	LTP21_184	<p>Submission states that the plan should focus on strong biosecurity (to prevent or minimise incursions of unwanted new organisms), and humane, ground based feral control.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>

Ms Asha Andersen Flora and Fauna Aotearoa	LTP21_188	<p>NOTE: This submission received 22 submissions of support.</p> <p>Please see original submission for a list of supporting submitters 5. Support Sustainable Non-toxic Biodiversity Care</p> <p>Current biodiversity strategies are based on the widespread use of cruel, toxic poisons. These poisons are entering the food-chain and causing secondary poisoning and disease in wildlife and people. Conservation and biodiversity approaches must be ecologically sound, however, the current approach is polluting our environment, soils, waterways and the fabric of life itself.</p> <p>Solutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support private sanctuaries and reserves of all kinds. • Support hunting and trapping based on the principles of ethical, non-toxic methods. • Support our communities efforts to set up resource recovery and social enterprise around hunting and trapping of resources.
Ms Rebecca Williams Secretary Tutukaka Coast Ratepayers and Residents Assoc	LTP21_179	<p>Submitter recommends that the council consider supporting the Tutukaka Coast to be a pest-free environment.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Ms Zelka Grammer	LTP21_183	<p>In my view, NRC should support and prioritize assisting landowners with feral pest suppression/eradication and suppression/eradication of pest plants (including moth plant, wild ginger, tobacco weed, privet, and climbing asparagus). Strong biosecurity systems are needed in Northland to prevent or minimise incursions of unwanted new organisms, GMO or otherwise). Humane, ground based feral control provides ethical jobs, education in the value of conservation, provides the side benefit of increased fitness, and protects indigenous biodiversity. Please ensure these are adequately mentioned and resourced in the new LTP 2021/31.</p>
Mrs Nan Pullman	LTP21_185	<p>While I agree with the development of low-incidence pest plant programme I would not like to see the council move away from other pest plant work. I'd like to see community-led HVA's supported with more practical resources and council weed teams or contractors engaged to target weed infestations that are too large for community groups. I support more funding for kauri dieback work in Northland, especially if this would ensure a faster identification and response to reports. I support the proposal to boost funding and develop more HVAs - although I note there is a limit to volunteer community work. I think there also needs to be realistic financial support for existing HVAs especially in areas of admin, outcome monitoring and advocacy.</p>
Mr Jon Muller Secretary GE Free New Zealand	LTP21_191	<p>"We applaud the detail and depth of your long term plan and support the understanding of the huge importance that improving the areas of biodiversity by tree planting, wetland and lake restoration and tackling soil erosion will have on the marine environment, ecosystem and water-ways. We also are pleased to see the forward thinking actions on climate change and empowering resilience in all sections of the communities across the Northland region."</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Ms Nora Shayeb Member Northland Toxin Awareness Group	LTP21_193	<p>Submitter raises concern about the impact of aerial and roadside spraying on health, and requests a moratorium on spraying with toxic chemical pesticides.</p> <p>{Staff summary; please see original submission}</p>

What is your preferred option for marine-based biosecurity?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	54.39%	-	93
Our proposed option	12.87%	23.66%	22
Another option (1)	28.65%	52.69%	49
Another option (2)	7.02%	12.90%	12
None of the above	5.85%	10.75%	10
[No Response]	45.61%	-	78
Total	100.00%	100.00%	171

Ninety-three of 171 submitters responded to this question, with 22 choosing our proposed option, 49 choosing another option (1), 12 choosing another option (2), ten choosing none of the above and 78 not selecting an option but still making comment (please see note in Introduction).

Of submitters who chose our proposed option, support was noted for all people paying for this work, not just marine users.

Of submitters who chose another option (1), support was largely for a user pays scheme, eg. boaties / mooring owners / marinas, to reduce the burden on ratepayers. Concerns were raised over marine incursions being likely to increase.

Of submitters who chose another option (2), support was noted for discontinuing to charge boaties for marine pest inspection monitoring, enforcement focusing on large commercial international vessels, and getting marae and hapū to help with monitoring. Concerns were raised over wasting money on trying to eradicate fanworm and that it is impossible to control any incursions.

Of submitters who chose none of the above, support was noted for concentrating on boarder control, user pays, and focusing on the framework of Te Mana o Te Taiao with a broad range of perspectives needed. Concerns were raised over existing pests being unable to be controlled and therefore it's wasting money trying to, the costs being unfairly pitched towards mooring/boat owners, and the proposed rates increase.

Of submitters who didn't chose an option, support was noted for inter-regional collaboration on the spread of marine pest and further work on reducing pest populations and eradication where possible, extra funding for marine biosecurity, further development of inter-regional partnerships, and implementation of precautionary and prohibitive rules around the release of genetically modified organisms in costal marine areas. Concerns were raised over the use of chemicals/pesticides and the use of revenue collected via a biosecurity charge for marine biosecurity inspections.

WHAT IS YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR MARINE-BASED BIOSECURITY?		
Name / Organisation	Reference	Comment
OUR PROPOSED OPTION (do the essentials)		
Jeroen Jongejans	LTP21_4	Incursions are not because of marine users- no reason to target them, this is a cost for all of us to bear.
Ian Heape	LTP21_17	this has been considered for it to be a preferred option there for I accept your wisdom
Graham Gallagher	LTP21_61	All residents benefit and are responsible not just mooring holders. Vast amounts of boats come up from Auckland and don't pay anything.
E Metz	LTP21_100	NRC should accept that it is impossible to control incursions existing and new future ones. I don't believe it fair that owners of moorings, marina berths and ports should shoulder the funding of new incursion works through increased charges.

Richard Morris	LTP21_142	We are broadly supportive of initiatives to improve water quality and biodiversity i.e. the first five initiatives listed in your consultation document.
ANOTHER OPTION (do this work, partly funded by user charges)		
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	It is only fair to place a higher financial burden on those who present new biosecurity risks to the marine environment through their activity
Ian Reeves	LTP21_20	Marine incursions are a real problem and likely to increase.
Mrs Jan Pirihi	LTP21_24	Charges need to be equitable and aimed at the right people, especially owners of moorings and marina berths.
Geoff Sharples	LTP21_73	If boating is leading to the incursions then folks who own boats should carry more of the cost. If it is too expensive, then don't own a boat or get a smaller boat.
Laurie Copland	LTP21_28	Where possible and where there is a direct link then charge users (boats)
Environment Officer Te Runanga o Whangaroa	LTP21_67	User pays regime!!! NRC revenue generated from marine leases needs to be recycled and returned to programmes that address biosecurity. Whangaroa Harbour is pest free? and needs to remain that way, unlike Whangārei where it's too late!!!
Mr Peter Doel	LTP21_95	User pays. We need to remember that this council is arrogant, self-serving and deceitful.
Mr Rihari Dargaville Chairman Ngati Manawa Hapū	LTP21_105	Work funded by rates is not a preferred marine option in this case user charges can partly fund marine -based biosecurity
Heather Tomason	LTP21_116	Charge a smaller percentage of new incursions work through an increased levy of \$35 (half of what is proposed via rates) to each mooring, marina berth and ports.
Mr Kevin Jenkins	LTP21_160	Mediterranean fanworm brought in by o/seas boats - to pay more.
Mr Harold Robinson	LTP21_168	We are in favour of other options where mooring owners pay \$70 increase per mooring and rate payers pay \$1-20
Mr Richard Gardner Senior Policy Advisor Federated Farmers of NZ	LTP21_170	The rate increase must be reduced to a manageable level. Applying user charges to beneficiaries of the work is one way of reducing the burden on ratepayers, and thereby reducing the rate increase to a manageable level.
Dr Lily George Policy Analyst Nga Tai Ora	LTP21_172	Submitter makes comment on topics relating to 'biosecurity' and makes the following recommendation relevant to this consultation point: · 'Another option': as a more equitable response we support 'another option "Do this work, partly funded by user charges (boost our marine biosecurity work, but fund new incursion work through an increased charge paid by the owners of moorings, marina berths and ports)". {staff summary; please see original submission}
Nora Shayeb	LTP21_192	The user should pay. {Staff comment: please see full submission for more information}
ANOTHER OPTION (don't do this work)		
Mr Carl Mather	LTP21_27	This idea of marine bio-security is a farce. You don't seem to understand how plant and animal migration works, or even evolution for that matter. Marine lifeforms migrate around the planet, when and where circumstances permit. Ditto for land based lifeforms. There is no reward for killing off marine

		lifeforms other than to increase the amount of toxins in the marine environment and some kind of self-congratulatory pap for efforts that waste tons of our money for no result
Mr Guy Wilson	LTP21_29	<p>I do not support the continued charging of boaties for marine pest inspection monitoring, this activity has no more benefit to a boatie than that received by a member of the general public. The compliance associated with the marine pathways rules already significantly impact on the boat owner.</p> <p>Claiming that the fees to mooring owners is user charges is a false premise, all the public benefit and use the waterways. The recreational boatie had no part in the introduction of marine pests to New Zealand. Putting your nice clean boat into the water and becoming infested due to others failures should not penalise that boatie. All other biosecurity funding is by way of general rate and government funding. Your proposed new charges also recognise it is a general public issue, penalising boaties is unfair in principle, they already face increase costs due to the failures of MPI and Regional Council to manage the waterway.</p> <p>The risk assessment modelling for introduction of marine pests is based on visiting ships being anchored in territorial waters for up to 48hrs, we currently have ships waiting for 2 to 4 weeks in our waters. Why should locals be charged for the likely failure to prevent pest incursions from these activities? You wish to increase funding to eradicate fanworm. The scientific evidence and advice does not support this effort, basically stating that you will not be successful, Cawthron Report No. 2479A, attached below from the NRC website.</p> <p>The observed evidence also does not support this activity. MPI abandoned eradication attempts many years ago based on this advice. If Marsden Cove cannot eradicate the worm, after massive cost and effort, there is little hope for achieving it anywhere else. Marsden cove is a contained body of water with generally good clear visibility, extensive costly efforts were made to remove the worm but failed. Trying to do the same in the murky open waters around Opuia, or anywhere else, is doomed to failure. Do not waste money on this activity, put it to better use elsewhere, follow the scientific expert advice. {Cawthron report attached}</p>
Tom Pasco	LTP21_64	NRC should accept that it is impossible to control incursions existing and new future ones.
Chris Claydon	LTP21_11	Marine pests are brought in Ballast water by big ships. Stop wasting time and money choosing the stable door on pests like fanworm which are already here and widespread. Anything already in NZ cannot be controlled, pest control rules, inspection and enforcement should focus only on large commercial international vessels which carry ballast water.
Hone Popata	LTP21_25	Get marae and hapū to help with monitoring moorings and people with boats (Staff comment: reported "Revitalisation of kaitiakitanga with our waterways within the Awanui River Catchment, Muriwhenua" attached to submission)
NONE OF THE ABOVE		
Klaus Kurz	LTP21_21	Concentrate on border control. Marine pest species which have entered our waters and established themselves like Sabella spallanzanii cannot be eradicated. They have become part of our ecosystems. Don't carry on wasting ratepayers' money and don't employ more staff. We have already enough bureaucracy. So far the years of work on inter-reg. mar pest

		management have proven to be just a waste of rate payers money. You are unable to do what you provided.
Harata Waetford	LTP21_97	Not right to force non-aquatic users to pay. Should be user pays only.
Ms Uwe Schmutzler	LTP21_123	<p>DO NOTHING</p> <p>The current MPMP's inception was on shaky grounds of insufficient due diligence by council staff and councillors, it is ineffective and wasting ratepayers' money. The funding burden is totally unfairly pitched towards mooring/boat owners. Adjacent southern regions' waters are infested with alien species already for as long as a decade and commercial and leisure crafts come into and frequent our waters without any reliable restrictions, monitoring and enforcement.</p> <p>This cannot be changed by the NRC in a lone ranger effort. Unless at least the most northern 4 or 5 regional councils fully commit to tackle the problem with workable very strict co-ordinated policies, administration and adequate funding keeping Northlands waters 'post-free' or at least minimizing infestation to an extent clearly justifying the costs remains an ambitious pipedream. Funding, of course, should have to come mainly from the regions 'exporting' their pests!</p> <p>The issue is really of general national interest and accordingly regional councils should apply determined pressure in Wellington and also turn their attention to exploring all possibilities to extract considerable cost contributions from vectors 'importing' pests to our shores. Unless, and until, such changes do materialize the MPMP should be scrapped without delay.</p>
Mr Neil Doherty	LTP21_85	More dollars I can't afford - bankruptcy by a thousand small cost increases.
Kelly Maxwell	LTP21_120	We wish to comment on Biodiversity & Biosecurity only.
Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	<p>Submitter supports implementation of Te Mana o te Taiao. Notes that a broad range of perspectives and expertise are needed to plan and implement the next steps - iwi, hapū, whanau, central and local government, industry, science, NGOs and communities.</p> <p>Submitter notes that a strategy also needs to set out a pathway for how the goals and objectives can be met and who will be working on them. Discusses implementation plan and reviews of the strategy.</p> <p>Submission includes link to doc website.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
NO OPTION SELECTED		
Ms Sophia Xiao-Colley	LTP21_93	5. Maintaining strong boundaries to protect our native clean environment.
Naomi James, Refining NZ (Mr Riaan Elliot)	LTP21_169	<p>Refining NZ supports inter-regional collaboration on the spread of marine pest but would also support further work on reducing pest populations and eradication where possible of existing or newly introduced marine pests.</p> <p>Refining NZ removes Mediterranean fan worm and other marine pests from its coastal structures each year, but this is of little value unless a coordinated harbour based approach is promoted to deal with targeted marine pests. It is recommended that the proposed target of Surveying at least 2000 vessel hulls for marine pests each year as part of a wider marine biosecurity surveillance programme would be improved by the inclusion of inspection of not only of hulls but structures</p>

		and high-value marine environments. This would provide greater early warning and protection against the introduction of new marine pests or the spread of existing pests. It would also provide the opportunity for eradication when an incursion is detected when it is small or limited in extent.
Mr David Lourie	LTP21_173	I support the extras for biosecurity and marine biosecurity.
Ms Anna Curnow Acting Mayor Kaipara District Council	LTP21_177	Further development of inter-regional partnerships (as part of the Clean Hull Plan) is a positive move along with introducing a marine-vessel database to manage information and assess risk to the marine environment.
Mrs Nan Pullman	LTP21_185	I support the development of inter-regional partnerships such as the Clean Hull Plan and the development of a marine vessel database and the eradication of Mediterranean Fanworm. Yes, I would like to see a boost to marine biosecurity work funded through rates as well as the extra funding proposed for new marine incursions through an increased charge paid by owners of moorings, marina berths and ports.
Mr Jon Muller Secretary GE Free New Zealand	LTP21_191	"In August 2020 the Regional Council Plan - appeal version, placed precautionary and prohibitive rules around the release of genetically modified organisms (GMO) in their coastal marine areas. (C1.9.4) GE Free NZ members fully support the hard fought precautionary and prohibitive provisions on Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO) implemented in the Regional Plan and would like these extended to the Northland Regional Council Long Term Plan 2021- 2031." {staff summary; please see original submission}
MS Nora Shayeb Member Northland Toxin Awareness Group	LTP21_193	Submitter raises concern about the impact of aerial and roadside spraying on health, and requests a moratorium on spraying with toxic chemical pesticides. {Staff summary; please see original submission}
Ms Zelka Grammer Secretary GE Free Tai Tokerau	LTP21_184	Submission states that the plan should focus on strong biosecurity (to prevent or minimise incursions of unwanted new organisms), and humane, ground based feral control. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Mr Michael Wrightson	LTP21_186	Submitter raises concern about the use of revenue collected via a biosecurity charge for marine biosecurity inspections, and states that council is now appropriating surplus to fund the whole of marine biosecurity work. Raises concern about Mediterranean fan worm. {staff summary; please see original submission}

Community resilience

Do you agree with our proposed option to undertake the following flood protection works?

Awanui River flood scheme upgrade

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	52.05%	-	89
Agree	28.65%	55.06%	49
Disagree	6.43%	12.36%	11
Neutral	16.96%	32.58%	29
[No Response]	47.95%	-	82
Total	100.00%	100.00%	171

Eighty-nine of 171 submitters responded to this question, with 49 registering agreement with the proposal, 11 registering disagreement, and 29 being neutral.

Of submitters who agreed, comment was made on the need to protect the community, noting climate change, support for a targeted rate on the area, making the most of central government funding, and the need to consider the lower reaches of the area.

Of submitters who disagreed, concern was raised about building in flood areas, that the eight-year scheme should be sufficient, that the funding model isn't suitable, and that changes need to be made upstream.

Of submitters who were neutral, comments related to managed retreat and that beneficiaries should pay.

Of submitters who didn't choose an option comment was made about considering broader options and developing wetlands.

AWANUI RIVER FLOOD SCHEME (accelerate this project to be completed in three years instead of eight)		
Name / Organisation	Reference	Comment
AGREE		
Mr Stephen Rush Environment Officer Te Runanga o Whangaroa	LTP21_67	Impose a targeted rate for this purpose just like the Whangaroa Flooding targeted rate.
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	While I don't live in the catchment, accelerating this project using the secured central government funding and relieving ratepayers in the catchment is a no-brainer
Ian Reeves	LTP21_20	The community needs protection
Harata Waetford	LTP21_97	Why would you not do it? You have dedicated funding. Is the central government funding from the provincial fund?
Fiona King	LTP21_134	But remember the plan does not include work in the lower reaches that is still required to be done. Pushing water through Kaitia may save the town but dumping onto lower catchments is not right. savings ratepayers interest is good but will the scheme rates be reviewed in 12 years.
Oliver Knox	LTP21_138	Climate change is happening and its effects are accelerating so we support this option.
Mr Kevin King	LTP21_171	Work done so far is great

Codie McIntyre Northland Inc	LTP21_146	<p>We support and agree with the proposals to undertake flood protection works at the identified areas across Northland. Flooding is a regularly occurring natural hazard in Northland due to rainfall and the topography of the region. It adversely affects many of Northland's urban centres and smaller townships and often results in disruption to communications and access and damages property, infrastructure, and productive inputs, e.g., farmland- which has a negative impact on the economic prosperity of the region.</p> <p>This investment supports projects within the Tai Tokerau Northland Economic Action Plan, which focus on flood protection and storm management as a way of improving resilience among logistics and transport infrastructure. It also supports actions/objectives within the Tai Tokerau Northland Destination Management Plan by helping to ensure that communities are better connected by infrastructure and that the routes used by both locals and tourists are safer and more productive.</p>
DISAGREE		
Chris Claydon	LTP21_11	Properties should not be built in flood plains, then flood defences would not be needed. Relocate houses out of the flood plain. Allow the river to flood out as that's the natural way to absorb excess rainfall, don't constrict it with unnatural defences which will create more problems than they solve.
Hone Popata	LTP21_25	Would prefer the 8 years cause of COVID, weather conditions, tired workers, and the environment factors
Mr Carl Mather	LTP21_27	If you are doing work to prevent flooding you have put the cart before the horse, i.e. you are doing it wrong. Go to the source and slow the water down there - intensive tree planting, not construction works downstream.
Mr Peter Doel	LTP21_95	The risk is for 1:100 years. Events finishing in 8 years should be fine.
Mr Neil Doherty	LTP21_85	Dumb idea to build next to a river or on a flood plain - user pays.
Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	I disagree with the proposed option, only because there is no budgeting model that works from the regional council around communities rates of that district. Also three year option is being used due to timeframes of Three Waters Reform programme. Due to rates increase for our small communities?
NEUTRAL		
Laurie Copland	LTP21_28	Flood schemes should only be paid for by those that benefit from them including capital costs. Landowners with flood prone land should be encouraged to shift buildings etc.
Robyn Skerten	LTP21_22	Sorry, I have insufficient knowledge here
Dean Baigent-Mercer	LTP21_145	Awanui is going under with sea level rise. Managed retreat is the best way to deal with upcoming inundation.
NO OPTION SELECTED		
Dr Lily George Policy Analyst Nga Tai Ora	LTP21_172	Submitter makes comment on topics relating to 'flood protection' and makes the following recommendations relevant to this consultation point: · We support all flood mitigation projects as listed but ask NRC to consider broader options · We recommend the NRC re-establish more wetland areas. {staff summary; please see original submission}

Otiria-Moerewa flood mitigation spillway

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	50.88%	-	87
Agree	36.26%	71.26%	62
Disagree	4.09%	8.05%	7
Neutral	10.53%	20.69%	18
[No Response]	49.12%	-	84
Total	100.00%	100.00%	171

Eighty-seven of 171 submitters responded to this question, with 62 registering agreement with the proposal, seven registering disagreement, and 18 being neutral.

Of submitters who agreed, support was noted for both the targeted rate and for the region-wide rate. The importance of protecting the community was noted, particularly in regard to kids getting to school, the economy and connectivity.

Of submitters who disagreed, concern was raised about building on a flood plain, that the funding model isn't suitable, and that changes need to be made upstream.

Of submitters who were neutral, comment was made about managed retreat and that beneficiaries should pay.

Of submitters who didn't chose an option, comment was made about considering broader options and developing wetlands.

OTIRIA-MOEREW A FLOOD MITIGATION SPILLWAY (construct spillway that diverts floodwater away from the town)		
Name / Organisation	Reference	Comment
AGREE		
Mr Stephen Rush Environment Officer Te Runanga o Whangaroa	LTP21_67	Impose a targeted rate for this purpose just like the Whangaroa Flooding targeted rate.
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	I don't live in the catchment, but I'm more than happy to contribute to the region-wide flood infrastructure rate for this project
Ian Reeves	LTP21_20	This community desperately needs assistance controlling floodwaters
Pamela-Anne Ngohe-Simon	LTP21_34	I strongly agree to this option, My partner and I own a home in Otiria and run the Otiria Rugby Club, this building always has water enter it, it is devastating that this matter been dealt with sooner. The investment in our children's education is far less than those not in a flood zone due to the amount of time they remain home because the school bus just can't get to them. We are upstream from Moerewa so this is not rocket science to know that if you stop Otiria from flooding it will stop or severely reduce the flooding to Moerewa. I agree to this option.
Heather Tomason	LTP21_116	This region suffered terribly in the latest flood
Oliver Knox	LTP21_138	Same as above
Harata Waetford	LTP21_97	Same as above
Codie McIntyre Northland Inc	LTP21_146	We support and agree with the proposals to undertake flood protection works at the identified areas across Northland. Flooding is a regularly occurring natural hazard in Northland

		<p>due to rainfall and the topography of the region. It adversely affects many of Northland's urban centres and smaller townships and often results in disruption to communications and access and damages property, infrastructure, and productive inputs, e.g., farmland- which has a negative impact on the economic prosperity of the region.</p> <p>This investment supports projects within the Tai Tokerau Northland Economic Action Plan, which focus on flood protection and storm management as a way of improving resilience among logistics and transport infrastructure. It also supports actions/objectives within the Tai Tokerau Northland Destination Management Plan by helping to ensure that communities are better connected by infrastructure and that the routes used by both locals and tourists are safer and more productive.</p>
DISAGREE		
Chris Claydon	LTP21_11	Properties should not be built in flood plains, then flood defences would not be needed. Relocate houses out of the flood plain. Allow the river to flood out as that's the natural way to absorb excess rainfall, don't constrict it with unnatural defences which will create more problems than they solve.
Mr Carl Mather	LTP21_27	If you are doing work to prevent flooding you have put the cart before the horse, i.e. you are doing it wrong. Go to the source and slow the water down there - intensive tree planting, not construction works downstream.
Mr Neil Doherty	LTP21_85	When was the last time it flooded - it's a flood plain
Michael Paul Bowker	LTP21_118	More work in the catchment is needed, upstream of the communities.
Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	I disagree with the proposed option, only because there is no budgeting model from the regional council around communities rates of that district. Also three year option is being used due to timeframes of Three Waters Reform programme. Due to rates increase for our communities?
NEUTRAL		
Laurie Copland	LTP21_28	Flood schemes should only be paid for by those that benefit from them including capital costs. Landowners with flood prone land should be encouraged to shift buildings etc.
Robyn Skerten	LTP21_22	Sorry I have insufficient knowledge here but trust NRC recommendations.
NO OPTION SELECTED		
Dr Lily George Policy Analyst Nga Tai Ora	LTP21_172	Submitter makes comment on topics relating to 'flood protection' and makes the following recommendations relevant to this consultation point: · We support all flood mitigation projects as listed but ask NRC to consider broader options · We recommend the NRC re-establish more wetland areas. {staff summary; please see original submission}

Kawakawa flood mitigation stopbank

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	50.29%	-	86
Agree	35.67%	70.93%	61
Disagree	4.09%	8.14%	7
Neutral	10.53%	20.93%	18
[No Response]	49.71%	-	85
Total	100.00%	100.00%	171

Eighty-six of 171 submitters responded to this question, with 61 registering agreement with the proposal, seven registering disagreement, and 18 being neutral.

Of submitters who agreed, support was noted for the targeted rate and for the region-wide rate. The importance of protecting the community was noted, particularly in regard to keeping state highways open, the cost to the local economy and tourism, and that the stormwater pump is not necessary. A comment was also made that the Kawakawa project should happen at the same time as the Otiria-Moerewa flood works.

Of submitters who disagreed, concern was raised about building on a flood plain, that the funding model isn't suitable, that changes need to be made upstream, and that the beneficiaries/businesses should pay.

Of submitters who were neutral, comment was made about managed retreat and that beneficiaries should pay.

Of submitters who didn't chose an option, comment was made about considering broader options and developing wetlands.

KAWAKAWA FLOOD MITIGATION STOPBANK (build a stopbank to deflect floodwater from shops)		
Name / Organisation	Reference	Comment
AGREE		
Mr Stephen Rush Environment Officer Te Runanga o Whangaroa	LTP21_67	Impose a targeted rate for this purpose just like the Whangaroa Flooding targeted rate.
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	I don't live in the catchment, but I'm more than happy to contribute to the region-wide flood infrastructure rate for this project
Ian Reeves	LTP21_20	Essential. Failure to provide assistance invites great cost to the community from future flooding
Fiona King	LTP21_134	keep State highways open at all times if possible
Oliver Knox	LTP21_138	Communities and economy needs to be resilient and able to cope in flood events. The cost of shop closures and remedial work is expensive and impacts the local economy.
Anahita Djamali	LTP21_125	Do not support the need to install a stormwater pump for these works to be effective
Quinn Miller	LTP21_130	The Kawakawa flood mitigation stopbank project should commence at the same time as the Otiria-Moerewa flood mitigation spillway project (2021), rather than in 2024. The Otiria-Moerewa flood mitigation spillway project will result in larger inflows of flood water reaching the Kawakawa area. While the floodplains in the Kawakawa area are bigger than those in Moerewa it will not take much of a rise in flood water levels in Kawakawa for significant flooding to occur.

		<p>In the July 2020 floods the water was over the footings of the commercial buildings on the northern side of SH1.</p> <p>A major stormwater drain also flows into that area and the stormwater outlet into that area is below the level reached in the July 2020 floods.</p> <p>Consequently it would be very easy for the stormwater drain to become back-filled and so be unable to adequately remove water from areas further up the stormwater drain resulting in flooding well beyond the current area behind the commercial buildings on the northern side of SH1.</p> <p>Such flooding would be even more likely if the Kawakawa flood mitigation stopbank project is not worked on concurrently with the Otiria-Moerewa flood mitigation spillway project.</p>
Codie McIntyre Northland Inc	LTP21_146	<p>We support and agree with the proposals to undertake flood protection works at the identified areas across Northland. Flooding is a regularly occurring natural hazard in Northland due to rainfall and the topography of the region. It adversely affects many of Northland's urban centres and smaller townships and often results in disruption to communications and access and damages property, infrastructure, and productive inputs, e.g., farmland- which has a negative impact on the economic prosperity of the region.</p> <p>This investment supports projects within the Tai Tokerau Northland Economic Action Plan, which focus on flood protection and storm management as a way of improving resilience among logistics and transport infrastructure.</p> <p>It also supports actions/objectives within the Tai Tokerau Northland Destination Management Plan by helping to ensure that communities are better connected by infrastructure and that the routes used by both locals and tourists are safer and more productive.</p>
DISAGREE		
Chris Claydon	LTP21_11	<p>Properties should not be built in flood plains, then flood defences would not be needed. Relocate shops out of the flood plain.</p> <p>Allow the river to flood out as that's the natural way to absorb excess rainfall, don't constrict it with unnatural defences which will create more problems than they solve.</p>
Mr Carl Mather	LTP21_27	<p>If you are doing work to prevent flooding you have put the cart before the horse, i.e. you are doing it wrong. Go to the source and slow the water down there - intensive tree planting, not construction works downstream.</p>
Mr Neil Doherty	LTP21_85	User pays
Michael Paul Bowker	LTP21_118	More work is needed in the upper headwaters as well.
Geoff Sharples	LTP21_73	<p>The businesses should be responsible for managing the costs. There are folks paying rates who can't afford the rate increase who will be bailing out a business that was potentially aware of the issue when they started it. They can always sell the business.</p>
Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	<p>I disagree with the proposed option only because there is no budgeting model from the regional council around communities rates of that district.</p> <p>Also three year option is being used due to timeframes of Three Waters Reform programme. Due to rates increase for our small communities?</p>

NEUTRAL		
Laurie Copland	LTP21_28	Flood schemes should only be paid for by those that benefit from them including capital costs. Landowners with flood prone land should be encouraged tho shift buildings etc.
Robyn Skerten	LTP21_22	Sorry I have insufficient knowledge here but trust NRC recommendations.
NO OPTION SELECTED		
Dr Lily George Policy Analyst Nga Tai Ora	LTP21_172	<p>Submitter makes comment on topics relating to 'flood protection' and makes the following recommendations relevant to this consultation point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · We support all flood mitigation projects as listed but ask NRC to consider broader options · We recommend the NRC re-establish more wetland areas. <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>

Whangārei flood mitigation project

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	48.54%	-	83
Agree	29.82%	61.45%	51
Disagree	7.60%	15.66%	13
Neutral	11.11%	22.89%	19
[No Response]	51.46%	-	88
Total	100.00%	100.00%	171

Eighty-three of 171 submitters responded to this question, with 51 registering agreement with the proposal, 13 registering disagreement, and 19 being neutral.

Of submitters who agreed, general support for protecting the area was noted. Support was noted for the targeted rate, and the impacts of flooding on the economy and infrastructure was noted. Concern was noted that the next lowest point be identified and landowners notified.

Of submitters who disagreed, concern was raised about building in flood zones, that town will need to retreat at some point, that the funding model isn't suitable, that changes need to be made upstream, and that users should pay.

Of submitters who were neutral, comment was made about managed retreat and that beneficiaries should pay.

Of submitters who didn't chose an option, comment was made about considering broader options and developing wetlands.

WHANGĀREI FLOOD MITIGATION PROJECT (build a flood wall and earth bund along Tarewa Road)		
Name / Organisation	Reference	Comment
AGREE		
Mr Stephen Rush Environment Officer Te Runanga o Whangaroa	LTP21_67	Impose a targeted rate for this purpose just like the Whangaroa Flooding targeted rate.
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	Since there is no additional funding required, there is really no reason to not do this work. We have all seen the benefit of effective flood mitigation in the 1-in-500-years rainfall event in July 2020.
Ian Reeves	LTP21_20	The city need protection
C Cotton	LTP21_81	As long as the next lowest point is identified and affected landowners are notified
Oliver Knox	LTP21_138	Communities and economy needs to be resilient and able to cope in flood events. The cost of shop closures and remedial work is expensive and impacts the local economy.
Codie McIntyre Northland Inc	LTP21_146	<p>We support and agree with the proposals to undertake flood protection works at the identified areas across Northland. Flooding is a regularly occurring natural hazard in Northland due to rainfall and the topography of the region. It adversely affects many of Northland's urban centres and smaller townships and often results in disruption to communications and access and damages property, infrastructure, and productive inputs, e.g., farmland- which has a negative impact on the economic prosperity of the region.</p> <p>This investment supports projects within the Tai Tokerau Northland Economic Action Plan, which focus on flood</p>

		protection and storm management as a way of improving resilience among logistics and transport infrastructure. It also supports actions/objectives within the Tai Tokerau Northland Destination Management Plan by helping to ensure that communities are better connected by infrastructure and that the routes used by both locals and tourists are safer and more productive.
DISAGREE		
Chris Claydon	LTP21_11	Properties should not be built in flood plains, then flood defences would not be needed. Relocate properties out of the flood plain. Allow the river to flood out as that's the natural way to absorb excess rainfall, don't constrict it with unnatural defences which will create more problems than they solve.
Mr Carl Mather	LTP21_27	If you are doing work to prevent flooding you have put the cart before the horse, i.e. you are doing it wrong. Go to the source and slow the water down there - intensive tree planting, not construction works downstream.
Mr Neil Doherty	LTP21_85	User pays
Geoff Sharples	LTP21_73	At some point, the town will need to retreat from rising sea - level and increased flooding. By shoring up flood walls we are just incentivizing folks to make bad decisions.
Mr Peter Doel	LTP21_95	User pays
Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	I disagree with the proposed option, only because there is no budgeting model from the regional council around communities rates of that district. Also three year option is being used due to timeframes of Three Waters Reform programme. Due to rates increase for our small communities?
NEUTRAL		
Laurie Copland	LTP21_28	Flood schemes should only be paid for by those that benefit from them including capital costs. Landowners with flood prone land should be encouraged tho shift buildings etc.
Robyn Skerten	LTP21_22	Sorry I have insufficient knowledge here but trust NRC recommendations.
NO OPTION SELECTED		
Dr Lily George Policy Analyst Nga Tai Ora	LTP21_172	Submitter makes comment on topics relating to 'flood protection' and makes the following recommendations relevant to this consultation point: · We support all flood mitigation projects as listed but ask NRC to consider broader options · We recommend the NRC re-establish more wetland areas. {staff summary; please see original submission}

What is your preferred option for upgrading our tsunami warning system?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	50.88%	-	87
Our proposed option	30.41%	59.77%	52
Another option	14.04%	27.59%	24
None of the above	6.43%	12.64%	11
[No Response]	49.12%	-	84
Total	100.00%	100.00%	171

Eighty-seven of 171 submitters responded to this question, with 52 choosing our proposed option, 24 choosing another option, 11 choosing none of the above and six not selecting an option.

Of submitters who chose our proposed option, support was noted for replacing outdated equipment, having a verbal communication included, differentiating sirens from other sirens and for generally learning from the recent tsunami event and updating plans. Specific comments were made about targeted instructions relating to areas and adding flashing alerts to cater to those who are hard of hearing. Concern was raised about those who live close to the sirens, that a plan needs to be in place for after everyone has evacuated, and that development in tsunami zones is limited.

Of submitters who chose another option – don't upgrade the system – comments noted that mobile phones and other methods of communications should suffice, that the current system works fine, that NZ is at low risk of tsunami, and that there are no sirens in Kerikeri inlet.

Of submitters who chose none of the above, comments noted that mobile phones and other technology is sufficient, that the current system works fine, that users should pay, that NZ is at low risk of tsunami, and lack of sirens at Kerikeri inlet.

Of submitters who didn't chose an option, some general agreement with the proposal was noted, and general emergency preparedness discussed. Kaipara District Council noted that they would like to contribute by purchasing and installing replacement sirens in the Mangawhai community.

WHAT IS YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR UPGRADING OUR TSUNAMI WARNING SYSTEM?		
Name / Organisation	Reference	Comment
OUR PROPOSEED OPTION (do this work)		
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	We should all learn from the tsunami evacuation on 5-Mar this year. If sirens had already been able to communicate verbally, targeted evacuation instructions (for example orange zone only, ETA of wave etc.) could have been provided to affected residents and reduced the overall congestion and confusion. I'm really looking forward to this upgrade, which will also eliminate the risk of confusing tsunami alerts with similar-sounding fire alarms.
Ian Reeves	LTP21_20	If it is out of date and needs replacement, then it should be replaced
Mrs Jan Pirihi	LTP21_24	Appointment of local emergency officers to ensure safety of all. Establish plans for provision of water and toilets in popular evacuation areas
Geoff Sharples	LTP21_73	Knowing how long you have is useful for decision making in a Tsunami event. The real issue on the Tsunami preparedness is that if a Tsunami were to come through all the survivors would be stuck on hill tops without a plan for food, water, power, shelter or rescue. Resilience zones should be established and these should be mapped. Also, at present, most of the local rescue or medical capacity is in the Tsunami zone which does

		approximately zero good in a Tsunami. Great that people can run up the hill. Then what?
Kim Robinson	LTP21_7	Add flashing alerts to the sirens for Deaf/hard of hearing people to know that the sirens are going.
Ian Heape	LTP21_17	Having experienced the latest alert this seems the logical choice
Laurie Copland	LTP21_28	Rates those landowners in coastal areas
Graham Gallagher	LTP21_61	Need verbal communication like in Japan. Having a siren blaring for an hour is useless.
Mr Stephen Rush Environment Officer Te Runanga o Whangaroa	LTP21_67	But keep the sirens as well and make provisions of generators for all marae designated as Civil Defence sites.
Ms Jan Boyes Whangārei Heads Citizens Association	LTP21_117	Please appreciate the difficulties people living close to a siren who did not have to evacuate. 1m on 30mins off would be acceptable after the first 15mins. (or maybe that would wake babies too, a low rumble while alert is active....)
Heather Tomason	LTP21_116	If they're not working well they need to be replaced
Mr Harold Robinson	LTP21_168	We agree with the proposed option.
Dr Lily George Policy Analyst Nga Tai Ora	LTP21_172	Submitter makes comment on topics relating to 'Tsunami warning system' and makes the following recommendations relevant to this consultation point: · We support the proposed option above. · That NRC strengthens its emergency response plan to enable the safe and quick evacuation of those at risk to places of safety. · That NRC considers limiting construction in at risk areas in future. {staff summary; please see original submission}
ANOTHER OPTION (don't upgrade the sirens)		
D Mcnamara	LTP21_13	Technology is such now that regional council shouldn't need to play a role in terms of the tsunami warning system. Mobile phones sirens and messaging is working. Living on the coast there needs to be some responsibility placed on folk to ensure they have the means to receive warnings... e.g. owning a mobile phone. We need to reduce doubling up on other agency/organisation work, and this is a space NRC can step back from and let other agencies take lead.
C Cotton	LTP21_81	Most people (and if they live in flood or tsunami zone they should) have access to TV, cellphone or radio for further information. As technology advances phone warnings will hopefully be more detailed.
Mike Burch	LTP21_83	Kerikeri Inlet has a high number of at-risk properties. There are currently NO sirens at all in Kerikeri Inlet.
Richard Morris	LTP21_142	Not necessary Items further down the list could either be deferred, scaled back or ceased. The recent tsunami warning showed a reasonable level of preparedness and the alarms generally worked well. The proposed new emergency response centre and tsunami alarm upgrade could be deferred.
Nora Shayeb	LTP21_192	I believe the risk of NZ being affected by severe tsunamis is minimal. {Staff comment: please see full submission for more information}
NONE OF THE ABOVE		
Chris Claydon	LTP21_11	Current system is inaudible at its location on Kerikeri river. Voice based warning will be harder to hear. Louder sirens are

		needed. The Kerikeri fire station siren is very effective, tsunami sirens should be like that. Simple, cheap, low tech but very loud sirens are the solution.
Klaus Kurz	LTP21_21	what we have is good enough Learn more about tsunami risks before you waste more rate payers money
Kim Robinson	LTP21_30	Use mobile phone networks instead of sirens
Annette Vernon	LTP21_37	Keep the sirens AND improve on the electronic communications as technology advances.
Mr Peter Doel	LTP21_95	User pays
Harata Waetford	LTP21_97	The existing alert is sufficient. Once alert went off then the text and radio advised the necessary action.
Mr Neil Doherty	LTP21_85	The risk of a tsunami is so small. Don't build on coast, on cliffs or by rivers - I didn't. Civil Defence are a bunch of f*kwits, they wait and hope for something to happen and it doesn't.
Kelly Maxwell	LTP21_120	We wish to comment on Biodiversity & Biosecurity only.
Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	Everything is fine at the moment...
NO OPTION SELECTED		
Melanie Gatfield	LTP21_70	At 656 Cove road we can't hear the sirens
Dr Mere Kepa	LTP21_48	<p>The Parawhenua (tidal wave) alert, in March, has raised concerns, in low lying places around Whangārei Te Rerenga Paraoa harbour, about the inadequate Civil Defence operation during the Natural disaster. The concerns include lack or even the absence of discussions between Tangata Whenua landowners and Civil Defence in rural areas, residents' and citizens' inadequate preparation for an emergency, insufficient parking, food, water and sanitation at a safe spot, the low lying position of the local marae and cemetery. Also, knowing who qualifies for financial assistance, post-disaster, is unclear.</p> <p>Climate change endangers the habitability and, in the longer term, the territorial existence of a number of low-lying Kainga [ancestral village]. Climate change, too, threatens to deprive Indigenous Maori Peoples of their traditional territories and sources of livelihood.</p> <p>These impacts have implications for the right to self-determination. Therefore, communication via Civil Defence, folk out and about, addressing the Kainga would seem a more efficient response than another building that will be at risk of destruction during a tidal wave, flooding, drought, fire, among other disasters, and which Kainga are unlikely to visit.</p>
Fiona King	LTP21_134	Ensure that you have backup power supplies for rural areas, communities and cell sites for the systems to work.
Ms Anna Curnow Acting Mayor Kaipara District Council	LTP21_177	KDC recognises the importance of maintaining the Northland tsunami siren network which is reaching the end of its lifespan and would like to contribute to this work by purchasing and installing replacement sirens in the Mangawhai community.
Ms Rebecca Williams Secretary Tutukaka Coast Ratepayers and Residents Assoc	LTP21_179	<p>Submitter raises questions about the state of the current tsunami sirens, effectiveness if no funding is allocated, and maintenance needs. Submitter recommends it be made clear what it intends to do if the proposed tsunami siren upgrade is not supported, and what the Tutukaka Coast can expect with regard to its current tsunami warning system.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>

Mrs Nan Pullman	LTP21_185	I also agree with the updating of the tsunami warning system and the building of a multi-agency emergency co-ordination centre.
-----------------	-----------	---

What is your preferred option for building a new emergency coordination centre?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	52.63%	-	90
Our proposed option	28.07%	53.33%	48
Another option	16.96%	32.22%	29
None of the above	7.60%	14.44%	13
[No Response]	47.37%	-	81
Total	100.00%	100.00%	171

Ninety of 171 submitters responded to this question, with 48 choosing our proposed option, 29 choosing another option, 13 choosing none of the above and eight not selecting an option.

Of submitters who chose our proposed option, general support was noted for the proposal and emergency preparedness. Specific comments included recommending that space be incorporated for hospital emergency response staff, funding marae to be able to respond, and specific comments from Fire and Emergency NZ who are involved in the scoping of the site.

Of submitters who chose another option, comments were made that existing buildings should be used for the centre, that technology should be used to connect, and that there should be local centres rather than a central response centre.

Of submitters who chose none of the above, comments were made that existing buildings should be used for the centre, the current setup is sufficient, that technology should be used to connect, that there should be local centres rather than a central response centre, and that the site identified for the building should be used for high-density housing.

Of submitters who didn't choose an option, most comments were made in support of the proposal, with some discussing suitability of site. General comments on emergency preparedness and the recent tsunami response were also made.

WHAT IS YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR BUILDING A NEW EMERGENCY COORDINATION CENTRE?		
Name / Organisation	Reference	Comment
OUR PROPOSED OPTION (do this work)		
Jeroen Jongejans	LTP21_4	Yes, good to have all info and communication centralized
Ian Heape	LTP21_17	having experienced the latest alert this seems the logical choice
Hone Popata	LTP21_25	Just pour funding into marae because we can help with huge numbers of people Need a centre in Kaitia as well
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	Northland received a quite a bit of bad press for the lack of coordination during the recent tsunami evacuation. Given the fact that Northland doesn't have such a centre yet, but an ideal site is available, now is the time to build one, so we're better prepared and equipped next time.
Ian Reeves	LTP21_20	Natural emergencies are likely to increase. A proper structure to relate to the public and coordinate emergency services seems a no-brainer
Kelly Murphy	LTP21_106	Support the establishment or upgrade of community centres which double as evacuation points with toilets and water.
Heather Tomason	LTP21_116	We need to have an emergency centre above the flood zone in the city centre

Oliver Knox	LTP21_138	We support this option as we know from events like recent earthquakes that the impact from natural disasters is massive and requires resources that can cope with the pressure.
Ben Tomason	LTP21_78	No brainer for a mature city
Mr Harold Robinson	LTP21_168	We agree with the proposed option - we need to plan for the future and think ahead.
Dr Lily George Policy Analyst Nga Tai Ora	LTP21_172	Submitter makes the following recommendations relevant to this consultation point: 'Proposed option': we support the proposed option re the development of a new emergency coordination centre, and also recommend including office space for Hospital Emergency Response Staff in the new centre. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Mr Brad Mosby Area Commander Fire and Emergency NZ	LTP21_176	Fire and Emergency NZ supports this proposal in principle. We agree that a multi-agency coordination facility for Northland would be a significant step forward in bringing the numerous agencies together to plan and prepare for emergencies that impact on our Northland communities. A new facility will ensure our partner agencies operate in a coordinated manner in a purpose built Emergency Operations Centre, built to specifications to withstand a significant earthquake and in a location away from flooding/inundation zones within Whangārei. Further scoping of the feasibility to locate the facility at 12 Mansfield Terrace which is owned by FENZ is ongoing and further consultation with our partner agencies is required on this proposal.
ANOTHER OPTION (don't build the centre)		
Chris Claydon	LTP21_11	Local centres are better able to provide local response than a centralised office with no local knowledge. Instead of centralising, improve communication between local centres.
D Mcnamara	LTP21_13	You don't need a dedicated emergency centre just for emergencies in this day in age... surely there are alternative spaces and plans that can be developed for appropriate folk to take over spaces in The Orchard, the Police Station, Fire Station, wherever. \$5.68m is unthinkable when technology allows us to work from anywhere now... there is surely more cost efficient alternatives than this option. I'd prefer to see the money utilised on technology platforms to support.
Bruce Mauchline	LTP21_35	Use existing infrastructure. Soon Forum North will have oodles of space that could be utilised for this purpose.
Mrs Jan Pirihi	LTP21_24	Why do we need to build a new centre? There are enough empty places in Whangārei now. Certainly have a multi-agency coordination centre but it doesn't need a new building.
C Cotton	LTP21_81	Have a multi-agency emergency centre but surely there's an existing building that can be utilised especially with the future moving toward technology.
Mr Neil Doherty	LTP21_85	Waste of money.
Martin Gvardijancic	LTP21_101	northland is very big, surely a central centre say in Whangārei would struggle to help a response north of kaitiaia, regional local centres would be better
Nithin Joseph	LTP21_108	Broaden capability with existing resources
Richard Morris	LTP21_142	Items further down the list could either be deferred, scaled back or ceased. We do not support the proposed convention

		centre. The proposed new emergency response centre and tsunami alarm upgrade could be deferred.
Geoff Sharples	LTP21_73	The instinct often seems to be that we need to build stuff. Per the question above, often it gets built in the wrong place or is not adequate for purpose. Explore other options rather than build a centre. such as establish local resiliency zones or 3X redundant comms systems. Figure out a procedure to connect virtually - radio, sat phones, sat internet etc., So often in an emergency, the personnel can't actually get to the centre and it is useless. Think small, distributed and nimble rather than centralized.
E Metz	LTP21_100	Don't waste more money on new council buildings. There are plenty of buildings NRC can buy instead. Use modern technology to coordinate during emergency responses 'live' with other multi-agencies.
Nora Shayeb	LTP21_192	I see no urgent need for this. {Staff comment: please see full submission for more information}
NONE OF THE ABOVE		
Klaus Kurz	LTP21_21	what we have is good enough
Annette Vernon	LTP21_37	Utilize the WDC office at the new Council building currently under construction. Why build new premises??
Mr Stephen Rush Environment Officer Te Runanga o Whangaroa	LTP21_67	Utilize current facilities as an emergency coordination centre - don't spend money on a new building!!!
Tom Pasco	LTP21_64	Contact between multi-agencies does not need to be in same building. These can be by Zoom or similar
Gemma Parkin	LTP21_77	Look beyond a co-ordination centre. Where are Northlands Emergency Services teams based? where do they train, store equipment, meet, and deploy from. Are these aspects of their emergency service operation occurring effectively to provide a professional service to the community. If council is going to invest in a new facility lets do this right the first time and scope the need further. Northland Search and Rescue would like to be included in this conversation.
Kelly Maxwell	LTP21_120	We wish to comment on Biodiversity & Biosecurity only.
Harata Waetford	LTP21_97	Use the FENZ land for high density housing. Use marae and community centres as gathering places. People will find their way without government interference.
Louise Mischewski	LTP21_121	Our local government agencies own capital assets. Surely they can use an already resourced building without adding further additional costs to the ratepayer.
Dallas King	LTP21_148	Consider other options that improves the capacity for localised responsiveness in an emergency.
Mr Richard Gardner Senior Policy Advisor Federated Farmers of NZ	LTP21_170	The rate increase must be reduced to a manageable level. Deferring this work may be one way of achieving this.
Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	Everything is fine at the moment...
NO OPTION SELECTED		
Dr Mere Kepa	LTP21_48	The Parawhenua (tidal wave) alert, in March, has raised concerns, in low lying places around Whangārei Te Rerenga Paraoa harbour, about the inadequate Civil Defence operation during the Natural disaster.

		<p>The concerns include lack or even the absence of discussions between Tangata Whenua landowners and Civil Defence in rural areas, residents' and citizens' inadequate preparation for an emergency, insufficient parking, food, water and sanitation at a safe spot, the low lying position of the local marae and cemetery. Also, knowing who qualifies for financial assistance, post-disaster, is unclear. Climate change endangers the habitability and, in the longer term, the territorial existence of a number of low-lying Kainga [ancestral village].</p> <p>Climate change, too, threatens to deprive Indigenous Maori Peoples of their traditional territories and sources of livelihood. These impacts have implications for the right to self-determination. Therefore, communication via Civil Defence, folk out and about, addressing the Kainga would seem a more efficient response than another building that will be at risk of destruction during a tidal wave, flooding, drought, fire, among other disasters, and which Kainga are unlikely to visit.</p>
Tony Hill	LTP21_65	<p>There is a need to fund the build of a Multi-Agency Coordination Centre in Whangārei. Recent events have demonstrated that the most likely emergency risk to Northland is floods or tsunamis. The current location for CDEM at the NRC is not suitable for managing these as it is in the flood zone.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to build a purpose built centre near FENZ base in Whangārei which would ensure that emergency management could continue regardless of the event. The recent tsunami event showed that the current location is not fit for purpose.</p> <p>The wellbeing of the residents and visitors of Northland relies on the effective management of emergency events. For that to occur there needs to be an environment where the management would not be disrupted or impeded. Serious consideration should be given to making this a priority.</p> <p>Superintendent Tony Hill District Commander Northland Police.</p>
Robyn Skerten	LTP21_22	Unsure, insufficient knowledge
Mr David Lourie	LTP21_173	I support the emergency coordination centre with some reservations. It would need to be located outside of any natural hazard area. That cancels out the CBD. Maybe somewhere near the fire station or Kensington Park.
Ms Anna Curnow Acting Mayor Kaipara District Council	LTP21_177	KDC recognises the need for improved emergency response facilities and is supportive of NRC building a multi-agency emergency coordination centre for the region in 2022 so that civil defence emergency management staff, Fire and Emergency New Zealand and NZ Police staff can effectively coordinate their emergency response. KDC will reflect this commitment in its Long Term Plan and appropriate supporting source documents.
Ms Rebecca Williams Secretary Tutukaka Coast Ratepayers and Residents Assoc	LTP21_179	Submitter raises concern around confusion and uncertainty during emergencies. Submitter recommends that council lead or support another agency towards improving co-ordination of Civil Defence and Emergency Planning in the region. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Mrs Nan Pullman	LTP21_185	I also agree with the updating of the tsunami warning system and the building of a multi-agency emergency co-ordination centre.
Ms Annette Hall President Far North Radio and Sea Rescue	LTP21_189	Recent emergency events in New Zealand have highlighted the need for purpose-built, multi-agency coordination centres that are set up with technology and software to enable quicker responses to support affected communities. This would be the

		<p>central point for emergency responses and would also provide office space for the daily operations of our civil defence emergency management staff, as well as some Fire and Emergency New Zealand and NZ Police staff Although this proposal has overall merit; there is no mention of a provision for a maritime service.</p> <p>Far North Radio and Sea Rescue Inc. based in Doubtless Bay in the Far North of New Zealand is a private, volunteer run, community coast watch station that has been providing a vital VHF and SSB marine radio service since 1947 without any direct government funding. VHF coverage is from the Cavalli Islands on the East Coast and from Whangapae north on the West Coast, including the Three Kings Islands.</p> <p>There is no other volunteer organisation providing a VHF Radio service that covers these areas. FNRSR Inc. WANTS SOME SERIOUS MONEY FROM THE EMERGENCY SERVICES FUND TO KEEP THE VITAL VHF RADIO SERVICE OPERATIONAL IN THE FAR NORTH</p>
--	--	---

What is your preferred option for climate change resilience?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	53.80%	-	92
Our proposed option	33.92%	63.04%	58
Another option	12.28%	22.83%	21
None of the above	7.60%	14.13%	13
[No Response]	46.20%	-	79
Total	100.00%	100.00%	171

Ninety-two of 171 submitters responded to this question, with 58 choosing our proposed option, 21 choosing another option, 13 choosing none of the above and 14 not selecting an option but still making comment (please see note in Introduction).

Of submitters who chose our proposed option, support was noted for prioritising the issue and council playing their part, electric vehicles and infrastructure, electric marine transport and infrastructure, bans on internal combustion engines, planting, re-instating wetlands, offsetting greenhouse gas emissions, and transitioning to zero-carbon. Concern was noted regarding wastewater systems, roading and other infrastructure being affected by sea level rise, and the impact of climate change on economic stability.

Of submitters who chose another option (don't do this work), comments noted that climate change is natural, that it's covered by central government, and that electric buses are not a good option.

Of submitters who chose none of the above, concern was noted about needing to understand climate change, that it is too late, that we are on track without extra spend, that climate change is overstated, that central government should fund and that the primary production sector should be taken in to consideration.

Of submitters who didn't chose an option but still provided comment, support was noted for the proposals, the need to collaborate and coordinate, and the need to lower carbon footprints. Concern was raised about the impact of climate change on water availability and water safety, algal blooms, that waste minimisation is more important than reducing carbon, that a collaborative working group be formed to advise on zero-carbon transition, that land use be considered, and the link with GMOs.

WHAT IS YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR CLIMATE CHANGE RESILIENCE?		
Name	Reference	Comment
OUR PROPOSED OPTION (do this work)		
Jeroen Jongejans	LTP21_4	Well done, this will need a lot of action and funding in the next few years- suggestion to double each year the charging points around Northland to facilitate a fast uptake of electric cars- yes- I know we are doing ok, but we will need a great focus on this- so- annual doubling of charge points should see us in 3 years with adequate facilities.
Chris Claydon	LTP21_11	Marine transport is being ignored in the plan. The plan needs to ensure all boats are electrified by 2030. Start by banning internal combustion engines on lakes, rivers and enclosed waters. Subsidise installation of free electric boat charging points on all jetties, fuel docks, marinas, etc and pay for this by taxing marine fuel docks. Ban all two stroke outboards immediately (the rest of the developed world banned them 20 years ago!)
Pamela Stevens	LTP21_23	Climate change is a reality and any planning to mitigate the affects is to be support as long as it does not have negative environmental effects.

Laurie Copland	LTP21_28	This is another want to do rather than need to do. Some of proposed plan is acceptable but not all because of impact on rates
Kim Robinson	LTP21_30	Definitely need to play your part in this
Mr Stephen Rush Environment Officer Te Runanga o Whangaroa	LTP21_67	And plant more native trees as a step towards reducing our carbon footprint and offsetting greenhouse gas emissions. Stop siltation and other solids entering the ocean. (the displacement of water is adding to the rising sea levels).
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	Given everything we know, and the advice provided by the Climate Change Commission, how can we not do this? NRC have to provide a good example, or we will never get buy-in from the community and landowners.
Ian Reeves	LTP21_20	Climate change has been identified for 30 years or so. All we can do now to improve our dealing with the outcome should be done
Robyn Skerten	LTP21_22	NRC must be paramount in addressing Climate Change, this is a huge urgent issue
Renee Dumas	LTP21_32	Transition to zero-carbon is urgently needed and this means the councils have to work collaboratively when granting consents to ensure each and every consent is given will reduce carbon. If an industry seeking consent does not lower the overall emission, consent should not be granted. Climate change is here and we need to work together to reduce its impacts. This means not giving consent to industries that will increase carbon emissions, uses too much water, and/or uses too much land to grow produces even though many promise jobs. We do not need to feed the world, only our country. A mindset change is needed at council levels to understand our environment is more essential than jobs.
Tania Aslund	LTP21_39	Important to incorporate a zero-carbon transition in all decision-making, particularly residential and industrial development. Look for links between programs such as waterway and catchment rehabilitation, greenbelts in new developments, research and education facilities, walkways/cycleways etc.
Val Scott	LTP21_58	I think net zero carbon emissions target is too late - target needs to be achieved by 2030 at least.
Geoff Sharples	LTP21_73	Significant work needs to be done on climate change adaption. The districts cannot be expected to have the skills or funding to do this on their own. Advocate for a national plan on this to further leverage funds. However, NRC spending money on decarbonizing would be a drop in the ocean compared to the real issue. Money should not be spent on non-economic trophy projects like overpriced electric cars and charging stations that make a good photo op. Really spend the money on figuring out the plan and communicating to the public.
Oliver Knox	LTP21_138	We need to adapt and find ways forward into the future
Ms Janine McVeagh	LTP21_140	Wastewater systems will be affected by sea level rise, so need to be replaced by land-based systems.
Ms Sarah Cameron Senior Policy Analyst NZ Kiwifruit Growers Inc	LTP21_84	<p>Submitter references a report by local government "Vulnerable: The quantum of local government infrastructure exposed to sea level rise" and cites data from the report. Submitter supports the recommendations in the report and requests that council prioritises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlight exposed infrastructure for council members and public consideration

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve coordination with stakeholders to prioritise “lifeline” roads and associated infrastructure • Perform research and analysis to determine options for priority roads • Engage with both central government and private businesses to address alternatives and costs; and • Ensure planned levels of service and suitability of location are included in long-term planning. <p>Submitter references report by MfE "Preparing for Coastal Change - A Summary of Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance for Local Government". Submitter requests "an aggressive and coordinated approach to address the recommendations to ensure the ongoing connectivity of the roading and infrastructure network and would therefore like to see council be more aggressive in their approach. "Submitter supports proposed spend on climate change. {staff summary; please see original submission}"</p>
Mr Rihari Dargaville Chairman Ngati Manawa Hapū	LTP21_105	Ensure a zero based carbon plan can be enforced where there is nil compliance to the plan
Anahita Djamali	LTP21_125	<p>I support this increase as the best option given but do not believe that this level of spending will be sufficient to reach our vision of a zero carbon economy. There needs to be more of an emphasis on realigning the existing budget to shift spending towards climate action and away from carbon emissions. NRC need to examine the spending they have locked in for the future and analyse the effects these have on climate change emissions. Building more carbon intensive infrastructure, will lead to an increase in car dependency.</p> <p>NRC need change to a zero emissions bus fleet, dramatically accelerate the development and promotion of walking and cycling. Including cycling infrastructure, protected cycle lanes. Need to diverting more waste from landfill. Reinstate more wetlands as carbon sinks including the Hikurangi Repo.</p>
Jessie McVeagh	LTP21_137	<p>Climate Change is the biggest risk of our time. All possible efforts need to be done to transition to zero-carbon, and all NRC decisions need to be made under a 'climate lens'.</p> <p>Dedicated support for farming to transition to regenerative practices, reforestation, forest protection, riparian restoration, coastal restoration and protection of the health of the ocean are necessary. Education and support for our communities and people to reduce our carbon footprint, as well as strategies for resiliency are required.</p>
Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	Agree
Dean Baigent-Mercer	LTP21_145	Managed retreat for humans and nature must be at the heart of this. Far North Holdings don't seem to factor in any climate impacts into their proposals.
Codie McIntyre Northland Inc	LTP21_146	We are in support of Council's proposed option. We are in support of this, as it is recognised at a global level that Climate Change has the potential to impact upon economic stability, so we support Council in taking a proactive approach in developing appropriate policy and beginning to implement a transition plan. Moving forward, any plans or strategies that Northland Inc either develop or be involved in the development of, will need to consider the impact that climate change will have, thus having a regional framework that considers this issue will be crucial in helping to inform any actions in these.

ANOTHER OPTION (don't do this work)		
Mrs Jan Pirihi	LTP21_24	Climate change is a natural phenomenon. Conserve our natural resources but there is no need for this emphasis on carbon remission
Heather Tomason	LTP21_116	Government has an agency and funding and is working on climate change for NZ as a whole. Use their resources and provide technical advice to Councils
Richard Morris	LTP21_142	Don't buy electric buses. Expensive option for little impact on carbon footprint. Creates excessive wear on roads (E Buses are heavy). Look at hydrogen.
Mr Harold Robinson	LTP21_168	We support "another option" and don't do this work but support district councils with technical advice on climate change.
NONE OF THE ABOVE		
Klaus Kurz	LTP21_21	there is no need for any of your suggested planning. First of all you should start learning to understand climate and possible climate changes properly Learn more about climate change before you waster more ratepayers money.
Annette Vernon	LTP21_37	Definitely do the work. Endeavour to make WDC a sustainable business practice in all areas - leading the community by example. Also replace the WDC garbage bags with biodegradable ones and lower prices for the paper bags already available.
Mr Carl Mather	LTP21_27	Yet another waste of time and our money. If there was ever any seriousness regarding adapting to climate change it meant all this would have been completed in the 1990's. It is far too late now to make any meaningful changes. The whole 'carbon footprint' meme is an extension of the 'carbon price' fraud invented by the financial industry. It is utterly dishonest. And 'resilience' is now just another govt catchphrase meaning 'we will look like we are doing something but in reality we will just spend and have fun.
Mr Neil Doherty	LTP21_85	Climate change has been overstated. Now everyone trumpets it and a minority pedal the fear for their own benefit. User pays. Snouts in trough.
Mr Peter Doel	LTP21_95	This should be led / funded by central government. We need to remember that this council is arrogant, self-serving and deceitful.
Harata Waetford	LTP21_97	We will already meet the expected carbon emissions by 2050. There is no need to put more funding to this plan.
Ms Jan Boyes Whangārei Heads Citizens Association	LTP21_117	Do some work on resilience but don't believe all the carbon nonsense.
Mr Richard Gardner Senior Policy Advisor Federated Farmers of NZ	LTP21_170	Submitter discusses climate change with particular focus on framers and growers and the current action being taken by these groups. Submitter set out what they consider to be the appropriate role for local government in climate change, and that councils should focus on ensuring their districts and regions can best adapt to the expected impacts of climate change and only seek to mitigate emissions which they themselves are directly responsible for. Submitter recommendation: That Council take note of this discussion [see full submission] on climate change as it affects the primary production sector. {staff summary; please see original submission}

Nora Shayeb	LTP21_192	Climate Change resilience should warrant much more funding than \$2M! {Staff comment: please see full submission for more information}
NO OPTION SELECTED		
Dr Mere Kepa	LTP21_48	<p>Submitter references the human right to water, and the requirement to adopt effective measures to realise the right to water without discrimination. Raises concern about the impacts of climate change on water availability, flooding and water contamination. Raises concern of impacts on renewable surface water and groundwater, and competition for water, and the far-reaching consequences of this. Raises concern about the impact of climate change on vulnerability to climatic events. Raises particular concern in relation to the potential for climate change to negatively impact Tangata Whenua, pushing them into poverty and death.</p> <p>Submitter requests that council implement proposed freshwater reforms that will limit synthetic nitrogen fertiliser and be beneficial to reducing climate emissions, and urges council to use the departure from business as usual as a result of Covid to redesign society to combat climate change. Raises concern of the impact of climate change on biodiversity.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Melanie Gatfield	LTP21_70	<p>"Coastal erosion, flooding and drought" Rising temperatures, drought etc currently a factor deemed to contribute to algal blooms. What can we do as a community about this?</p> <p>"Three adaptive pathway plans to be developed for larger populations, toolkits for smaller coastal communities"</p> <p>Interested in what these toolkits might look like</p> <p>" Zero carbon emissions by 2050" What is NRC doing to reduce carbon emissions and what can we as a community do to reduce carbon emissions?</p>
C Cotton	LTP21_81	I'd like to see practical measures taken and put resources into trying to protect what we have and concentrate on waste minimisation instead of carbon remission.
Caron Mounsey-Smith Specialist Advisor Water Safety New Zealand	LTP21_165	<p>Submitter discusses legislative responsibility relating to climate change, the likely negative impacts of climate change, and the subsequent impacts on the water safety sector. Submitter supports council's acknowledgement of climate change, and acknowledges Council's 2019 climate change achievements such as the collaborative staff working group with other Northland councils on a regional climate change adaption strategy, and new community response plans to prepare for emergencies such as storms, flooding, and tsunamis. Submitter supports the provision of adaptive pathway plans in larger population centres, and toolkits for smaller coastal communities to develop their own pathways.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Naomi James, Refining NZ (Mr Riaan Elliot)	LTP21_169	<p>Submitter supports the need for the development, delivery, and implementation of key regional climate change plans and documents and acknowledges the need to find economically feasible alternatives to fossil fuels, that also make the most of Northland's capabilities.</p> <p>Submitter discusses the potential of the Marsden Point site for future fuel and energy requirements, and is keen to explore opportunities in this space. Submitter recommends that a collaborative working group, including Iwi, business and other</p>

		<p>relevant stakeholders should be formed to advise on the proposed zero-carbon transition plan.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Mr David Lourie	LTP21_173	<p>Support climate change resilience mapping and lowering carbon footprint. It is important that while maps are drawn the Regional Council work with WDC on plans, plan changes, and resource consent applications and challenge WDC plans and resource consent applications for development on at risk areas.</p>
Ms Anna Curnow Acting Mayor Kaipara District Council	LTP21_177	<p>KDC have appreciated the collaboration between councils through the Te Tai Tokerau regional staff group and value participating in the Joint Climate Change Adaptation Committee made up of elected members and Mana Whenua representatives.</p> <p>KDC support NRC undertaking adaptive pathways planning that includes a dedicated programme for hapū and community-led adaptive planning, and the development and implementation of a zero-carbon transition plan.</p> <p>KDC are proposing a series of climate change works to ensure it meets its climate change responsibilities. This work includes creating a Climate Smart Policy, and Climate Action Plan, the Regional Adaptation Strategy and an appropriate Communications Platform. KDC commit to identify and manage climate risks, to adapt to change sustainably, and to build resilience - this is KDC's adaptation response. We are committed to measuring, reporting and managing Council's emissions footprint.</p> <p>KDC have already started laying the groundwork for stronger, more informed climate change planning and response.</p>
Ms Rebecca Williams Secretary Tutukaka Coast Ratepayers and Residents Assoc	LTP21_179	<p>Submitter raises concern about climate change and the need to collaborate, and raises concern at sea level rise and more extreme weather conditions.</p> <p>Submission highlights two learning opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Ngunguru seawall - concern over lack of coordination between NRC and WDC and the need for improved communication. b) Sandy bay - concern over lack of coordination between NRC and WDC, and failure of stream flow redirection work. <p>Submitter recommends that council plan and work with WDC in a more co-ordinated and strategic way on matters concerning the coastal environment and Climate Change responses. Submitter recommends that council work with WDC to create a shared Climate Change planning and decision-making framework, and that this includes mechanisms for constructive and progressive ongoing engagement with the Tutukaka Coast Community.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Ms Zelka Grammer	LTP21_183	<p>Submitter states: "I would like to see climate change addressed by the NRC and a strong precautionary climate change policy placed in the NRC new LTP 2021/31" and "In my view, some of the greatest impacts for global warming in New Zealand are in land management, and therefore the most pressing area for immediate constructive action by councils including NRC to address harmful climate change" Submission goes into more detail on climate change and GMOs.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Mrs Nan Pullman	LTP21_185	<p>I support a more resilient, low-carbon transport network and the co-ordination of planning for climate change and</p>

		adaptation. Yes, I would like to see adaptive pathway plans; zero-carbon transition plan but before 2050. I support the move to electric buses and the replacement of the harbour boat with an electric or hybrid vessel.
Dr Lily George Policy Analyst Nga Tai Ora	LTP21_172	<p>Submitter makes comment on topics relating to 'Climate change resilience' and makes the following recommendations relevant to this consultation point:</p> <p>'Climate change emergency in Northland: an equitable transition to healthy people living in a healthy climate' recommendations:</p> <p>NRC strengthens its approach to climate change mitigation and adaptation, drawing on the work of other Councils such as Auckland Council, Waikato District Council and Horizons Regional Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invest in climate change action: the focus must not only be on adaptation but also on mitigation (i.e. emissions reductions) For the Northland region and for NRC itself: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measure carbon emissions by type and district, including a baseline inventory and on-going monitoring Set measurable emission reduction targets by type/sector that match the urgent scale and rate of transformation that is required and align with the Paris Accord, IPCC and Zero Carbon Act recommendations e.g. 50% reduction by 2030, net zero by 2050. NRC work more closely with Ngā Tai Ora/Public Health Northland (Northland DHB) to develop and implement plans that support an equitable transition to a safe, healthy, decarbonised region. This means applying a health/wellbeing and equity lens to all climate relevant policies/decisions, with a particular focus on the following areas: transport, water, food systems, agriculture, energy. Recommended structured processes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health Impact Assessment (HIA) Health in all Policies (HiAP) approach <p>Avoid locking in infrastructure projects over the next decade and beyond that are not compatible with rapid decarbonisation; instead prioritise projects that decarbonise with co-benefits to health e.g. active transport.</p> <p>NRC takes a 'green recovery' approach to rebuilding our local economy and communities from the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic i.e. taking the opportunity to create the healthy decarbonised region we need</p> <p>Adaptation: plan to prepare for the already locked in impacts of climate change, and to rapidly adapt to a zero-carbon future. Measures need to prioritise and protect groups likely to be worst affected - Māori, Pacific peoples, children, elderly, and low income people, and those geographically more affected by the direct climate impacts e.g. living in flood or drought prone areas. To avoid increasing inequities in implementing the aforementioned measures consideration needs to be given to minimising further negative financial impact on low income groups.</p> <p>Vehicle fleet recommendation:</p> <p>We recommend that NRC electrify their vehicle fleet to reduce CO2 emissions.</p> <p>Drinking water recommendation:</p>

		<p>That NRC work jointly with the three regional Territorial Local Authorities (TLAs) to undertake climate change mitigation (emissions reductions) to reduce any impacts on water supply</p> <p>Option recommendation:</p> <p>‘Proposed option’: we support NRC’s proposed option to undertake adaptive pathways planning, write and begin implementing a zero-carbon transition plan. However as per our climate change action recommendations under ‘A. Climate change resilience’, we reiterate and emphasise that the science dictates that the pathway to zero-carbon must involve significant reductions in emissions by 2030 (e.g. 50% reduction) – we cannot defer until later without the risk of extremely serious consequences.</p> <p>Conclusion recommendation:</p> <p>Climate change and environmental sustainability: An equitable transition to healthy people living in a healthy climate and environment. That the global crisis of mass biodiversity loss/decline of nature be acknowledged and formal recognition given to the knowledge and values of Māori to help address this. That NRC strengthens its approach to climate change mitigation and adaptation by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Baselining regional emissions (developing a baseline emissions inventory), setting quantitative reductions targets that align with the science (e.g. 50% reduction by 2030, net zero emissions by 2050 as per Auckland City Council) b. Collaborating with Ngā Tai Ora/Public Health Northland (Northland DHB) to develop climate action policies that optimise health/wellbeing and equity co-benefits (using tools like Health in all Policies and Health Impact Assessments) with a focus on transport and water <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Ms Linda Kaye	LTP21_174	<p>4. On "climate change resilience" it is time to maximise low-cost, subsidised opportunities for re-purposing, re-cycling, up-cycling waste disposal options. The waste "management" in far north district is shameful, and a disgrace. There is a total absence of any meaningful system of waste reduction. I would say that the conditions are third-world, but third world citizens are probably far more responsible in their re-use of discarded materials, than FNDC.</p> <p>You should mandate product stewardship at source and at distribution (e.g. supermarkets), to reduce plastic and other harmful packaging. You should also control tourism activities that harm the natural environment, waste local resources and undermine the quality of life in our small towns and settlements. Policies to reduce the harmful effects of "over-tourism" are long overdue. In terms of "responding to the bigger picture", I would prefer that you address these issues as matters of climate crisis and climate emergency, rather than the relatively neutral terminology of "climate change". We are well beyond that by now. When the planet's on fire, you can't go looking for a garden hose.</p>
Ms Gail Aiken	LTP21_180	<p>Submitter strongly agrees with plans to undertake adaptive pathways planning, with a dedicated programme for hapū and community-led adaptive planning. Write and begin implementing a zero-carbon transition plan. States that this is a start but doesn’t go anywhere near far enough: "Reducing carbon emissions is not enough, we also need to take opportunities to sequester carbon. Healthy living soils and</p>

		<p>healthy living ecologies all have huge potential to sequester carbon and this is not all about trees.”</p> <p>Submitter discusses the benefit of promoting regenerative land use for carbon sequestration. Submitter discusses other ways to recapture carbon, through healthy wild ecologies, and not giving consent to environmentally damaging activities. Submission urges acknowledgement of the links between treatment of the land and climate change, flooding, droughts and water quality.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
<p>Ms Zelka Grammer Secretary GE Free Tai Tokerau</p>	LTP21_184	<p>We support council doing everything in its power to help ameliorate climate change. We urge council to be wary of biotech industry hype (which continues to make false claims that GE /GMO/ gene edited trees, grasses or animals are the answer to NZ addressing climate change). This is false. The greatest impacts for global warming in New Zealand are in land management, and therefore the most pressing area for immediate constructive action by councils to address harmful climate change.</p>

What is your preferred option for improving water resilience?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	53.80%	-	92
Our proposed option	33.92%	63.04%	58
Another option	14.04%	26.09%	24
None of the above	5.85%	10.87%	10
[No Response]	46.20%	-	79
Total	100.00%	100.00%	171

Ninety-two of 171 submitters responded to this question, with 58 choosing our proposed option, 24 choosing another option, ten choosing none of the above and five not selecting an option but still making comment (please see note in Introduction).

Of submitters who chose our proposed option, support was noted for the scheme, that tanks should be required for new builds and the importance of water as a human right was noted. Concern was noted that the scheme be administered well and that tanks are better than dams.

Of submitters who chose another option, concern was raised that this was not council's role, that it is central government's role and that better infrastructure should be provided.

Of submitters who chose none of the above, comments suggested a 50/50 cost share, that infrastructure should be improved, and that the issue needs to be looked at holistically. Concern was raised that the issue should be covered by the three waters reform/Te Mana o Te Wai and that council is not a bank.

Of submitters who didn't chose an option, support was noted for the scheme, that the materials be environmentally friendly and locally sourced, and that non water-based sewage be promoted. Concern was raised about future water requirements with growth, that individuals should pay.

WHAT IS YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR IMPROVING WATER RESILIENCE?		
Name	Reference	Comment
OUR PROPOSED OPTION (set up and fund the proposed grant scheme)		
Hone Popata	LTP21_25	Totally support this initiative
Laurie Copland	LTP21_28	This will need strict monitoring and scrutiny as those of us providing our own water supply will be supporting others who have chosen to live where these amenities are
Kim Robinson	LTP21_30	Totally support this
Mr Stephen Rush Environment Officer Te Runanga o Whangaroa	LTP21_67	Catch the rainwater wherever possible.
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	Given our recent experiences and dry summers, this is a wise scheme. I know how much I benefit from my own 1000 litre rainwater tank. I'd rather see the grants doubled to \$1m, though.
Inge Bremer	LTP21_12	Increase the fund (double it)
Ian Reeves	LTP21_20	Water is essential for all communities
Mrs Jan Pirihi	LTP21_24	Where council water is not available the provision of tanks should be a requirement for all new and existing homes
Renee Dumas	LTP21_32	As above: consents to be given to industries lowering the overall footprint of carbon in the region. A coordinated approach needed.

Pamela-Anne Ngohe-Simon	LTP21_34	I strongly agree and those that have one water tank should still be able to access this funding as a water tank owner now (town supply doesn't connect out to us down Otiria Road) we have to purchase a refill twice in summer at a cost of \$500 each time it's far too costly for us.
Tania Aslund	LTP21_39	All households (residential and rural) need to be as resilient as possible, whether they are on water schemes or not. Rainwater running off rooves and not collected can become a stormwater problem. Every household should have at least one connected rainwater tank.
Val Scott	LTP21_58	Add a requirement for the installation of water tanks in all new builds.
Nicole Anderson	LTP21_133	The other critical matter our Takiwa wishes to support - is a water tank grant scheme which would see free water tanks and plumbing provided to whanau who are in financial hardship.
Jessie McVeagh	LTP21_137	Water poverty is unacceptable in our country. More education and policies are needed to require people to use water wisely, store water, and resource consents need to take into account the ability for water sources to refresh under the new unpredictable weather/ climate change.
Oliver Knox	LTP21_138	We all have a right to fresh, clean water and some people need assistance to get that as it can be expensive. Once tanks and filters are in place its easy, but getting set up can be a challenge for some people. Collecting rainwater and storing in tanks is a no brainer.
Ms Janine McVeagh	LTP21_140	Water tanks definitely - not dams!
Mr David Lourie	LTP21_173	I support improving water resilience, great idea to assist in providing water storage tanks to vulnerable people.
Kirsty Edmonds	LTP21_144	Not for those most in need - encourage all rate payers to install a water tank on their property if possible. Provide subsidy for this. Water tanks subsidy should be offered to all rate payers, including commercial properties. The plan just mentions guttering, tanks etc but no specific details. As a person who is about to settle on a property that will require another tank with the proposed rate increase and the issues in the Kaikohe area with droughts and water I would expect to be eligible to receive a significant subsidy promoted in the area to have more water tanks installed to decrease the pressure on current water systems. We should not be having to call in the army each summer.
Dallas King	LTP21_148	Communities in areas high on the deprivation index represent those most in need when it comes to resilience and drinking water. Funding water tanks for homes in these rural and isolated communities is essential.
Dr Lily George Policy Analyst Nga Tai Ora	LTP21_172	Recommendation: - 'Proposed option': We support the proposed option to set up and fund the proposed grant scheme (put \$500k/year into funding and grants to those most in need so they can buy water tanks, guttering and spouting)
Nora Shayeb	LTP21_192	The funds should also be available to any low income households. {Staff comment: please see full submission for more information}
ANOTHER OPTION (do not support the scheme)		
D Mcnamara	LTP21_13	I like the idea of properties having the means to support themselves in drought situations and having their own tanks. I

		don't like the idea of funding it through council. Central govt need to step up as they do in all things climate change, and, considering 3 waters reform not far off either.
Graham Gallagher	LTP21_61	I'm guessing the most at need don't pay rates so shouldn't be supported with ratepayers money. Find another funding source
E Metz	LTP21_100	What is "water resilience" anyway? We could better use \$500k/yr in other areas.
C Cotton	LTP21_81	I'm all for as many water tanks as we can but isn't this central government's responsibility? Perhaps waive any consenting fees!
Mr Neil Doherty	LTP21_85	Good idea is to economise with water at all times, don't take this resource for granted. We all seem to want abundant and we want it now!! I'm broke - no \$\$
Martin Gvardijancic	LTP21_101	this should be helped out by better council water systems rather than absolving this to house owners who may or may not care.
Heather Tomason	LTP21_116	I don't see this as NRC's role. Support based on emergency.
NONE OF THE ABOVE		
Jeroen Jongejans	LTP21_4	Suggest a 50/50 grant fund for \$1 million p/a for those that want to increase their water supply resilience.
Chris Claydon	LTP21_11	Spend the money on improving and extending the mains water network instead. Ensure drinking water supplies are available on all jetties and marinas for live-aboard boats.
Geoff Sharples	LTP21_73	This is a tough decision. On one hand I see the merit. If it is truly helping folks who are out of other options. On the other hand it seems like its a subsidy scheme that can be taken advantage of. Rates come from everyone so you would be raising the rates of some folks who can't afford the tanks to pay for others who get to have the tanks. Rain water also requires filtration to be free of pathogens. that costs a lot too. This needs to be looked at holistically and not just stop gap on tanks and gutters. That is not how we solve water and energy poverty.
Mr Peter Doel	LTP21_95	This should be covered by the 3 waters proposal. We need to remember that this council is arrogant, self-serving and deceitful.
Kelly Maxwell	LTP21_120	We wish to comment on Biodiversity & Biosecurity only.
Fiona King	LTP21_134	Water systems are a Local Council responsibility. There are other organization's to assist the needy. NRC is not a bank to loan monies/ infrastructure to private properties.
Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	Their needs to be a focus report that includes Te Mana o te Wai that guides transition into the Three Water Reform Programme in this space. https://www.dia.govt.nz/Three-Waters-Reform-Programme
Mr Richard Gardner Senior Policy Advisor Federated Farmers of NZ	LTP21_170	The rate increase must be reduced to a manageable level. Deferring this program may be one way of achieving this.
NO OPTION SELECTED		
Melanie Gatfield	LTP21_70	"Water a crucial resource" At 656 Cove road, the water pressure is halved during periods when holiday makers swell our local population and therefore the water requirement, sometimes to a trickle. What is being done to address future

		water requirement for our local population growth? Could you elaborate on the fund and scheme proposal?
Mrs Nan Pullman	LTP21_185	I support the development of a scheme to provide funding and grants to those most in need.
Mr Harold Robinson	LTP21_168	We do not support this scheme - each individual should pay own costs. They have time now through the wet season to make improvements to their water reserves before next drought.
Ms Linda Kaye	LTP21_174	3. On "water resilience", I support the proposal to subsidise and/or fully fund replacement rain water storage tanks for people in areas of Northland where there is no municipal water supply. You should require that the construction and materials for such storage meet the highest environmental standards, and also support local industry in construction and delivery. So, preferably renewable or recycled/re-purposed materials You should also subsidise or fund delivery of water to these households in times of drought. You should require the construction of mandatory rain water tanks on all public buildings in the region, both for new builds and as retro-fittings.
Ms Gail Aiken	LTP21_180	There are some proposals that I really like and support including: improving Water Resilience by proposing to provide funding and grants to those most in need so they can buy water tanks, guttering and spouting, in partnership with other funders. An additional step to this though would be to promote and support non water based sewage systems that not only waste valuable drinking water but also create pollution in our rivers and harbours. Promoting and facilitating composting toilet systems for home owners would be a positive step as would pushing for clean, land based facilities for townships such as Rawene, Opononi and Kohukohu rather than the polluting systems supported by FNDC.

What is your preferred option for harbour safety and navigation?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	50.88%	-	87
Our proposed option	15.79%	31.03%	27
Another option	27.49%	54.02%	47
None of the above	7.60%	14.94%	13
[No Response]	49.12%	-	84
Total	100.00%	100.00%	171

Eighty-seven of 171 submitters responded to this question, with 27 choosing our proposed option, 47 choosing another option, 13 choosing none of the above and eight not selecting an option.

Of submitters who chose our proposed option, support was noted for the cost of abandoned boats being covered by owners and that infrastructure be replaced, and concern was raised about an electric vessel and charging time.

Of submitters who chose another option, concern was raised about ratepayers paying of the cost of abandoned boats, and that users should pay, and that the cost should be recovered from the owners of the abandoned boats.

Of submitters who chose none of the above, concern was noted that the maritime vessel did not need to be replaced, that users should pay for the cost of abandoned vessels, and that the cost should be recovered from the owners of the abandoned boats.

Of submitters who didn't chose an option, comments supported the proposals, requested upgrades in Mangawhai, and raised concern that boat owners should be able to cover the costs.

WHAT IS YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR HARBOUR SAFETY AND NAVIGATION?		
Name	Reference	Comment
OUR PROPOSED OPTION (do all this work)		
Mr Stephen Rush Environment Officer Te Runanga o Whangaroa	LTP21_67	Cost of abandoned boats to be 100% covered by owners. The NRC subsidiary - Harbour master authority is operating autonomously and needs to be reviewed in light of meaningful consultation with iwi and hapū on harbour matters. Where NRC has policies the roll-out of these to the harbour master role is, at times, inconsistent. e.g. Regional Coastal Plan designated mooring areas where the harbour master is exercising discretionary authority without consultation or notification to do so. This is a serious concern for the long term plan, particularly where planning for long term coastal and marine matters are at issue.
Ian Reeves	LTP21_20	Ageing infrastructure must be replaced
Mr Neil Doherty	LTP21_85	I agree
Richard Morris	LTP21_142	Don't buy an electric vessel. Takes too long to charge in an emergency.
ANOTHER OPTION (do the work but don't share the cost of abandoned boats)		
Laurie Copland	LTP21_28	user pays
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	Once again I think that the cost of abandoned boats should be covered by those who introduce boats into the marine environment in the first place. As for NRC's new harbour boat, please only consider an electric/hybrid vessel, even if the capital cost is still much higher at present. I'm happy to

		contribute to the higher purchase price. It's all about establishing precedents and setting good examples. If councils lead, the communities have to follow.
Mrs Jan Pirihi	LTP21_24	Cost of dealing with abandoned boats should be borne by the owners plus a fine for littering.
Geoff Sharples	LTP21_73	Not clear why the owners of abandoned boats cannot be tracked down and fined or asked to dispose of the boat. Or auction off the mooring including the burden of removing the old boat. Unclear what one boat do in the event of an oil spill? Is one expensive boat better than a few smaller ones along with an agreement to be able to use private boats in the event of an oil spill. Much more likely to be able to electrify small boats than a big one. Replacing the buoys makes sense.
Martin Gvardijancic	LTP21_101	Why on gods green earth would rate payers have to cover cost of abandoned boats?
Heather Tomason	LTP21_116	Boat owners to take responsibility for their boats
Harata Waetford	LTP21_97	Sounds like a good deal for our money.
Mr Harold Robinson	LTP21_168	Do the work but do not share the costs of abandoned boats as many landowners do not own boats and this would be an unfair cost to them.
Dr Lily George Policy Analyst Nga Tai Ora	LTP21_172	Recommendation: · ‘Another option’: We support the option, “Go ahead with the essential boat and beacons work, but don’t share the cost of dealing with abandoned boats, and leave this to be covered 100% by users via a charge on moorings"
Nora Shayeb	LTP21_192	I see no obligation to share the costs. {Staff comment: please see full submission for more information}
Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	Agree...
NONE OF THE ABOVE		
Jeroen Jongejans	LTP21_4	Navigational equipment replacement is ongoing, should come out of rates- replacement vessel should have had funding (depreciation) attached to it in last 20 years....
Chris Claydon	LTP21_11	Instead of replacing the harbour boats, retrofit the current boats with electric propulsion. Fund removal of abandoned boats by selling the boats, buyer to collect. (act promptly when they are first abandoned and they still have value)
Bruce Mauchline	LTP21_35	The cost of replacing beacons should be borne by all boat/ship users not just those who permanently moor their boats. This could be achieved by initiating boat ramp fees. Replacement of harbour boats should be imposed on all ratepayers. Abandoned boats expenditure should be borne by the owner of the boat or through sale of the boat with any shortfall being met by all ratepayers.
Graham Gallagher	LTP21_61	Charge owners for abandoned boats not the responsible boat/mooring holders.
Mr Guy Wilson	LTP21_29	If you mean the owners of abandoned boats are the users with respect to cost sharing of your removal service I support your doing so, If you mean users as in all other owners of moorings then no I do not support sharing costs. Charging mooring owners for the cost of removing abandoned vessels is unfair. Guilty by association springs to mind, captive target? Why should fee paying mooring owners be responsible for the vessels abandoned by others? If the council wishes to under take such activities find somewhere else to get the money.

Tom Pasco	LTP21_64	The owners of abandoned boats should pay 100% of costs to remove.
Kelly Maxwell	LTP21_120	We wish to comment on Biodiversity & Biosecurity only.
Kevin Pugh	LTP21_76	Place the cost of dealing with abandoned boats squarely on the owner of that boat. They are all traceable with some simply enquiry. Extend the life of the current harbour boat to relieve the cost on ratepayers. Adapt a user pays basis for buoys and beconage placing cost on commercial users.
Mr Peter Doel	LTP21_95	User pays
E Metz	LTP21_100	Replace our harbour boat and ageing beacons, BUT cover the costs of dealing with abandoned boats 100% by the owner of the boat and if this is not possible then 100% by rate payers. Why should mooring and berth owners pay for recovery of someone else's abandoned boat just because its water related. Stupid idea.
Bruce McKay	LTP21_139	No need to replace harbour boat
Mr Richard Gardner Senior Policy Advisor Federated Farmers of NZ	LTP21_170	The rate increase must be reduced to a manageable level. Deferring this program may be one way of achieving this.
NO OPTION SELECTED		
Dr Mere Kepa	LTP21_48	Whangārei harbour is seldom without commercial, recreational, and pleasure vessels travelling roundabout and to and fro'; therefore, new maritime vessel and navigation beacons would seem a sensible and valuable safety precaution against a tragic incident. Failure by the Council to address the impact of increased shipping and boating transport, on the harbour, would endanger people's lives; both on the sea and land.
Mr John Pearce Chair Mangawhai Harbour Restoration Society	LTP21_49	Submission requests that council consider upgrading and maintaining the navigation and warning aids within the Mangawhai harbour including adding port/starboard lights at the entrance and buoy over the reef situated out from Sellar's Reserve. Submission requests that council consider providing adequate resources for harbour wardens to carry out their duties, citing increasing boats and jet skis in the Mangawhai harbour, and safety concerns. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Ms MaryAnn Harding	LTP21_53	The owners of boats are likely to have enough discretionary income to look after their own safety resources.
Ms Jan Boyes Whangārei Heads Citizens Association	LTP21_117	Plan properly. save for a better boat that will last a long time.... Start a boating register tomorrow. and charge the owners of abandoned boats for everything you can.
Mr Michael Wrightson	LTP21_186	Submitter questions replacement of the maritime vessel, and navigation aids. {staff summary; please see original submissions}
Caron Mounsey-Smith Specialist Advisor Water Safety New Zealand	LTP21_165	Council's plans to build a fit for purpose maritime boat is also supported. This new vessel will help improve water safety and drowning prevention in Northland.
Mr David Lourie	LTP21_173	I support maritime and harbour safety proposals.
Mrs Nan Pullman	LTP21_185	I support the move to electric buses and the replacement of the harbour boat with an electric or hybrid vessel.

What is your preferred option for increasing CityLink services?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	48.54%	-	83
Our proposed option	27.49%	56.63%	47
Another option	14.62%	30.12%	25
None of the above	6.43%	13.25%	11
[No Response]	51.46%	-	88
Total	100.00%	100.00%	171

Eighty-three of 171 submitters responded to this question, with 47 choosing our proposed option, 25 choosing another option, 11 choosing none of the above and nine not selecting an option.

Of submitters who chose our proposed option, support was noted for improvement of services, light rail to Whangārei and electric buses. Comments were made on the need for more frequent services, bus lanes, more options for rural commuting and cycleways. Concern was raised about public transport and accessibility for disabled and elderly people, and that buses should be free.

Of submitters who chose another option, comments noted that the proposal should be de-prioritised in favour of water quality and flooding issues.

Of submitters who chose none of the above, support was noted for user pays, and comments made that buses are inefficient, that planning should be strategic, that frequency should be increased to see if it is supported, and that cycling should be encouraged.

Of submitters who didn't chose an option, comments noted support for regular trains to Auckland, electric buses, public transport in rural areas, strategic thinking for public transport, increased frequency, and that direct routes to Whangārei hospital be added.

WHAT IS YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR INCREASING CITYLINK SERVICES?		
Name	Reference	Comment
OUR PROPOSED OPTION (increase the frequency of bus services from 2022/23)		
Kim Robinson	LTP21_7	Add Light rail to Whangārei and outlying towns. Public Transport in this region is currently non-existent. Disabled and Elderly people need to move around. Light-rail connecting Whangārei to towns outside will be viable A regional disability strategy is a must. It's important that the region is accessible to disabled people and elderly.
Chris Claydon	LTP21_11	Electric buses only, with immediate effect. Set an example.
Ian Heape	LTP21_17	makes sense
Pamela Stevens	LTP21_23	Only if viable, perhaps an option of small shuttle buses at more frequent times.
Annette Vernon	LTP21_37	Offer 7 days a week service - currently there are no services on Sundays.
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	As the Climate Change Commission pointed out, telling us what we need to do without enabling us to make the proper choices is not going to work. Establishing bus lanes by WDC and then increasing the frequency of the service (as well as switching to electric buses in or before 2027) is once again all about providing the right settings and infrastructure to make the right action the default action.

Inge Bremer	LTP21_12	publish CO2 emissions of bus fleet consider earlier replacement by electric buses
Ms Annemarie Florian	LTP21_18	Smaller electric buses or people carriers. May also consider pre-booking systems and pick-up points flexibility, the MyWay trial in Timaru looks promising. Also consider free public transport for all, within serviced areas. This would have an immediate effect mitigating climate change and protecting environment, and could easily be weighed against the costs of setting up and maintaining and monitoring systems of payment. It also connects community and is a great leveller, something sorely needed, with disparity in wealth increasing between population sectors.
Ian Reeves	LTP21_20	I expect that a greater availability of bus services will encourage greater use by the public, and, among other things, relieve some pressure on traffic
Mrs Jan Pirihi	LTP21_24	Use smaller buses where patronage is low. Cover more areas. Rural runs need to be re-examined.
Val Scott	LTP21_58	Re-vamp the routes in consultation with users; introduce electric buses as soon as possible; improve the stops; connect the Intercity buses with the local buses linked to that establish a new bus station in a safer and more accessible position; improve the number and site of the stops e.g. No stops between Kingsgate and Rose Street - makes it very difficult to use Intercity buses and for shoppers without cars using PaknSave not to speak of people going to from the airport. We need buses all weekend and in the evenings
Tom Pasco	LTP21_64	Preferably E-buses
C Cotton	LTP21_81	The services need to be well marketed and perhaps smaller buses/vans on less used routes.
Mr Neil Doherty	LTP21_85	If Whangārei wants it. I'm in Dargaville so don't care and won't benefit at all.
Kelly Murphy	LTP21_106	I would like to see more options improved rural commuting / cycle ways in the far north into Kaitaia - mostly flat and good weather!
Geoff Sharples	LTP21_73	Getting greater regularity would be necessary to increase ridership. But this should really be coupled with routing optimization and a campaign to increase ridership. This is part of the WDC carbon plan so getting a head start on it would be good.
Mr Rihari Dargaville Chairman Ngati Manawa Hapū	LTP21_105	Increase frequency of services can only work if policy is developed to encourage bus service use and discourage private transport options
Anahita Djamali	LTP21_125	Make the buses free. Hardly anyone uses them anyway. This will increase patronage and create more equitable and accessible transportation. Also introduce more bus routes, smaller buses out to Whangārei Heads and to Ruakaka.
ANOTHER OPTION (maintain bus services at current level)		
Richard Morris	LTP21_142	In our separate submission on the RLTP/ RPTP we have recommended transport as one area which should be de-prioritised in favour of addressing water quality and flooding priorities.
Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	Maintain...
NONE OF THE ABOVE		

Maggie Buxton	LTP21_15	You need to think more smartly about transport in general. Small electric shuttles may potentially be a smarter way to deal with transport.
Laurie Copland	LTP21_28	to be paid for by area that receives this service
Graham Gallagher	LTP21_61	Having busses with no one on is inefficient. Just pay for Uber rides will be a better use of resources.
Mr Guy Wilson	LTP21_29	Why are you subsidising bus companies? Christchurch switched to a competitive tender model for bus routes many years ago, the ended up with a much higher standard of service and an income. If you want electric buses make it a condition upon the tenderer, there is no incentive for a business to contain costs and grow their customer base if they are subsidised.
Heather Tomason	LTP21_116	Increase the frequency for a period of time and assess whether the bus system is being supported to cover the additional services
Kelly Maxwell	LTP21_120	We wish to comment on Biodiversity & Biosecurity only.
Harata Waetford	LTP21_97	Not familiar with this service.
Nora Shayeb	LTP21_192	ENCOURAGE CYCLING. Councils need to differentiate between cycle lanes to facilitate and promote cycling as a means of commuting and cycle ways as recreational facilities. In many parts of the world it has been recognised that mountain biking as a sport, can have serious detrimental effects on the environment. Even in NZ some cycle tracks have been closed again to recreational cyclist, to protect the natural environment. The main reason for investing in cycle lanes is to reduce traffic congestion and carbon emissions by fossil fuel driven engines. Yet, WDC has just reconstructed one of Whangārei's main arteries, Mill road, without a cycle lane on both sides. This is a fallacy! Town centre should be connected to all suburban areas through a safe network of cycle lanes. All country roads should have cycle lanes on both sides. To allocate funding to cycle ways solely for sport and recreation, should not be covered by rate payers, but by the users! {Staff comment: please see full submission for more information}
NO OPTION SELECTED		
Robyn Skerten	LTP21_22	Unsure, insufficient knowledge, could this be borne more so by WDC
Ms Sophia Xiao-Colley	LTP21_93	7. Transport: regular charter train service on public holidays between Auckland and Whangārei.
Ms Janine McVeagh	LTP21_140	It would be good to have some kind of public transport in the more rural areas.
Ms Jan Boyes Whangārei Heads Citizens Association	LTP21_117	Think Clever. some buses at peak times, some vans to houses (charge people the right amount for service), some T3 lanes, some park'n'ride van or share transport systems
Dr Lily George Policy Analyst Nga Tai Ora	LTP21_172	Submitter makes comment on topics relating to 'CityLink services' and makes the following recommendations relevant to this consultation point: · Electrification of the bus fleet to reduce carbon emissions · That more bus routes are added and frequency of buses is increased. In particular: o That direct routes to Whangārei Hospital from all suburbs are added to the schedule to exclude Rose Street Bus Depot so that staff and patients have direct transport to and from the hospital. This will remove a significant portion of vehicles from the road, and will increase bus usage o That direct school bus routes

		(bypassing the Rose Street Bus Depot) are provided from all suburbs. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Ms Linda Kaye	LTP21_174	6. On "increasing City Link Bus services", I submit that you should make a serious and major commitment to public transport throughout the region. You should begin by genuine engagement with the community, to address our needs and wishes and enhance our wellbeing, as well as reduce the effects of climate change and support the local economy. We should all have access to local and regional, low cost, low-emissions, high service quality public transport by mini-bus, coach and water taxi.
Mr David Lourie	LTP21_173	I support initiatives to provide more frequent public transport.
Ms Rebecca Williams Secretary Tutukaka Coast Ratepayers and Residents Assoc	LTP21_179	Submitter recommends that NRC give greater consideration of the needs of rural and coastal communities in relation to its transport planning. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Mrs Nan Pullman	LTP21_185	I support the move to electric buses and the replacement of the harbour boat with an electric or hybrid vessel. Like to see electric buses thanks and also development of more cycle paths.

Regional leadership

What is your preferred option for Māori partnerships?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	51.46%	-	88
Our proposed option	37.43%	72.73%	64
Another option	7.02%	13.64%	12
None of the above	7.02%	13.64%	12
[No Response]	48.54%	-	83
Total	100.00%	100.00%	171

Eighty-eight of 171 submitters responded to this question, with 64 choosing our proposed option, 12 choosing another option, 12 choosing none of the above and 83 not selecting an option (please see note in Introduction).

Of submitters who chose our proposed option, support was noted for benefits to the whole community, a dedicated Whangaroa Regional Councillor, improving and building relationships with Māori, honouring Te Tiriti o Waitangi, connecting communities/iwi and hapū/decision makers, compensation/assistance for those working hard to do the right thing, help with subdivision on Māori land, and collaboration with Northland Inc.

Of submitters who chose another option, concern was largely raised over treating the community as a whole and not singling one group out, and Māori being capable without needing special assistance.

Of submitters who chose none of the above, support was noted for TOW/central govt money to fund this. Concerns were raised over this being undemocratic, racist, and the lack of detailed framework around it.

Of submitters who didn't chose an option, support was noted for greater Māori representation and leadership, creating meaningful relationships and partnerships (and resourcing this), and funding for tangata whenua in RMA participation. Concerns were raised over Māori being singled out and dividing the community.

WHAT IS YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR MĀORI PARTNERSHIPS?		
Name	Reference	Comment
OUR PROPOSED OPTION (do this work)		
Pamela Stevens	LTP21_23	Long overdue. I encourage this and can see only benefits to the whole community.
Hone Popata	LTP21_25	Totally 100% agree more Maori in NRC council will help us all
Laurie Copland	LTP21_28	Be realistic, it all adds up this is 1.1% of the 20% increase. Do what needs to be done not what you'd like to do
Mr Stephen Rush Environment Officer Te Runanga o Whangaroa	LTP21_67	We believe that historically Whangaroa has been better serviced by local councillors, familiar with unique Whangaroa environments and issues, until 1987. We therefore advocate for a dedicated Whangaroa Regional Councillor.
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	As you already stated, there really are no options here. Please do the work and don't listen to the small but vociferous colonial opposition. We've already come so far over the last few years, and we need to stay the course and continuously improve our relationship with Māori.
Ian Reeves	LTP21_20	Essential that we honour the Treaty of Waitangi obligations, and that Maori have a seat at the table.

Val Scott	LTP21_58	Required by our partnership under te Tiriti
Heather Tomason	LTP21_116	I believe the opportunity of development and training for all Northlanders in this area would be of benefit. Council's greater cultural competency and understanding of Treat obligations is important. e.g. at The Orchard
Oliver Knox	LTP21_138	This is essential to connect our communities, hapū /iwi, and decision makers so that the vulnerable and at risk get the support they need. As well te ao Maori is holistic and encourages empathy towards the environment and our communities, which is what we need to be connected and supportive as we move forward united.
Ben Tomason	LTP21_78	If councils and community expect Hapū to engage meaningfully in projects and other undertakings they need to be provided with the resources, either by way of a fee for service or human resources, offices etc. Having dealt with Ngati Kahu O Torongare on Oruku Landing, that hapū works hard to do the right thing to support projects typically free of charge and over many hours. They deserve to be compensated/assisted to deliver this work if council and community truly value these relationships.
Ms Jan Boyes Whangārei Heads Citizens Association	LTP21_117	Help with subdivision on land with Maori sites. Give balanced advice, be involved early before subdivider/developer has spent a lot of money. Landowners should have to ask for consultation and about possible problems, Maori obvious on board here, but not subdivision advice should be mandatory. Work with WDC on this
Anahita Djamali	LTP21_125	We need to honour Te Tiriti. The proposed option is the only acceptable option provided.
Jessie McVeagh	LTP21_137	Respectful engagement and equal partnership with tangata whenua across all levels of council is an obligation under Te Tiriti. The days of creating plans then 'consulting' to get them over the line are of the past.
Codie McIntyre Northland Inc	LTP21_146	Northland Inc strongly supports the investment into the development of capacity and capability building designed to support iwi/hapū. Much like Northland Regional Council, Northland Inc is also seeking to improve our internal cultural competency and we would be interested in collaborating, where possible, with Council on this journey.
Dallas King	LTP21_148	Working with hapū & improving cultural competency is key if the council wants to realise effective/efficient use/management of resource and honour the partnership under Te Tiriti o Waitangi.
Mr James Murray	LTP21_166	In support of the Northland Regional Council Long Term Plan 2021-2031 regarding Māori partnerships, I want to work with the Northland Regional Council to make things happen for our people and region. However Māori partnerships have applied since 1840 so my support here is no necessary as this is already a Crown partnership.
Dr Lily George Policy Analyst Nga Tai Ora	LTP21_172	Submitter makes comment on topics relating to 'other decisions' and makes the following recommendations relevant to this consultation point: Engagement with Iwi recommendation: · That NRC continues to build successful relationships with Māori and iwi/hapū. Option recommendation: · 'Proposed option': we support the proposed option - "create meaningful partnerships with Māori by implementing programmes across council to increase our cultural competency, and provide support to iwi/hapū to build

		<p>their capacity and capability so they can address opportunities and challenges themselves and engage meaningfully with council activities”.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
ANOTHER OPTION (don't do this work)		
Chris Claydon	LTP21_11	It is undemocratic and racist to consult Iwi more than you consult everyone else. Consultation should be increased for the whole community not just one group. Councils should act on the results of the consultation of the whole community and not simply go through the motions then ignore the response as they do currently.
Mrs Jan Pirihi	LTP21_24	Are Maori so incompetent that they cannot engage meaningfully with everyone??? Many Maori have been elected to ridings without special support. Maori participation can be covered by more Maori standing for general council elections .. If they don't have the support of their people what is their purpose? Surely there are capable Maori or are we so "racist" to say they need special assistance?
Mr Carl Mather	LTP21_27	I have lost all faith in your 'values' so I don't believe your claims
Mr Guy Wilson	LTP21_29	Iwi and Hapū are already the beneficiaries of massive amounts of funding for building their capacity and capability.
Mr Neil Doherty	LTP21_85	More snouts. Not comfortable with idea.
Fiona King	LTP21_134	I do not think you should single out one culture. We are a multi raced community.
NONE OF THE ABOVE		
Tom Pasco	LTP21_64	Treaty of Waitangi monies should be used for this
Kelly Maxwell	LTP21_120	We wish to comment on Biodiversity & Biosecurity only.
Kevin Pugh	LTP21_76	Iwi have excellent access through to central government grants and loans. Several private charity groups also support this work. We pay enough through central government taxes without burdening the rate payer with extra cost because a regional council thinks its a fuzzy thing to do.
Mr Peter Doel	LTP21_95	Your recent actions have shown you have no intention of democratically representing the people of Taitokerau. Your apartheid actions are disgusting and we need to remember that this council is arrogant, self-serving and deceitful.
Mr Richard Gardner Senior Policy Advisor Federated Farmers of NZ	LTP21_170	Whether or not the Council undertakes this work, it needs to take care that the democratic principles on which the Country is founded are not undermined.
Nora Shayeb	LTP21_192	<p>I would like to know more about how council intends to create such partnerships.</p> <p>{Staff comment: please see full submission for more information}</p>
Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	<p>There is no detailed framework in your preferred option one for Maori, I see words been used around partnership, but I have added links where cross government approach around Maori interests and Maori Participation is an preferred option. The sustainable development approach is described in section 14(h) of the LGA as: 'In performing its role, a local authority must act in accordance with the following principles: (h) in taking a sustainable development approach, a local authority shall take into account: (i) the social, economic, and cultural interests of people and communities; and (ii) the need to</p>

		maintain and enhance the quality of the environment; and (iii)the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.' {staff comment: submission includes links to government websites}
Mr Kevin King	LTP21_171	I feel disgusted how Maori seats were snuck in. I believe it is racist and insulting to Maori. I add Stuart Smiths opinion as it is exactly how I feel. There is nowhere ion the Treaty of Waitangi that mentions Maori seats or extra rights of Maori. {Staff comment: see attached article}
NO OPTION SELECTED		
Dr Mere Kepa	LTP21_48	Submitter agrees with council's support for greater Māori representation and leadership in council as well as creating meaningful relationships with Māori people and Hapū. Submitter references the Charter of the United Nations, the United Nations Declaration of Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and the right to self-determination. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Ms MaryAnn Harding	LTP21_53	It would also be fairer to allocate the money for scholarships to those who deserve them regardless of race, colour or creed. If there are eight Maori students who are superior to other applicants then they should all get the scholarships...not miss out in favour of four Pakeha; and vice versa.
Ro Gravit	LTP21_127	I support: Where there are RMA participation arrangements with tangata whenua, ensuring these receive necessary funding support. NRC staff are on salaries. Tangata whenua are almost always participating at their own expense outside of their usual jobs. For this reason consultation needs to be timely and meaningful, not last minute, box ticking "lip service."
Mr Harold Robinson	LTP21_168	We do not support your proposed option. If it is a partnership it should be all nationalities not just Maori - we should all work together otherwise it will be seen as division in the community. We are against formally introducing Maori Representation on council what about all the other nationalities residing in our country- We are all New Zealanders and whoever feels they are worthy and have the desire to stand for election should be decided by the vote of the people.
Mr David Lourie	LTP21_173	I support partnerships with Tangata whenua. This should be without saying. Where there are additional consultation requirements, their input needs to be treated the same as any other contracted professional advice. I support Maori Partnerships.
Ms Anna Curnow Acting Mayor Kaipara District Council	LTP21_177	KDC support NRC in getting greater Māori representation and leadership and enabling tangata whenua to participate more fully in decision making. KDC have benefited from improving council's cultural competency and putting more resources into relationship management and encourage NRC to go ahead with plans of employing Māori technical advisors and providing professional development for TTMAC members.
Ms Rebecca Williams Secretary Tutukaka Coast Ratepayers and Residents Assoc	LTP21_179	Submitter raises concern at the 'do nothing' option included in the LTP consultation document in relation to Māori relationships. Submitter supports the development of iwi/hapū based kaitiaki rangers in principle and notes that to be effective it must work with local hapū. Submitter recommends that council commit the necessary funds, resources and efforts to ensuring that its partnerships with Māori are real and meaningful for Māori, and that it resources these activities through it standard operational budget rather than through a

		<p>planning option. Submitter recommends that council consult more proactively and progressively with local hapū on the Tutukaka Coast to develop and implement a plan to protect the environment, and preserve and protect local cultural sites and history; and that council identify specific funds and resources to support this activity.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
--	--	---

What is your preferred option for supporting work across council?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	53.80%	-	92
Our proposed option	38.01%	70.65%	65
Another option	8.77%	16.30%	15
None of the above	7.02%	13.04%	12
[No Response]	46.20%	-	79
Total	100.00%	100.00%	171

Ninety-two of 171 submitters responded to this question, with 65 choosing our proposed option, 15 choosing another option, 12 choosing none of the above and 79 not selecting an option (please see note in Introduction).

Of submitters who chose our proposed option, support was noted for using the current funding of Northland Inc. for this work, this work being essential, a regional disability strategy, the Enviroschools programme, moving with the times, this being positive with local partnerships, a regional ethnic diversity strategy, having minimum requirements for Māori staff, including Northland Inc. in the investment in IT systems, and focusing all financial resourcing on protection of the environment first and foremost.

Of submitters who chose another option, support was noted for council making do with what it had and spending the budget more efficiently, using free open source software, and live streaming in all committee meetings (not just council meetings). Concerns were raised over the clarity of what was being funded, and the necessity of employing more staff.

Of submitters who chose none of the above, support was noted for utilising existing systems, an independent review of staff roles to identify duplications and inefficient processes, a disability strategy to be part of an overall strategic plan, Enviroschools supported through Vote Education, demonstration of the use and purpose of existing funding/budget and working within this, and deferring at least some of this work to keep rates manageable. Concerns were raised over the proposed rates increase and supporting Enviroschools at this level.

Of submitters who didn't chose an option, support was noted for lean thinking strategies incorporated into the processes that council have to perform, current staff being more effective or cooperative with the technology to reduce regular running costs and investing in IT systems/more staff/Enviroschools.

WHAT IS YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR SUPPORTING WORK ACROSS COUNCIL?		
Name / Organisation	Reference	Comment
OUR PROPOSED OPTION (do this work)		
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	I checked out the detailed information in your Supporting Information, and as a semi-retired IT guy I'm impressed. I know only too well how beneficial and enabling the correct IT tools can be, and there's so much to learn from the pandemic and the lockdowns about the future of work. Go for it!
Ms Annemarie Florian	LTP21_18	Use the current funding of Northland Inc in-house for this. This organisation appears too narrow in its focus, the \$\$ would be better utilised elsewhere.
Ian Reeves	LTP21_20	Failure to use IT systems will result in inefficiencies. Falling behind on IT is a wasted opportunity to benefit the future. Essential that this work is done
Kim Robinson	LTP21_7	A regional disability strategy is a must. It's important that the region is accessible to disabled people and elderly.
Ian Heape	LTP21_17	logical option

Pamela Stevens	LTP21_23	Enviroschools programme is a wonderful investment in our future and very school should have the option.
Laurie Copland	LTP21_28	Be realistic, it all adds up this is 1.1% of the 20% increase. Do what needs to be done not what you'd like to do
Ben Tomason	LTP21_78	Move with the times, don't do half the job
Mr Rihari Dargaville Chairman Ngati Manawa Hapū	LTP21_105	Employ more staff on the basis of what is being proposed positive with local partnerships
Anahita Djamali	LTP21_125	We also need a regional ethnic diversity strategy to promote equity and inclusion of minority cultures and encourage Te Tai Tokerau to become more multicultural.
Nicole Anderson	LTP21_133	Our Takiwa ask that the People and Culture Strategy of NRC include minimal requirements for Maori staffing numbers across the organisations business units.
Kelly Maxwell	LTP21_120	Please increase personnel for pest plant biosecurity.
Ms Sarah Trass	LTP21_163	Yes, yes, yes :)
Codie McIntyre Northland Inc	LTP21_146	We support Council in investing substantially in improving their IT systems and we think it is good that they have recognised that in order to provide quality services to their customers, that they need to ensure their own internal systems strike the right balance between being efficient, fit for purpose and yet cost effective. To be able to have IT systems that improve efficiency, security and data management are key for modern day businesses to operate effectively and in a lean manner. Northland Inc, much like Council, faces similar challenges with their ageing IT Systems and this is likely to affect the way in which they interact and deliver services to their clients (the Region). The conundrum we face is that if we divert operational funding into addressing this growing need, it will come at the cost of staff and other organizational resources that are key to delivering upon our Statement of Intent. Considering that Northland Inc is a Council Controlled Organisation of Northland Regional Council, we suggest that Northland Inc be considered as part of the investment in IT systems to ensure consistency in delivery between the two organisations.
Mr Harold Robinson	LTP21_168	We support your proposed option to do this work BUT why the need to employ more staff if "IT" is supposed to make work and contact easier and quicker. We just cannot keep increasing staff numbers at a huge cost to ratepayers. Work smarter and faster.???
Dr Lily George Policy Analyst Nga Tai Ora	LTP21_172	Recommendation: - 'Proposed option': We support the proposed option "Support our ongoing activities and growth by investing in better IT systems, employing more staff, developing a regional disability strategy, meeting the growing demand for the Enviroschools programme, and much more"
Nora Shayeb	LTP21_192	I would like to see the Northland Regional Council invest a substantial amount of funding into independent and unbiased expert advice and into urgently needed scientific research to reassess the actual biodiversity and biosecurity situation and focus all financial resources on the protection of the environment first and foremost. I would like to see the NRC expanding your team with highly skilled people, to allow for better monitoring and compliance enforcement. As for funding of all the proposed projects, the NRC may find that by reassessing your approach to the named issues and using

		<p>funding more efficiently, funds will become available to invest more productively, without having to overburden the rate payers in such critical economic times.</p> <p>{Staff comment: please see full submission for more information}</p>
ANOTHER OPTION (continue with the current level of resourcing)		
Mrs Jan Pirihi	LTP21_24	Many of the proposed projects are just empire building. Make do with what we have.
Geoff Sharples	LTP21_73	The additional \$7m is a big number. It needs to be broken out. I'm supportive of better IT systems but there are several other things bundled in there and it is not clear that a rate payer who is struggling to pay their rates should be subsidizing these activities. Also before sending money to Enviroschools, get kids outside weeding and cleaning water ways. - actually get something done while educating.
Chris Claydon	LTP21_11	Switch to free open source software and operating systems throughout, ban expensive, poor quality products such as Microsoft Windows. No need to spend extra money, just spend the budget more efficiently.
Mr Peter Doel	LTP21_95	When council shows a little more respect for ratepayers we may need to revisit this, but I doubt it.
Harata Waetford	LTP21_97	Use funding already in place.
E Metz	LTP21_100	Whatever!
C Cotton	LTP21_81	Invest in IT but do we really need more staff.
Fiona King	LTP21_134	Need to have better rate payer services- to live stream for the rate payers to see on line or via u tube what does happen in all committee meetings not just the Council meeting. FNDC is doing this now.
Richard Morris	LTP21_142	Look to be more efficient and absorb this cost in existing budgets. Spending on additional staff and IT is said to be due to growth. As Northland's population grows, so will the NRC's rating base. Growth in headcount and support services should be limited to the underlying growth of the region. Indeed, a growing population will spread existing fixed costs over a broader base.
NONE OF THE ABOVE		
Mr Guy Wilson	LTP21_29	<p>Submitter disagrees with rates increases.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Tom Pasco	LTP21_64	Your present IT system appears satisfactory and new systems have glitches and are superseded very quickly. I do not support Enviroschools. This should be integrated into current curriculum and is a Government education dept issue
Bruce Mauchline	LTP21_35	By all means update IT systems but before taking on extra staff have an independent review of what duties staff perform to identify areas of duplication, inefficient processes, outdated systems. Bureaucracies are renowned for their inefficient systems and empire building. Such a review should not be undertaken by another Bureaucracy but rather management/administrative experts.
Mr Stephen Rush Environment Officer Te Runanga o Whangaroa	LTP21_67	IT systems should be up-to-date. Govt funding for major projects to be sourced and confirmed. Staffing levels to be consistent with needs and requirements. Feedback should be sought to determine work priorities for NRC. A disability strategy should be included in an overall strategic plan.

		Enviroschools should source support from Vote Education budgets not NRC. A more realistic work priority from our perspective is infrastructure to protect waterways, land and marine environments and a greater presence of monitors, kaitiaki rangers and community/environmental advisers (to help educate and advise on environmental impacts).
Kevin Pugh	LTP21_76	To access more funds from ratepayers council must demonstrate the use and purpose of it existing funding base. Redeploy existing staff to cover new projects. Do the work within the existing funding. There is too much pressure on the ratepayer now. We are not seeing the result on the ground of promises made years ago. This lot proposed will be no different.
Ms Jan Boyes Whangārei Heads Citizens Association	LTP21_117	Work within your budget.
Mr Neil Doherty	LTP21_85	Enough already. The NRC from small beginnings has grown into a huge behemoth vacuuming up ratepayer \$\$ like a black hole sucks up stars, it will never be satisfied. Power mad egos. I'm broke.
Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	There is no detailed framework in your preferred option one for Maori, I see words been used around partnership, but I have added links where cross government approach around Maori interests and Maori Participation is an preferred option. The sustainable development approach is described in section 14(h) of the LGA as: 'In performing its role, a local authority must act in accordance with the following principles: (h) in taking a sustainable development approach, a local authority shall take into account: (i) the social, economic, and cultural interests of people and communities; and (ii) the need to maintain and enhance the quality of the environment; and (iii) the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.' {staff comment: submission includes links to government websites}
Mr Richard Gardner Senior Policy Advisor Federated Farmers of NZ	LTP21_170	The rate increase must be reduced to a manageable level. Deferring this work, or at least some of it, may be one way of achieving that.
NO OPTION SELECTED		
Melanie Gatfield	LTP21_70	I am aware that councils, like any large organisations, can become too big and unmanageable, with administration costs becoming top heavy, and people doubling up on work being done while working in silos. I would like to see some lean thinking strategies incorporated into the processes that council have to perform.
Ms Sophia Xiao-Colley	LTP21_93	3. Can the current NRC staff be more effective or cooperative with the technology to reduce regular running cost?
Mr David Lourie	LTP21_173	I support the Supporting the work proposals.
Mrs Nan Pullman	LTP21_185	I support the council's suggestion to invest in IT systems, more staff and expansion of the Enviroschools programme. However, not sure we should be supporting any further development along Riverside Drive when we are talking about climate change, flooding etc.

Other decisions

Do you agree with our proposed option for Oruku Landing?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	54.39%	-	93
Agree	19.30%	35.48%	33
Disagree	25.15%	46.24%	43
Neutral	9.94%	18.28%	17
[No Response]	45.61%	-	78
Total	100.00%	100.00%	171

Ninety-three of 171 submitters responded to this question, with 33 agreeing with our proposal, 43 disagreeing, 17 neutral and 78 not selecting an option (please see note in Introduction).

Of submitters who agreed with our proposal, support was noted for the government funding this will secure, this being a valuable asset and great opportunity, a much-needed hotel/conference/international events facility, contribution to Hihiaua Cultural Centre, providing for the future and growth of Northland, the positive effects on the local economy, the synergies with existing buildings (Hihiaua, Hundertwasser), more local jobs, and this being a catalyst for further development. Concerns were raised over the loss of government funding if we don't support this.

Of submitters who disagreed with our proposal, support was noted for a vibrant meeting place in the city centre, funding going toward Hihiaua Cultural Centre, spending on things that will better serve all of Northland, and the money going towards wastewater infrastructure/cleaning up waterways/protecting the environment/climate mitigation. Concerns were raised over ratepayers funding a development that benefits private businesses, this not being regional council business or a priority, the flood/tsunami zone it's proposed within, the location further dividing the city, this being another proposal for an events centre, the proposed rates increase, that money is only going to Whangārei not the rest of the region, the limited capacity, the lack of parking, and the uncertainties of such venues considering the pandemic.

Of submitters who were neutral, support was noted for focus on the environment and climate change, sponsorship with naming rights instead, and the tangata whenua of the place deciding whether it's appropriate. Concerns were raised over the trend towards online considering the pandemic, the location away from the city centre, that individuals don't benefit and that it is funding economic development.

Of submitters who didn't chose an option, support was noted for this being funded by Whangārei residents as they get the most benefit. Concerns were raised over this not benefitting all of Northland, selling our shares in Northport, this being inappropriate and insulting to ratepayers, and the tsunami/flood zone (considering climate change).

WHAT IS YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR ORUKU LANDING?		
Name / Organisation	Reference	Comment
AGREE		
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	I already submitted to WDC's LTP consultation that I'd like to see Oruku Landing built, and I strongly support NRC's involvement and proposed contribution
Ian Reeves	LTP21_20	This contribution will secure the \$60 million grant by the government for the community; ensure a valuable asset is established for Northland; lead to a much needed hotel being developed alongside the convention centre; provide ongoing stimulus for the construction industry in Northland; ensures that conventions, which at present cannot come to Whangārei because of lack of venue and accommodation, can now do so

		to boost the tourism and retail Industries in Northland. Failure to contribute the \$14 million will lose the initial capital expenditure on the convention centre and infrastructure works contributed by the government and the Whangārei District Council totalling \$82 million (total project cost \$97 million) and lose subsequent capital expenditure for hotel, retail and commercial outlets in excess of a further \$100 million.
Jeroen Jongejans	LTP21_4	Great opportunity that would not exist with PGF \$60 million- We CANNOT afford to miss out on this- Hotel development will follow, conferences and events will significantly increase economic opportunities for our region- This is an issue that should NOT be decided by agreement/disagreement of ratepayers- it is a leadership decision issue- and the accountant ability should rest at that level.
Kim Robinson	LTP21_7	and contribute to Hihiaua Cultural Centre.
Ian Heape	LTP21_17	because Whangārei needs these facilities for future progress and if our local councils fail to support this initiative so much government funding will be lost which we can't afford to let happen
Keith Russell	LTP21_57	Oruku Landing is a great opportunity for Whangārei to boast a modern contemporary architectural development that creates its own identity. It will be a major contributor in the transformation of Whangārei city.
Camden Andrews	LTP21_59	Projects like the Oruku landing are vital for the future and growth of northland to provide a conduit to further projects that funnel revenue into a much needed economy. It is important for people to understand the business behind these developments that ultimately benefit the region in many more ways than they may be understanding.
Ben Tomason	LTP21_78	<p>All Northland councils and EDA's have tried to attract regional scale developments in the performing arts, conference and event centre space, able to cater for more than a couple of hundred people. Not only that, there are no full scale 4 star hotels in Northland, let alone ones combined with such a facility. And none that show case Northland as Oruku does on the banks of our beloved Awa.</p> <p>Oruku will be iconic locally, nationally and also internationally, like Darling harbour etc due to its careful configuration and most importantly the world class location. Oruku does not compete with Hihiaua, the synergies that will come as both projects (Oruku and Hihiaua) are realized along with Hundertwasser, completing a sustainable offering amplifying and cementing our position as a tourism and business destination. Whangārei and Northland are currently losing a lot due to these things not being in existence.</p> <p>NRC's comparatively low contribution was set by NDC with consideration that as a regional those in the Whangārei district will receive more benefit and should share more of the cost. Should Oruku be lost NRC and regional ratepayers will inevitably have to contribute a greater share in the very near future if we are to have such a facility, which is well overdue and will support the whole region. Whangārei is the regional (capital) city, its logical it holds the regional infrastructure. Oruku have been supported and encouraged by councils, NINC and the Chamber of Commerce to create opportunities, we have done what has been asked at huge personal risk. The purpose of the Northland Regional Council is to enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities and to promote the social, economic,</p>

		<p>environmental, and cultural wellbeing of communities in the present and for the future (Section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002). Oruku Landing ticks all of these boxes.</p> <p>COVID-19 is not over and the government has put \$64.34 million on the table for Oruku as part of its response, through the shovel ready programme. Theatres with retractable seating are commonplace in NZ. Oruku can do theatre despite some people wanting something more dedicated. Oruku can cater for; - Conferences - Meetings -Weddings -Corporate events - launch parties -Ballet -Opera -Dance (of all descriptions) - International conferences and events -Trade shows and exhibitions -Community gatherings -Large funerals -Awards nights -Banquets (650 pax) -Any thing flat floor (999 pax) - Seminars/ Lectures/ Wananga (750 auditoria style) NDC have blended community needs with commercial activity allowing the business case to subsidize local non-commercial use. This is because we know our rate payers want value for money and bang for buck i.e. solve many needs efficiently as possible for locals. NDC are local business people, operating small businesses, who are risking much to try and realize this for our community, hapū and kids. We know in scale for NRC this is a big decision, but we are no longer a small region and we are certainly growing, this is the cheapest it will ever be. As we have we now need you to be bold. Thankyou for your consideration.</p>
Ms Felice Croft General Manager Croft Poles and Timber	LTP21_86	This is an easy project to support as a local business and group of ratepayers. The effect on rates is minimal and far outweighs the overall benefits to the local economy (through the construction of the centre and once in use)
Owen Liiv	LTP21_149	This contribution will bring jobs, better infrastructure and more quality building to add to the Hundertwasser museum in the town basin which increases the appeal of the entire town basin/waterfront area of the city. A conference centre will also provide more space and attract organisations to hold events in Whangārei.
Ms Sarah Trass	LTP21_163	This would be so amazing. Perfect location, perfect design - it meets so many needs now and into future. Let's lift our city!
Mr Tim Robinson Bernina Northland	LTP21_175	I wish to submit in FAVOUR of support for the Oruku events centre proposed for Riverside Drive. My support is based on the following benefits: More local jobs More infrastructure More quality buildings in the region More user space for our current lack of conferences More regional awareness for our tourism industry Support of a new 4 star hotel once Oruku events centre is built. A \$250M project on our doorstep Increased waterfront appeal It is vital that NRC contributes along with WDC to enable this exciting project.
Nithin Joseph	LTP21_108	This project will create employment opportunities, building more capability and capacity to host events and thereby improving regional awareness and visitors- a new outlook for Whangārei. Good infrastructure is key to economic development. Having this said, the involved stakeholders must take into account a sustainable approach to undertake this event and consider such sources to execute the plan. Aim to strike the right balance at planning stage.
Heather Tomason	LTP21_116	2. The opportunity to reap the rewards of the Governments allocated \$60.0m grant for the betterment of Whangārei and Northland cannot be allowed to disappear. The purpose of the grant is to provide jobs during construction of The Oruku Conference and Events Centre (and once complete) through

		training, apprenticeships and also opportunities for many businesses in Whangārei through the flow on effect which will be terrific. Our region has been ignored for too long. The quality hotel will only be built if this facility is built and will fill the current void for accommodation for international events, sports teams, visitors to the Hundertwasser Events Centre and Hihiaua Cultural Centre events. This is an opportunity and a recognition by Government which cannot be let go. We need to provide for upcoming generations by creating a buoyant economy where they can live, grow and be educated and find employment.
Mr Barry Trass	LTP21_126	This is a once in a lifetime opportunity to take advantage of a \$60m government grant to build a much needed facility for our entire region that will be the catalyst for a desperately needed hotel. Together these facilities will employ over 100 people and will be a huge contributor to the regional economy. If councils don't support projects like this they will never happen and we will lag behind other regions with what we can offer to enhance our wellbeing and lifestyles.
Ms Melitza Skudder	LTP21_128	I believe this investment will benefit the whole community and is a one off opportunity
Codie McIntyre Northland Inc	LTP21_146	We agree to this option, as from an economic development perspective, we have been involved in the development of the Oruku Landing Conference and Events Centre project. It is a project within the "Visitor Industry" workstream of the Tai Tokerau Northland Economic Action Plan, signifying that its development is likely to contribute to the transformation and strengthening of the Northland economy. It also helps to support a key action in the Tai Tokerau Northland Destination Management Plan, as it will be an enabler in attracting private investment into both accommodation and further attractions that will create new jobs, appeal to both a domestic and international audience and support greater regional dispersal. Overall, this development represents an exciting opportunity for Northland. However, it is important to note the interdependency that exists between this initiative and the development of the Hotel and other privately funded infrastructure that exists as part of the wider opportunity- ultimately the biggest win for Northland is if they are all completed together. Considering, the development of the Oruku Landing Conference and Events Centre is an enabler for the wider project, whereby its development will catalyse further private investment of up to \$129 million for a hotel, apartment, carpark, and marina development, resulting in a total combined development value of circa \$222 million. Overall, the economic impact of the total development is estimated at \$377 million, with new money of \$30 million injected into the Northland economy over the first 5 years of operation. In the short-term, during construction, jobs for up to 250 contractors will be created. After 5 years of operation, the combined development is expected to create 123 Full Time Equivalent jobs, with 58 directly attributable to the Conference and Events Centre.
Mr Kevin Jenkins	LTP21_160	Necessary facility - close to the CBD
Ms Janet Trass	LTP21_162	This is an opportunity that Whangārei must take advantage of. Getting \$60 million from the Government is incredible and to be able to build much needed facilities this must happen. This will then bring a desperately needed hotel to Whangārei. These facilities/hotel etc will bring employment to the Whangārei people and will be an enormous boost to our areas economy.

		If this is not supported and doesn't happen, I'm concerned this will not happen again and our region will miss out so much and we will lag behind other region again.
DISAGREE		
Nathan Read	LTP21_6	Ratepayers already funded the construction and ongoing losses from one events centre. Ratepayers should not be funding another events centre so that the developers and operators of the adjoining hotel can make profits. If you want this development I suggest a targeted rate on those who will directly benefit. i.e. The developers and operators of the adjoining hotel.
Ms Annemarie Florian	LTP21_18	It's not the Council's job to go chasing after promised pots of gold at the end of private business rainbows. Furthermore, those promised pots of gold are nonetheless public monies which should not be used to line the pockets of a few sleight-of-hand realtors and developers. Upcoming changes to the RMA will require councils to plan for removal from coastline and river flood zones. This especially does not appear to have been factored into council thinking. What Whangārei needs is a vibrant meeting place right in the city centre, not an add-on to somebody else's business project on the wrong side of the river, within a designated flood-risk zone. As the main city in Te Tai Tokerau, our collective rights over social hubs are particularly important for us to hold onto. Any publicly owned and managed cultural centre should be built and maintained as a public asset.
Mrs Jan Pirihi	LTP21_24	We need ONE events centre - decide which one and build it to allow concerts etc to come to the town. We are the poor relations for international events and performances.
Mr Guy Wilson	LTP21_29	Submitter disagrees with rates increases. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Debbie Raphael	LTP21_60	This build is for Whangārei with money only going to Whangārei so should be funded by Whangārei. The \$14m would cover all the more expensive options elsewhere in the LTP
Melanie Gatfield	LTP21_70	"Oruku Landing conference and events centre "Great idea, but should be independently viable. Don't contribute from NRC
Chris Claydon	LTP21_11	A conference and events centre should be self-funding if it is managed properly. Management should present a business plan to a bank and borrow the funds required, pay it back from revenue (venue hire, ticket sales) when operating. 14M sounds expensive. Find a more economical way to build the centre (cut council red tape such as resource consent which is a major cost of such ventures)
Maggie Buxton	LTP21_15	No contribution should be made to this project. You should consider diverting this money to Hihiaua Cultural Centre who are a true regional asset and will be inclusive.
Pamela Stevens	LTP21_23	This should be available to Hihiaua Cultural Centre which has an increasing role in our diverse community and has been an option for a very long time. The Oruku Landing is in the wrong location and maybe a nice to have in the future when other sites are considered. It needs to be located where it will revitalise the city centre not divide it .The private enterprise hotel development may not go ahead if tourist levels to not return or there is anxiety over the site being flood prone due to Climate change .Our younger generation are very climate aware and in the future large conferences maybe conducted on

		line in preference . A performance theatre alongside the Forum North/Civic Centre redevelopment has been considered for a very long time and has a detailed business model.
Bruce Mauchline	LTP21_35	<p>Submitter disagrees with the proposal, as it should have been built on the Whangārei RSA site on a larger scale. Submitter discusses other alternatives, and raises concerns about the size of the proposal, parking, lack of demand, and flood and tsunami zoning.</p> <p>Raises concern about councils being involved in commercial enterprises, and liability for cost overruns and management.</p> <p>Discusses other current options in Whangārei.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Mr Stephen Rush Environment Officer Te Runanga o Whangaroa	LTP21_67	This is not a regional council matter. Whangārei District council should raise these funds or seek central Govt funding. User pays.
Geoff Sharples	LTP21_73	<p>The money is coming from regular people in 3 ways. Taxes they pay to central government, rates they pay to WDC and rates they pay to NRC. At the end of the day regular people are being asked to pay for a conference centre that will (1) be built at sea level and therefore be at risk of flooding, Tsunami and sea-level rise - this will make the region less resilient, (2) will be for people mostly from out of town and (3) will lead to surge over capacity of flights, hotels, restaurants etc followed by other weeks of no activity. It will cost a lot more at the end of the day to build the supporting infrastructure. IT will increase the carbon footprint because folks will be flying in and out or driving in and out for a 3 days conference. In fact at 2,000 people per conference, 50 weeks at year it would be moving the entire population of WDC in and out of the area each year. That is a massive carbon footprint addition. The climate change action plan will very likely tell us that this was a really bad idea. It will be exclusive (4 star hotel and private marina) which goes against WDC's vision of inclusion. The few low paying jobs it offers are minor compensation to the community. It is a monument to a bygone era. Post Covid conference centres are white elephants. If it's such a great commercial idea then a commercial entity should do it. There are much better alternative uses of these funds. Please don't fund more stuff being built at sea-level. We could do a lot of river clean up, estuary restoration, weed eradication and bike paths for \$14M</p>
Mr Peter Doel	LTP21_95	Don't you dare scam us again like you have with the Rugby Stadium / Events Centre.
Harata Waetford	LTP21_97	Have NDC supply fitout.
Paul Mcdonald	LTP21_109	While this is a good project there are greater priorities which are not funded. A tough choice but nrc ought to focus on its environmental role. Perhaps nrc could broker some support from another funder to assist.
Jessie McVeagh	LTP21_137	Send the money on things that will better serve all of us and our areas. Regeneration and restoration of our environment and community resilience across the region are where the money should go.
Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	Due to their is no sustainable development option in this LTP NRC approach where it is described in under section 14(h) of the LGA as: 'In performing its role, a local authority must act in accordance with the following principles: (h) in taking a sustainable development approach, a local authority shall take into account: (l) the social, economic, and cultural interests of

		people and communities; and (ii) the need to maintain and enhance the quality of the environment; and (iii) the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.' Examples below... {staff comment: submission includes links to government websites}
C Cotton	LTP21_81	The NRC tsunami map shows this area to be in the orange zone. I am concerned about so much money being invested into an at risk area when many of our larger buildings are already in this zone. e.g. Semenoff Stadium, the cricket building, Hunderwasser and Hihiaua Cultural Centre.
Mr Neil Doherty	LTP21_85	Another white elephant.
Calvin Green	LTP21_136	we should not be funding a commercial activity without a stake. it is not a project born of community need or wants. 14 million for a fitout is clearly extravagant and without merit. the community has stated quite clearly that it wants a performance theatre based at forum north. where does one find the background supporting information, i.e. the northland inc supporting documents? the community consultation documents. WDC has done a consultation and paid close to 100k to be advised that the preferred location for such a project is at forum north, not riverside drive. please access that document. the forum north trust has put together an excellent project document supported by architectural drawings, a quantity surveyed pricing and total northland wide community consultation. please go to www.forumnorthtrust.org.nz . the total cost for a 850 seat theatre will be 35 million. Oruku landing will cost the public 100 million for something that is not needed nor requested by the community. nrc has a commercial wing that invests with a commercial orientation and I believe do so positively. oruku landing will give a wdc debt and the public a debt for years to come.
Ms Janine McVeagh	LTP21_140	I would far rather see that amount of money going into waste water infrastructure across the region! And riparian planting and other real on-the-ground projects.
Richard Morris	LTP21_142	The proposed convention centre will add significantly to both Whangārei District Council and Regional Council rates. It will also put the risk that the centre is not financially viable onto ratepayers. The region should aim for one iconic feature every decade or so. With the Hundertwasser Art Centre nearing completion, the region should pay down some of the associated debt and not jump straight into another major project. The partial availability of central government capital funding does not make the project essential or viable.
Ms Erica Clue	LTP21_152	Regarding the long term plan I think money could be better spent than on a conference centre. Cleaning up waterways and protecting the environment should be priorities of this council. We can't afford to be complacent about this.
Mr Peter Nerney	LTP21_155	I wish to register my opinion regarding the funding of the proposed convention centre on Riverside Dr. I feel the centre is a waste of money and do not support it. I would prefer the money be spent on environmental and climate change mitigation.
Nora Shayeb	LTP21_192	I do NOT support the NRC contributing to the Oruku Landing conference and events centre. Firstly, there are other venues that already cover the need of our community for such places. Secondly, there is a great uncertainty on how the Covid 19 pandemic will affect public gatherings in the future. In the lockdown periods conferences were held very successfully and

		<p>sustainably online. This made it very clear that using modern technology for conferences will be the most environmentally friendly and cost-efficient method in the future. Not only is this removing the adverse effects of fossil fuel driven travelling on the environment, but it will minimise the biosecurity risks of translocating pathogens of any kind.</p> <p>{Staff comment: please see full submission for more information}</p>
NEUTRAL		
Robyn Skerten	LTP21_22	<p>Unsure, insufficient knowledge, but perhaps with Covid and a trend more so to online conferences, NRC might be better to focus on the environment and climate change, perhaps this internal fit out could be funded elsewhere. I do think Whangārei will benefit from a project such as Oruku Landing, the location enhancing our waterways, state of the art conference centre and accommodation to bring more visitors which we need especially now after Covid...</p>
Val Scott	LTP21_58	<p>After Covid and growth of Zoom I question whether we need a conference centre aside from the stadium. At least one proposed hotel development here will not proceed and business may not end up building an hotel by the Landing. In addition, a shopping development there will do nothing for re-vitalizing the city centre nor for local shoppers. While taking the Government money is attractive, will the NRC funding be a good, long term investment or will it become a white elephant?</p>
Tom Pasco	LTP21_64	<p>If sponsorship can be found with naming rights this pathway should be taken.</p>
Laurie Copland	LTP21_28	<p>How do I benefit from this? so why am I paying?</p>
Ms Jan Boyes Whangārei Heads Citizens Association	LTP21_117	<p>Funding economic development</p>
Kelly Maxwell	LTP21_120	<p>We wish to comment on Biodiversity & Biosecurity only.</p>
Dallas King	LTP21_148	<p>The whenua at Oruku is significant. It is for the tangata whenua of that place to decide if the proposal is appropriate.</p>
NO OPTION SELECTED		
Mr Owen Stevens	LTP21_52	<p>Greetings from Pahi; all your plans seem sound to me. I ask NRC to stick to the Knitting & not get involved in Oruku Landing Conf. & events centre. Please remember your decisions should have all of Northland in mind. Whangārei has done very well thankyou with NRC. financial support for the Okara stadium which through NRC. rates we are still paying for Whangārei. I for one have never had a benefit from the stadium, with no reason to set foot in the place. Please do not entertain selling our shares in Northport</p>
Leslie Bell	LTP21_151	<p>One truly unnecessary "want" by the Council is the funding of a "fit-out" of the Oruku Conference Centre, which it appears would be from borrowing. This is not only inappropriate but also a gross insult to ratepayers. The Council will own NO asset, just put up the money - at the ratepayers cost - for many years to come. The Oruku Centre will be a privately owned property and Council should not be allowed to contribute to a private ownership property at ratepayers expense. IT IS NOT AN ASSET. My suggestion to council is: Collect nothing for the Oruku Centre and leave it to private enterprise to fund it.</p>

Mr David Lourie	LTP21_173	Oruku Landing. Not happy with the site being in a tsunami and sea level rise hazard zone. I can't see how ratepayers benefit from the proposal.
Mrs Nan Pullman	LTP21_185	I support the council's suggestion to invest in IT systems, more staff and expansion of the Enviroschools programme. However, not sure we should be supporting any further development along Riverside Drive when we are talking about climate change, flooding etc.
Mr Harold Robinson	LTP21_168	Our view is the Whangārei residents will be the big users of this plan and also get the most benefit, so the cost should be theirs to fund.

Do you agree with our proposed option for funding economic development?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	54.97%	-	94
Agree	26.90%	48.94%	46
Disagree	14.62%	26.60%	25
Neutral	13.45%	24.47%	23
[No Response]	45.03%	-	77
Total	100.00%	100.00%	171

Ninety-four of 171 submitters responded to this question, with 46 agreeing with our proposal, 25 disagreeing, 23 neutral and 77 not selecting an option (please see note in Introduction).

Of submitters who agreed with our proposal, support was noted for this projecting a more positive image, focus on wellbeing outcomes, the development of Pioneer Park into a multi-sport centre, this opening the discussion for greater opportunities than just “infrastructure”, the ongoing contribution to the Investment and Growth Reserve more secure over the long term plus providing a larger portion of funding to this, and providing clarity over what the funds can be used for. Concerns were raised over the lack of advocacy for Māori economic development.

Of submitters who disagreed with our proposal, support was noted for improving sewerage and greywater infrastructure, being people-focused and promoting wellbeing, community investment (as opposed to an economic development fund) and putting social/cultural/environmental wellbeing first (including Treaty relationships and Climate Change). Concerns were raised over protecting the rate for infrastructure needs, the costs involved with changing the name, the funding going towards activities that ratepayers can’t afford to be part of, and there being no framework for Māori.

Of submitters who were neutral, support was noted for leaving economic growth to private enterprises. Concerns were raised over the proposed rates increase.

Of submitters who didn’t chose an option, support was noted for improved efficiency and economic development in the region, and upholding GMO precautions. Concerns were raised over council funding private businesses through Northland Inc.

WHAT IS YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR FUNDING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT?		
Name / Organisation	Reference	Comment
AGREE		
Ian Heape	LTP21_17	because it projects a more positive image
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	I'd welcome an increased focus on wellbeing outcomes, in line with central government's wellbeing framework, rather than mere economic/GDP growth
Chris Fife	LTP21_10	Please see attached submission. Submitter outlines plans for the development of Pioneer Park complex and facilities into a multi sport centre and seeks allocation of funding from the Regional sporting facilities rate. {Staff summary; please see original submission}
Ian Reeves	LTP21_20	Make sense
Mr Rihari Dargaville Chairman Ngati Manawa Hapū	LTP21_105	Very Little if any is advocated for Maori Economic development, this needs to be more focused around Maori economic development relevant to the Kaitiakitanga operations of the hapū responsibility in maintaining te taioa

		(environment) and the health of the water, or water bodies in their respective rohe
Ms Sarah Trass	LTP21_163	Opens the discussion for greater opportunities rather than feeling limited to "infrastructure". Economic Development entails so much more.
Kirsty Edmonds	LTP21_144	No need to re-name
Codie McIntyre Northland Inc	LTP21_146	<p>We agree with the proposed changes to the way that economic development activities are funded. By changing the name of the "Regional Infrastructure Rate" to the "Regional Economic Development Rate" and allowing a proportion of economic development activity to be funded through a targeted rate, we believe it makes the ongoing contribution to the Investment and Growth Reserve more secure over the long term.</p> <p>The renaming of the "Community Investment Fund" to the "Economic Development Reserve" in our view, is a positive move from Council as it provides more clarity around what the existing fund can be used for. However, it is noted in the finer details that the Investment and Growth Reserve will only be funded from gains made from the Community Infrastructure Fund and we hope that Council will remain open to using more than just the gains from this fund to contribute to the Investment and Growth Reserve and subsequently Northland Inc's operations.</p> <p>Northland Regional Council has identified "a strong and sustainable regional outcome" as one of six strategic outcomes that underpin this Long Term Plan and will contribute to achieving the vision of "Our Northland- Together we Thrive." From our perspective there is room for a larger proportion of funding that will be collected from the Regional Economic Development Rate and the Economic Development Reserve to be put towards the Investment and Growth Reserve and subsequently Northland Inc's operational funding to better support regional economic development.</p> <p>{staff note: full submission sets out a comparative analysis of economic development and tourism funding, nationally.}</p> <p>For Northland Inc, having more long-term security in regards to operational funding, much like any business, aids in forecasting, budgeting, continuity of service delivery and job security for staff over longer periods. This security would enable Northland Inc to build and maintain better relationships with its stakeholders, operate with greater efficiency and effectiveness when executing programs and continue to deliver transformational outcomes for Northland. Based upon this, we urge Council as a shareholder, to consider contributing more to the Investment and Growth Reserve overtime so that the overall contribution to Northland Inc is more on par with other Economic Development Agencies and Regional Tourism Organisations across New Zealand.</p>
DISAGREE		
Bruce Mauchline	LTP21_35	What's in a name - it is the purpose that is relevant.
Mr Stephen Rush Environment Officer Te Runanga o Whangaroa	LTP21_67	We want to protect our infrastructure rate for infrastructure needs!!! Help support district councils to improve sewerage and greywater infrastructure that impacts on our waterways, harbours and coastal environments.
Ms Annemarie Florian	LTP21_18	The primary focus of council policy on material sources of well-being (economic growth etc) is not delivering what people care about (environmental quality, social connections, and the

		absence of poverty). Councils need to rethink policy priorities to be people-focused and promote well-being.
Mrs Jan Pirihi	LTP21_24	Why do we need a new name which would involve costs in stationery, signs etc.?
Tom Pasco	LTP21_64	This funding is for infrastructure not community support programmes. Keep the same name and avoid costs
C Cotton	LTP21_81	Keep infrastructure rates for infrastructure needs. Help the councils with sewerage infrastructure that affects our waterways, harbours and coastal areas.
Mr Neil Doherty	LTP21_85	Why? Change names, change rolls - add more to the agenda?
Calvin Green	LTP21_136	community investment is exactly what northland needs. not an economic development fund. the latter is basically a business capture with a pure focus on business initiatives...not the community. it is an old outdated model and is based on a theory coming out of the usa in the time of reagonomics. it has not proven to be a valid theory. northland ink is an excellent example of an outdated business model that merely serves to channel as much government money it can access into business. business does not equal community.
Ms Janine McVeagh	LTP21_140	Infrastructure upgrade is badly needed - all those waste water systems that need to be land-based for a start. We need the foundations set right first.
Geoff Sharples	LTP21_73	It doesn't matter what you call it. Funding the Hundertwasser centre and visitor centre is less economic development and more building nice stuff for wealthy folk to enjoy. Folks who are choosing between paying rates, energy bill, food or medicine probably are not too pleased to see the funding go to these activities. The same folks who are supposed to be getting a subsidized water tank are paying for an art gallery.
Mr Peter Doel	LTP21_95	You are stealing ratepayer funds and giving it to loss making enterprises run by your community pets.
Harata Waetford	LTP21_97	Must keep regional infrastructure stand-alone. Do not co-mingle. There is already funds committed to economic and wellbeing and communications.
Jessie McVeagh	LTP21_137	Names need to reflect the values- all economic development needs to put social, cultural and environmental wellbeing first, including Treaty relationships and Climate Change. Too often when economic development is seen as the focus these important aspects are compromised.
Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	There is no detailed framework in your preferred option one for Maori, I see words been used around wellbeing and Community, but I have added links where cross government approach around Maori interests and Maori Participation is an preferred option including Funding for Economic Development in co management arrangements. Government Guidelines... The sustainable development approach is described in section 14(h) of the LGA as: 'In performing its role, a local authority must act in accordance with the following principles: (h) in taking a sustainable development approach, a local authority shall take into account: (i) the social, economic, and cultural interests of people and communities; and (ii) the need to maintain and enhance the quality of the environment; and (iii)the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.' {staff comment: submission includes links to government websites}
NEUTRAL		

Laurie Copland	LTP21_28	I don't care what you call it, Government should only provide infrastructure leave economic growth to private enterprise Don't over rate them
Robyn Skerten	LTP21_22	Insufficient knowledge
Mr Guy Wilson	LTP21_29	Submitter disagrees with rates increases. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Michael Bowker	LTP21_118	Just Hot Air
Kelly Maxwell	LTP21_120	We wish to comment on Biodiversity & Biosecurity only.
Kevin Pugh	LTP21_76	No matter what you call it. Its the purpose and funding level that must meet ratepayer ability. That has been seriously reduced due to redundancies and lack of tourism and economic growth in the north. Both NDC and NRC are planning huge rate hikes. You are introducing a situation where more will resort to applying for rating relief. That means less money in to councils. Its a no brainer.
Dean Baigent-Mercer	LTP21_145	Many of the regional economic development of Far North holdings is not supported by the community or without being informed by hapū or community. This leads to unnecessary conflicts. Far North Holdings need to have sustainability, changing climate resilience and community will at its heart, not have a solely economic driver.
Nora Shayeb	LTP21_192	Don't know enough about it. {Staff comment: please see full submission for more information}
NO OPTION SELECTED		
Mr David Lourie	LTP21_173	I don't support NRC funding private businesses through Northland Inc. Financial support businesses should be outside of the councils scope.
Mr Jon Muller Secretary GE Free New Zealand	LTP21_191	"We note that you are consulting on a new structure, Northland Inc., which includes the Far North and Kaipara District Councils with Whangārei having an option to opt in. It is hoped that this will improve efficiency and economic development in the region. We support this body and ask that it will uphold GMO precautions and consistency within the region." {staff summary; please see original submission}
Mr Harold Robinson	LTP21_168	We note there is no mention in your plan of anything being invested in Kaipara. Are we the forgotten west side of Northland.

Do you agree with our proposed option on changes to rates?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	53.80%	-	92
Agree	26.32%	48.91%	45
Disagree	16.37%	30.43%	28
Neutral	11.11%	20.65%	19
[No Response]	46.20%	-	79
Total	100.00%	100.00%	171

Ninety-two of 171 submitters responded to this question, with 46 agreeing with our proposal, 28 disagreeing, 19 neutral and 79 not selecting an option (please see note in Introduction).

Of submitters who agreed with our proposal, support was noted for this projecting a more positive image and renaming the rates.

Of submitters who disagreed with our proposal, support was noted for maintaining the distinction between land and freshwater management rates. Concerns were raised over these things being trivial, that this it is hiding increased costs, that combined rates are not the best for transparency, and there being no framework for Māori.

Of submitters who were neutral, concerns were raised over the this being re-marketing and packaging so that rates can be diverted.

Of submitters who didn't chose an option, only one comment stated to rate for what was needed and do the work.

WHAT IS YOUR PREFERRED OPTION ON CHANGES TO RATES?		
Name / Organisation	Reference	Comment
AGREE		
Ian Heape		because it projects a more positive image
Mr Oliver Krollmann		No objections or suggestions
Codie McIntyre Northland Inc		We agree with the renaming of the "regional infrastructure rate" to the "regional economic development rate".
DISAGREE		
Laurie Copland	LTP21_28	Maintain the distinction between land and freshwater management rates, these are different!!! Why change the name? What does 'expand the purpose of this rate slightly' mean?
Bruce Mauchline	LTP21_35	Here again, why do we need new names? If the activities are being successfully managed the names are trivial.
Mr Stephen Rush Environment Officer Te Runanga o Whangaroa	LTP21_67	Purpose of this rate should not be expanded as this would open it up to being used for purposes not agreed to by ratepayers
Mrs Jan Pirihi	LTP21_24	If it's doing the same job why rename
Tom Pasco	LTP21_64	See above.
C Cotton	LTP21_81	Land management should be kept separate the same as water management then we can see what it is all costing. This rate is rated on land value not on per rating assessment. It is very

		expensive on farm land. The increase in amalgamating is too high. increasing 30% more than last year.
Mr Neil Doherty	LTP21_85	Regional economic development is basically a business capture of public funds. regional infrastructure does not equate necessarily to economic development as proposed by northland inc.
Fiona King	LTP21_134	Just hiding increased costs.
Calvin Green	LTP21_136	I don't trust you. We need to remember that council is arrogant, self-serving and deceitful.
Kevin Pugh	LTP21_76	Want to see separation between CC and CD/hazard money. CC is not an emergency
Mr Peter Doel	LTP21_95	Combined rates aren't the best for transparency - people actually like to see funds not too combined to make sure each area gets its fair share
Harata Waetford	LTP21_97	Will combining the land and freshwater management rates mean less increase in rates? Will this mean we get a discount on rates?
Ms Jan Boyes Whangārei Heads Citizens Association	LTP21_117	Infrastructure should be kept as the name, as it reflects the importance of investing in our infrastructure.
Louise Mischewski	LTP21_121	There is no detailed framework in your option one for Maori, I see regional economic development rate, where is the Maori interests in that modelling, I have added links where cross government approach around Maori interests and Maori Participation is an preferred option also of the LSF of Treasury. The sustainable development approach is described in section 14(h) of the LGA as: 'In performing its role, a local authority must act in accordance with the following principles: (h) in taking a sustainable development approach, a local authority shall take into account: (i) the social, economic, and cultural interests of people and communities; and (ii) the need to maintain and enhance the quality of the environment; and (iii) the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.' {staff comment: Links to websites provided}
Jessie McVeagh	LTP21_137	Maintain the distinction between land and freshwater management rates, these are different!!! Why change the name? What does 'expand the purpose of this rate slightly' mean?
Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	Here again, why do we need new names? If the activities are being successfully managed the names are trivial.
NEUTRAL		
Robyn Skerten	LTP21_22	Insufficient knowledge
Mr Guy Wilson	LTP21_29	Submitter disagrees with rates increases. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Kelly Maxwell	LTP21_120	We wish to comment on Biodiversity & Biosecurity only.
Geoff Sharples	LTP21_73	This just sounds like remarketing and packaging so that rates can be diverted.
Nora Shayeb	LTP21_192	Don't know enough about it.
NO OPTION SELECTED		
Michael Bowker	LTP21_118	Rate what is needed, and do the work.

Do you agree with our proposed option on reviewing financial reserves?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	53.22%	-	91
Agree	26.90%	50.55%	46
Disagree	13.45%	25.27%	23
Neutral	12.87%	24.18%	22
[No Response]	46.78%	-	80
Total	100.00%	100.00%	171

Ninety-one of 171 submitters responded to this question, with 46 agreeing with our proposal, 23 disagreeing, 22 neutral and 80 not selecting an option (please see note in Introduction).

Of submitters who agreed with our proposal, support was noted for no funding to be given to private investment or development, the name change accurately reflecting the proposed use of the fund, and Northland Inc. being involved in the formation of the process to access the fund and either be consulted or included as part of the decision-making process. Concerns were raised over this fund having the potential to duplicate an existing Northland Regional Council fund that Northland Inc administers access to.

Of submitters who disagreed with our proposal, support was noted for priority to water and sewerage / electric car and boat charging points and maintaining the infrastructure rate.

Concerns were raised over compromising infrastructural needs for economic gain, the proposed rates increase, the broadening of the name meaning it opens to funding not agreed to by ratepayers, and there being no framework for Māori.

Of submitters who were neutral, supported was noted for infrastructure across the region to be prioritised above projects focused on economic development.

Of submitters who didn't chose an option, no comments were received.

WHAT IS YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR REVIEWING FINANCIAL RESERVES?		
Name / Organisation	Reference	Comment
AGREE		
Maggie Buxton	LTP21_15	No funding should be given to private investment or development.
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	No objections or suggestions
Codie McIntyre Northland Inc	LTP21_146	<p>We agree with the changes that Council are proposing to make to the current Infrastructure Investment Fund Reserve and believe the name change accurately reflects the proposed use of the fund. By broadening the scope of the reserve to allow it to be utilised for investment in joint infrastructure projects with other key actors, it will allow the region to be better positioned to both attract and secure inward investment into important infrastructure projects.</p> <p>We therefore commend the Council on being forward thinking and bold in proposing these changes and think that in this current environment, where co-investment is often required, that it is a change that will positively affect the region. However, Northland Inc, as both the Regional Tourism Organisation and Economic Development Agency for the region, request that we be involved in the formation of the process to access the fund and either be consulted or included as part of the decision making process. Northland Inc has proven itself as a key facilitator and resource through which economic development projects and opportunities, especially</p>

		those relating to infrastructure, are able to find and secure access to the most appropriate means of funding once investment ready. In the past Northland Inc have also managed similar funds successfully and feel that as one of our work activities in our Statement of Intent 2021/22-2023/24 agreed upon by Northland Regional Council, as well as others is to, "Support and facilitate the development of new and enabling infrastructure," we should be providing strategic oversight to this decision making process and potentially have a staff member(s) whose role would be to facilitate access to this new proposed fund. One of the risks that we see with this fund is that it has the potential to duplicate an existing Northland Regional Council Fund that Northland Inc administers access to- The "Enabling Investment Fund." In 2018, Northland Regional Council introduced this fund by reducing the original scope of the Investment & Growth Reserve and in its current form, the purpose of this fund "is to provide funding for projects that lift the economic performance of Northland through the construction of public or community held infrastructure that underpins economic growth or the development of regionally strategic sectors". Projects that have been supported/funded out of this fund include ones that relate to water storage and water resilience issues, which the "Regional Project Reserve" is proposing to fund moving forward.
DISAGREE		
Chris Claydon	LTP21_11	Fund earmarked for infrastructure should be spend on infrastructure. Priority should be water and sewerage, electric car charging points, electric boat charging points.
Bruce Mauchline	LTP21_35	What's in a name - it is the purpose that is relevant
Mr Stephen Rush Environment Officer Te Runanga o Whangaroa	LTP21_67	This should stay put as a fund for Infrastructure Investment as mentioned above. There seems to be a drive towards economic concerns in this LTP plan. There are proposals to change funds from Infrastructure purposes to economic purposes, e.g. Regional Economic Development Rate. Economic Development Reserve. Regional Project Reserve We strongly oppose compromising infrastructural needs for economic gain.
Nathan Read	LTP21_6	Concentrate on environmental monitoring, if past experience is anything to go by NRC makes bad investment decisions that cost ratepayers money.
Mrs Jan Pirihi	LTP21_24	Another new name! For what purpose?
Mr Guy Wilson	LTP21_29	Submitter disagrees with rates increases. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Tom Pasco	LTP21_64	To broaden purpose of this fund would open it up to funding not agreed to by ratepayers
C Cotton	LTP21_81	NRC should provide and maintain infrastructure.
Geoff Sharples	LTP21_73	Seems like this is being done so that funds can be spent on a much broader range of projects.
Kevin Pugh	LTP21_76	As per above
Mr Peter Doel	LTP21_95	Give all the money back to ratepayers and stop mis-appropriating it! Did I mention deceitful?
Harata Waetford	LTP21_97	Must use the \$21m to invest in our infrastructure. There are many opportunities in infrastructure in Northland to use these funds. Why do you have \$21m in the fund?

Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	There is no detailed framework in your option for Maori, I see regional Project Reserve what is its purpose, where is the Maori interests in that purpose, I have added links where cross government approach around Maori interests and Maori Participation is an preferred option also of the LSF of Treasury. The sustainable development approach is described in section 14(h) of the LGA as: 'In performing its role, a local authority must act in accordance with the following principles: (h) in taking a sustainable development approach, a local authority shall take into account: (i) the social, economic, and cultural interests of people and communities; and (ii) the need to maintain and enhance the quality of the environment; and (iii) the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.' {submission includes links to government websites}
NEUTRAL		
Robyn Skerten	LTP21_22	Insufficient knowledge
Mr Neil Doherty	LTP21_85	Not
Kelly Maxwell	LTP21_120	We wish to comment on Biodiversity & Biosecurity only.
Jessie McVeagh	LTP21_137	As long as our infrastructure across the region is prioritised above projects that are focused mainly on economic development.

Do you agree with our proposed option on updates to policies?

	% Total	% Answer	Count
Number of Responses	51.46%	-	88
Agree	25.15%	48.86%	43
Disagree	8.19%	15.91%	14
Neutral	18.13%	35.23%	31
[No Response]	48.54%	-	83
Total	100.00%	100.00%	171

Eighty-eight of 171 submitters responded to this question, with 43 agreeing with our proposal, 14 disagreeing, 31 neutral and 83 not selecting an option (please see note in Introduction).

Of submitters who agreed with our proposal, support was noted for fostering Māori participation, and land use policies/anything associated with this being updated to reflect respect for the mauri of Aotearoa. Concerns were raised over this not doing enough to ensure tangata whenua are able to be active in the decision-making end of council processes.

Of submitters who disagreed with our proposal, support was noted for doing a better job implementing policies instead of rewriting them, and only improving policies. Concerns were raised over there being no framework for Māori.

Of submitters who were neutral, one comment raised concerns about what council is not telling us.

Of submitters who didn't chose an option, concerns were raised about the effective "back door" process of amalgamation with FNDC and other district organisations, through Northland Inc, and not being able to find the full reasons for council's proposed policies.

WHAT IS YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR UPDATES TO POLICIES?		
Name / Organisation	Reference	Comment
AGREE		
Pamela Stevens	LTP21_23	Foster Maori participation.
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	No objections or suggestions
Dallas King	LTP21_148	A step in the right direction but it doesn't do enough to ensure tangata whenua are able to be active in the decision making end of council processes.
Nora Shayeb	LTP21_192	I believe that the land use policies and anything associated with this should be updated to reflect respect for the mauri of Aotearoa {Staff comment: please see full submission for more information}
DISAGREE		
Chris Claydon	LTP21_11	Sounds like a waste of time. Do a better job of implementing policies instead of rewriting them.
Mrs Jan Pirihi	LTP21_24	Some policies may need updating but only if there is improvement.
Kevin Pugh	LTP21_76	As per above
Mr Peter Doel	LTP21_95	Leave them alone. You will only be achieving something underhand by changing them. Remember arrogant, self-serving and deceitful.
Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	There is no detailed framework in your option for Maori policy making, where is the Maori interests in within these plans, I have added links where cross government approach around

		<p>Maori interests and Maori Participation is an preferred option also of the LSF of Treasury. The sustainable development approach is described in section 14(h) of the LGA as: 'In performing its role, a local authority must act in accordance with the following principles: (h) in taking a sustainable development approach, a local authority shall take into account: (i) the social, economic, and cultural interests of people and communities; and (ii) the need to maintain and enhance the quality of the environment; and (iii) the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.'</p> <p>{staff comment: submission includes links to government websites}</p>
NEUTRAL		
Mr Neil Doherty	LTP21_85	The question is do we believe politicians - I don't. Not what you tell us so much as what you are not telling us.
Kelly Maxwell	LTP21_120	We wish to comment on Biodiversity & Biosecurity only.
NO OPTION SELECTED		
Ms Linda Kaye	LTP21_174	7. On "updates to policies", I am so disappointed that you are effectively engaging in a "back door" process of amalgamation with FNDC and other district organisations, through Northland Inc. We, the people, made very clear that we do not want this amalgamation. Shame on you, is all I can say.
Mr Michael Wrightson	LTP21_186	Submitter raises concern that they could not find the full reason for the council's proposed policies.

Other comments

Regional Sporting Facilities

Name / Organisation	Reference	Comments
Shane Knowler	LTP21_33	Yes, a document from Te Araroa Northland Trust TANT to support our submission. Submitter outlines benefits, support, and request's in relation to Te Araroa Northland Trust, including "An ongoing annual contribution to TANT for Te Araroa track sections within the Region as part of the Long Term Plan for activities associated with Natural Environment." {Staff summary; please see original submission}
Mr Brent Eastwood Chief Executive Sport Northland	LTP21_50	Submitter acknowledges their partnership with council, and supports the continuation of the Regional Sporting Facilities Rate past 2021, for the benefit of the regionally prioritised projects. Acknowledges that council has been a key stakeholder in development of Kokiri ai Te Waka Hourua, and discusses this strategy. Encourages council to use the 'specific spaces and places' pillar of the strategy in continuation of the rate. Submitter is interested in working with NRC to help increase utilisation of the natural environment through play and active recreation activities. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Ms Arwen Page Development Officer Bike Northland	LTP21_98	Submission raises the management of growth and alternative transport options as key issues in Northland. Submission seeks funding for Bike Northland to actively pursue the development of alternative transport. Submission seeks shared funding from local government organisations for a three year term, \$35,000 of this from NRC, to provide industry representation, leadership and stewardship to develop Northland's biking infrastructure for recreational and commuter activities. Benefits and specifics of the proposal are included in the submission. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Grant Harrison	LTP21_72	Northland Volleyball Association are very enthusiastic to develop a Regional Volleyball Training Centre at Ruakaka within the Ruakaka Recreation Facility Volleyball NZ has endorsed this project and will undertake to direct national activity to the regional training centre reducing the cost for Northlanders to be involved in their sport This development will be staged to include both Beach Volleyball and Indoor Volleyball facilities Volleyball is increasing in its popularity and the recent Beach Volleyball NZ championships held at Ruakaka drew many visitors to the region The regional training Centre is being designed to be multi-purpose - with other sports codes being able to make use of the facility.eg turbo touch and netball {Staff comment: further details included in attached submission}.
Mr Brent Sheldrake Regional Partnership Manager Sport New Zealand	LTP21_51	Submission acknowledges the importance of councils' contribution to Sport NZ, and urges continued support and investment in the play, active recreation, and sport sector, and notes that without this community spaces will be compromised. Submission notes the significant positive impact of the Regional Sporting Facilities Rate over the last three years. Submission notes the impact of covid-19 on inequality, and on the recreation/sport sector as a whole. {staff summary; please see original submission}

Paul Mcdonald	LTP21_109	Support the recreation facilities rate. Support the inclusion of the Northland Regional Volleyball Arena and regional Volleyball centre development to be funded partly from NRC rates as a viable regional facility of significance as a priority. Support and thank you for the contribution to the Pohe island Bike Park. Support the purchase of land at Ngunguru sandspit. Develop regional parks. Strengthen the protection of surf breaks from development and Council activity such as Sandy Bay and Ahipara.
Paul McDonald	LTP21_111	<p>Please see the attached pdf submission in support of our submission. Submission item 1. We support the Recreation Facility Rate and; request the Northland Regional Council allocate a part of that budget within the 2021 - 2031 LTP for the Northland Regional Volleyball Arena to align with the wider development, preferably in years 1 to 3, and, 1.a: We support the Submission of the Northland Sports Coalition, and 2.b: We support the submission of the Northland Volleyball Association. Reasons for this request: 1. Council and Ruakaka Recreation Centre have worked for many years to implement improvements to Ruakaka Recreation Ground. 2. WDC is currently expanding the park use through 2 new football field developments. 3. WDC have been requested to fund a carpark at the facility. 4. Partnership with the Northland Volleyball Association will see a Regional and National level volleyball and Beach Volleyball facility on the site, hosting tournaments and bringing visitors and economic benefit to Ruakaka. 5. The building provides for many community efficiencies in terms of replacing the need for both football and the local High School requiring further facilities. It takes a holistic approach to facility planning, optimising the benefits of a Regional Facility into a community facility also. 6. Third party funders view Council contribution towards the project favourably. 7. With contribution from both Councils, external funding will likely be \$6 Million, and Ratepayer funded approximately 1.5 Million. 8. Timing is essential. The Project is supported by the following key stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry of Building Innovation and Employment. • Northland Volleyball association. • Volleyball New Zealand • Patuharakeke • Sport Northland • Northland Sports Coalition • Ruakaka Residents and Ratepayers Association • Bream Bay United Football Association • The many users of the facility

Funding for Emergency Services

Name / Organisation	Reference	Comments
Ms MaryAnn Harding	LTP21_53	Reading your January pamphlet I learn that Coastguard and Surf lifesaving are allocated \$284,000; St John's - \$90,000. Since anyone in our region might need St John's it seems very unjust that they get so much less than the relatively small percentage who would call on coastguard and lifesavers.
Gemma Parkin	LTP21_77	Please include Far North and Northland Search and Rescue to the Emergency Services organisations supported by the NRC emergency services rate. We believe our organisation fits this fund's purpose of supporting 'organisations whose primary purpose is to save lives that are in immediate or critical danger'. Our Search and Rescue teams comprised entirely of volunteers contributed 4330 hours to Search and Rescue in the Northland Region in 2020. As much of the work we do occurs in the far reaches of our region or during darkness hours, we do not have the same public profile other volunteer services have, making it more difficult to attract national sponsors. We also do not benefit from the same 'charge back' government funding model which supports our Emergency Service counterparts. Funding support from the Northland Regional Council would assist our teams to meet their equipment and training needs and provide recognition of the lifesaving service our volunteers provide. We provide for the land environment the same service that Coastguard and Surf Lifesaving provide for the marine environment. 24/7, 365 days of the year. (Northland overview attached to submission).
Mrs Donna MacCarthy	LTP21_79	Please add Far North and Northland Search and Rescue to the Emergency Services organisations supported by the NRC emergency services rate. We believe our organisation fits this fund's purpose of supporting 'organisations whose primary purpose is to save lives that are in immediate or critical danger'. Our Search and Rescue teams comprised entirely of volunteers contributed 4330 hours to Search and Rescue in the Northland Region in 2020. As much of the work we do occurs in the far reaches of our region or during darkness hours, we do not have the same public profile other volunteer services have, making it more difficult to attract national sponsors. We also do not benefit from the same 'charge back' government funding model which supports our Emergency Service counterparts. Funding support from the Northland Regional Council would assist our teams to meet their equipment and training needs and provide recognition of the lifesaving service our volunteers provide (Northland overview attached to submission)
Mr Ian Ruddell President Far North Search and Rescue	LTP21_80	
Catherine Johnson	LTP21_82	
Mike Burch	LTP21_83	
Nick Hamer	LTP21_103	
Lisa Williams	LTP21_147	
Martin Gvardijancic	LTP21_101	<p>Please add Far North and Northland Search and Rescue to the Emergency Services organisations supported by the NRC emergency services rate. We believe our organisation fits this fund's purpose of supporting 'organisations whose primary purpose is to save lives that are in immediate or critical danger'.</p> <p>It actually beggars belief that this hasn't been as a matter of course years ago. LandSAR provide an extensive network of professional volunteers that put in incredible hours helping rescue people and save lives in the bush, just as coastguard and surf lifesaving do on the ocean. currently it's as if the NRC only cares about saving your life if you're in the water, and does not care at all if you're lost in the bush. even a little could be made</p>

		<p>to go a long way, and a reasonable funding level would make all the difference in the world. as it is, rescuing injured and lost people in the bush seems to hold zero interest for the council and it really isn't a good look. Our Search and Rescue teams comprised entirely of volunteers contributed 4330 hours to Search and Rescue in the Northland Region in 2020.</p> <p>As much of the work we do occurs in the far reaches of our region or during darkness hours, we do not have the same public profile other volunteer services have, making it more difficult to attract national sponsors. We also do not benefit from the same 'charge back' government funding model which supports our Emergency Service counterparts. Funding support from the Northland Regional Council would assist our teams to meet their equipment and training needs and provide recognition of the lifesaving service our volunteers provide.</p>
<p>Caron Mounsey-Smith Specialist Advisor Water Safety New Zealand</p>	LTP21_165	<p>Submitter introduces Water Safety New Zealand and seeks to draw council's attention to the need for drowning prevention and water safety initiatives. Submission provides context around drowning and water safety, introduces 'Wai Ora Aotearoa - water safety sector strategy 2025' and presents the legislative mandate for water safety and drowning prevention, under which it notes that local authorities have mandate, in terms of the community well-being umbrella.</p> <p>Submitter notes the link between water safety/drowning prevention, and council's responsibilities in terms of water quality. Submitter notes that Council is preparing its long-term plan in a period of substantial change including Resource Management Act reform, Three Waters reform, 'Essential Freshwater' package, and Climate change. Submitter also notes the changing role of iwi in freshwater management and the impacts of COVID-19. Submitter supports Council's community outcomes - Ngā whakataunga ā hāpori -particularly healthy waters for the environment and people (water quality), meaningful partnerships with tangata whenua, and resilient, adaptable communities in a changing climate. Submitter considers partnerships an effective way to expand awareness of Māori water safety issues, and potential ways to reduce the Māori drowning toll in the Northland region.</p> <p>Submitter notes that council needs to address water safety and drowning prevention in freshwater, coastal waters, and in, on and around vessels, with water safety and drowning prevention activities in these aquatic environments. Submitter requests that this approach compliment the investment made into water safety sector partner organisations (like Surf Life Saving NZ), or the funding provided through contestable funding process. Submitter supports Council's investment in life saving services (Northland Rescue Helicopters, Surf Life Saving, St John's and Coastguard). {staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
<p>Ms Annette Hall President Far North Radio and Sea Rescue</p>	LTP21_189	<p>FNRSR Inc. wants some serious money from the emergency services fund to keep the vital vhf radio service operational in the far north.</p>

Comments relevant to other Councils

Name / Organisation	Reference	Comments
Mrs Jan Pirihi	LTP21_24	The Ruakaka area with all its new housing contributes a large portion of rates with little return from the council. What has been the benefit to this community? Where is the public library expansion to cover the increased population? Where are the council amenities - parks? swimming pools? bike tracks? etc.
Kim Robinson	LTP21_30	This may not be related to the LT Plan but I would like to suggest that with increased activity the Rescue helicopter service is relocated to the airport or another location which is less urban. The frequency of flights, particularly during the night is increasing and the noise pollution is becoming quite disruptive. Other members of the community would not get away with those noise levels and there must be another location that would be more suitable
Mr Alan Agnew	LTP21_40	Concerns regarding WDC roading - Weeds on side of roads - Ruatangata community hall - Guntown road culverts - Roadside tree planting - Rubbish dumped on side of roads - Dog park in Whangārei {Staff summary; please see original submission}
C Cotton	LTP21_81	I haven't seen any mention of protecting our Esplanade Reserves from eroding into the sea. At present the Esplanade Reserve above the One Tree Point Cliffs is disappearing into Whangārei Harbour creating more silting. This erosion is undermining the cliffs creating overhangs which topple from time to time on to the beach below. As Bream Bay's population increases more and more people are using the Esplanade Reserve and are in danger of falling the 5 - 8 metres off the cliff, or their weight near one of the many overhangs may trigger a landslide on to someone below. Likewise the children and young adults who climb and swing from the beautiful pohutukawas on the cliff edge risk these undermined trees toppling into the ocean or beach on to anyone that may be below. The erosion has also created sandstone caves which children play in - a potentially dangerous situation which would not be tolerated at a work site. I suggest the sea retaining rock wall built on some parts of the cliff be continued up harbour from the One Tree Point boat ramp.
Ms Glenys Bean	LTP21_89	Hi - 100% on board with less/no spraying. Roadside weeds are controlled well by mowing so why the need for spraying? Even after spraying some weeds still grow thick and strong. Waste of money. And so why do we pay Council to poison us - really.
Richard Doolan Hospitality New Zealand	LTP21_90	Submission also raises the issues of Alcohol policies, freedom camping, and accommodation operators, which are district council issues. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Mr Harold Robinson	LTP21_168	Also the proposed Pouhoi rubbish tip is an absolute NO GO.
Kirsty Edmonds	LTP21_144	My concern living and working in the Kaikohe area is that a lot of the funding goes to Kerikeri and more affluent areas when it needs to be put back into this area. We don't have paths,

		lighting. We have a dog control issue. We have a water issue in summer for no good reason. I don't mind paying higher rates ONLY IF Kaikohe actually significantly sees improvement otherwise you should only increase rates in areas that are going to benefit from these plans.
--	--	---

GE / GMO provisions

Name / Organisation	Reference	Comments
Dr Mere Kepa	LTP21_48	Submitter urges NRC to reinstate the precautionary GE/GMOs wording and give adequate support to the Northland Regional Plan and Regional Policy Statement. Further submits that the new Long Term Plan 2021/31 includes precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMOs wording/ policy and a budget commitment to address the risks of GE/GMOs including Gene edited organisms. Submitter urges NRC to honour: i. The Te Tiriti of Waitangi; ii. The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP); iii. Their obligations as a full member of the Northland/ Auckland Inter Council Working Party on GMO Risk Evaluation and Management Options INTER COUNCIL WORKING PARTY ON GMO RISK EVALUATION AND MANAGEMENT OPTIONS and to identify an elected representative (councillor) and staff member to sit on the ICWP on GMOs; and iv. The RPS Policy 6.1.2, Method 6.1.5, and the GE/GMOs issue that has been appropriately identified as an Issue of Significance (concern) to communities and the Tangata Whenua o Te Tai Tokerau. {Staff summary - please see original submission}
Mr John Carapiet Auckland GE Free Coalition (AGEFC)	LTP21_87	Submitter asks that the Long Term Plan 2021/31 includes precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMOs wording/policy and a budget commitment to address the risks of GE/GMOs/Gene edited organisms. {Staff summary; please see original submission}
Ms Mary Wilson	LTP21_91	Submitter urges the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMOs wording in the Long Term Plan 2021. {Staff summary; please see original submission}
Ms Mary McDonald	LTP21_92	Submitter discusses risks involved with GE/GMOs. {Staff summary; please see original submission}
Beverley Aldridge Grey Power Inc.	LTP21_141	We believe it is vital for the NRC to reinstate the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMOs wording in the NRC Long Term Plan 2021/31 (including a strong precautionary approach to risky gene edited organisms, CRISPR and "gene drive" on both land and in the Coastal Marine Area/CMA)on both land and in the Coastal Marine Area/CMA) This important wording (reflecting community concerns/ wishes/ aspirations, setting policy direction, prioritizing truly sustainable integrated management of finite resources, as well as budgetary requirements) was in the 2004/14, 2002/16, 2009/19 NRC Long Term Council Community Plan/s...along with a \$10,000 contingency fund in the event of someone applying to the EPA for an outdoor GE/GMO experiment/ field trial /release in Northland. The NRC inappropriately removed this critically important wording, with zero public consultation or notification, a few years ago. We strongly urge NRC to reinstate the precautionary GE/GMOs wording and give adequate support to the Northland "Regional Plan" and "Regional Policy Statement" (RPS). We strongly urge that the new Long Term Plan 2021/31 includes precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMOs wording/ policy and a budget commitment to address the risks of GE/GMOs (these include Gene edited organisms. We ask that the NRC honours its obligations as a full member of the Northland/ Auckland INTER COUNCIL WORKING PARTY ON GMO RISK EVALUATION AND MANAGEMENT OPTIONS and to identify an elected representative (councillor) and staff member to sit on the ICWP on GMOs. The Northland "Regional Policy Statement" (RPS]

		must call on all Councils to apply precautionary GMO policies when reviewing their plans. (NRPS 2018, 6.1.2 and 6.1.5) , as well as the GE/GMOs issue being appropriately identified as an Issue of Significance (concern) to all New Zealanders and communities, as we must protect our land for future generations as well as the health of the planet, particularly as introducing genetically modified organisms to the environment where they are scientifically uncertain, unknown or little understood, and potentially significantly adverse. 6.1.5 Method - Statutory Plans and Strategies The regional and district councils should apply Policy 6.1.2 when reviewing their plans or considering options for plan changes and assessing resource consent applications.
Ms Jenny Kirk	LTP21_154	Submitter urges the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMOs wording in the Long Term Plan 2021. {Staff summary; please see original submission}
Bob Jones	LTP21_181	Submitter urges the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMOs wording in the Long Term Plan 2021. {Staff summary; please see original submission}
Ms Clare Swinney	LTP21_182	Submitter urges the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMOs wording in the Long Term Plan 2021. {Staff summary; please see original submission}
Ms Zelka Grammer	LTP21_183	Submitter raises concern about GE/GMOs. Discusses the issues and progress to date. Repeatedly requests that council place a strong precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO policy and other wording in the LTP, as well as budget commitment. Submission contains various links and attachments. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Ms Zelka Grammer Secretary GE Free Tai Tokerau	LTP21_184	Submission requests that in the LTP 2021-2031 council: reinstate the precautionary GE/GMOs wording and give adequate support to the Northland "Regional Plan" and "Regional Policy Statement" (RPS); include precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMOs wording/ policy and a budget commitment to address the risks of GE/GMOs; honour its obligations as a full member of the Northland/ Auckland "Inter council working party on GMS risk evaluation and management options", including identifying an elected representative and staff member to represent NRC on the ICWP on GMOs. Submission discusses GE/GMO issues with detailed requests and references. Submission includes multiple links and attachments including to other agencies websites and articles, news articles, reports and previous submissions from other agencies. Submission requests that the Long Term Plan focus on organic/regenerative agriculture/horticulture and forestry. Submission requests that council prioritize reduction of the exposure of Northland residents to toxic herbicides and pesticides. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Dr Benjamin Pittman Chair Te Pouwhenu o Tikiariri Kukupa Trust	LTP21_187	Submitter urges the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMOs wording in the Long Term Plan 2021. {Staff summary; please see original submission}
Mr Jon Muller Secretary GE Free New Zealand	LTP21_191	"We believe it is important that the NRPS recommendations for GMO precautionary provisions are placed in the 2021-2031 NRC long term plan. Also, to budget the continued participation, as a full member, of the Northland/ Auckland Inter Council Working Party On GMO Risk Evaluation And Management Options.

		<p>WE ask that you consider the move to regenerative organic methods to try and mitigate future climate change crisis.</p> <p>GE Free NZ requests that Northland Regional Council:</p> <p>Budget funds to implement a precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMOs policy in the context of the new LTP 2021/31</p> <p>Ensure that if the new structure Northland Inc, maintains the provisions and rules that support the Northland Regional Council, Whangārei and Far North District Councils wording.</p> <p>Budget funds to participate as a full member of the Northland/ Auckland Inter Council Working Party On GMO Risk Evaluation And Management Options.</p> <p>We consider that these GMO rules and policies should be adopted in the 2021-2031 Northland Regional Council LTP for regional consistency on GMO management. We fully support the submissions made from GE Free Northland and AGEFC.</p> <p>Submission contains various links and attachments {staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
<p>MS Nora Shayeb Member Northland Toxin Awareness Group</p>	LTP21_193	<p>Submitter raises concern about the impact of aerial and roadside spraying on health, and requests a moratorium on spraying with toxic chemical pesticides.</p> <p>"We urge the NRC to reinstate the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMOs wording in the Long Term Plan 2021/31 (including a strong precautionary approach to risky gene edited organisms which are GMOs- and "gene drive" on both land and in the Coastal Marine Area/CMA."</p> <p>{Staff summary; please see original submission}</p>

Transport (including rail)

Name / Organisation	Reference	Comments
Kim Robinson	LTP21_7	Public Transport in this region is currently non-existent. Disabled and Elderly people need to move around. Light-rail connecting Whangārei to towns outside will be viable.
Mr Mark Schreurs	LTP21_55	Submitter asks council to consider their responsibilities to regional transport, and that the region's railways be considered as an extension to the regional state highway system. Includes link to the "Northland Rail, North Auckland Line and Marsden Point Rail Link Single Stage Business Case" and asks that council consider how they can assist in actioning the outcomes of the report. Submission includes a think piece on the possibility of using the existing rail corridor through Whangārei to run a public transport service with the aim of reducing pressure on roads, and asks that this be considered. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Ms Sophia Xiao-Colley	LTP21_93	7. Transport: regular charter train service on public holidays between Auckland and Whangārei.
Liza Prinsloo	LTP21_102	Rural roads Arapohue are in shocking condition due to trucks and tankers. The dust and speed needs addressing for health and safety. We pay rates for very little in return.
Dr Lily George Policy Analyst Nga Tai Ora	LTP21_172	<p>Transport recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · That NRC review air quality monitoring in areas that have been raised as a concern by the community. This may include the number of available monitors, and staff capacity to support work in this area · That the June 2014 document 'Regional Dust from Unsealed Roads Mitigation Framework' be reviewed in terms of roads that were identified for sealing at that time, progress in this regard, and opportunities for obtaining funding from NZTA. This could be coordinated by the Northern Transport Alliance or the NRC Transport Manager That NRC works together with Ngā Tai Ora/Public Health Northland (Northland DHB) to plan and implement transport infrastructure that supports an equitable transition to safe, healthy, decarbonised transport by 2030, including setting measurable targets. This includes that the following be in place as soon as possible and well before 2030: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Accessible, low cost, convenient, reliable and safe public transport for people with diverse needs (people using guide dogs, pushchairs, walking sticks, wheelchairs, mobility scooters, and people with disabilities and their caregivers, people with babies and toddlers, and/or during the later stage of pregnancy, and senior citizens) o Accessible and safe walkways, cycleways, shared use pathways, especially in urban areas, with more planting for environmental health o A Transport User's Hierarchy model is adopted for transport planning in the region o Zero carbon public and freight transport systems (electric rail and buses, widespread electric car share systems, low carbon shipping, electric vehicle charging infrastructure). · That NRC implements a plan to measure and reduce its own transport emissions (with targets aligned with guidance set by the prevailing science and legislation [the IPCC, Paris Accord, Zero Carbon Act])

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Avoid locking in transport infrastructure projects that are not aligned with transport decarbonisation · Speed limit reductions on regional roads not according to road level (e.g. State highway, town, neighbourhood), but according to quality of road as well as layout of road.[example of Ngunguru provided] Additionally, in Northland there are many dairies and shops along main roads, with people stopping to visit the shops, often crossing the road in places with no pedestrian crossings. All of the above are risks that could be mitigated with more restrictive road rules in those areas for vehicles. · That transport strategy aligns with an equitable transition to safe, healthy, decarbonised transport. Prioritise investment in active transport, ride sharing, electrification of public transport, electric vehicle infrastructure; and divest from carbon emission-heavy projects. {staff summary; please see original submission}
--	--	---

LTP Process

Name / Organisation	Reference	Comments
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	I'm impressed by the detail and quality of your consultation documents, and I can finally see a shift towards recognising and addressing climate change, thinking about wellbeing, improving engagement with Māori, as well as increasing measuring and building knowledge.
Maggie Buxton	LTP21_15	Some of these items for me count as over consultation. In your efforts to be collaborative you are asking people to consult on details like internal policies which feels like overkill. I would also like to add that the process of how people can input to this plan has not been well managed. There was only a very short amount of notice for the public consultations in Whangārei and the times were not manageable. The online submission process is ridiculously cumbersome and presents a barrier to those who wish to have their voice heard. I suggest you look at how WDC have created their online submission process to see how this could be done better next time. I would be surprised if you get anybody submitting either online or in person due to the way that this process has been designed. That weakens democracy.
Ms Annemarie Florian	LTP21_18	When I asked about Transport Planning at a Community Consultation meeting for the District Plan, the staff member, Sandra Boardman, informed the meeting that this was NOT in the District Funding, that it was Regional Funding. It would have been sensible for her to add that NRC was currently receiving submissions, but this information was NOT shared, I was left to find that out for myself. Then again, why WDC (and the other Northern District Councils) and NRC are not able to coordinate meetings that ask for public input is BEYOND ME, wouldn't that make a huge amount of sense? As well as being an efficient use of resources, information could be relayed and shared at such meetings for all involved. Council needs to rethink its policy priorities from the recent focus on economic growth to community well-being. The trickle-down theory of economics (bolstering business, thinking that that direction will in turn enhance community well-being, yeah, right!) was rightfully disproved last century. Look after the environment and the community, that's what your role is.
Val Scott	LTP21_58	NRC needs to spend more time, effort and expertise to educate the community on what it does, how and why. Improving participation rates in Local Government is the responsibility of each entity in LG and the NRC needs to produce regular, easily accessible and jargon free information. All Councillors should be required to inform and consult their electorates at least quarterly. A strategy for engagement and accountability should be included in the Long term.
Ms Sophia Xiao-Colley	LTP21_93	1. NRC is not making it easy for people to contribute our idea and thoughts. You must register or login before making a submission.
Michael Paul Bowker	LTP21_118	Only Dargaville is a West Coast venue on the list below. ?#@\$\$###?
Angus McCulloch	LTP21_135	Maintain a public education programme to keep the public with you on the relevance and importance of your work.
Dallas King	LTP21_148	This form & the 'Have your say' events did not enable me to articulate in a culturally appropriate or fitting way the connections and perspectives which are important with regard

		to the NRC's Long Term Plan on behalf of Nga Hapū o Hokianga. I request the opportunity to address the council in person.
Ms Rebecca Williams Secretary Tutukaka Coast Ratepayers and Residents Assoc	LTP21_179	Submitter recommends that current or already planned works are made easier for ratepayers to see/find in relation to planning processes and timelines.
Mr Michael Wrightson	LTP21_186	Submitter raises concern that the consultation period included Easter, that the consultation events were held only in main settlements and that there should be a consultation committee. {staff summary; please see original submission}

Area-specific: algae at Waipū

Name / Organisation	Reference	Comments
Mr Grant Smith	LTP21_122	Submission relates to algae at Waipu cove, with submitter requesting funding in the Long Term Plan to enable research by an independent and experienced team of marine scientists to determine how this algae problem can be eliminated or, at least, mitigated. {Staff summary; please see original submission}
Mr David Lourie	LTP21_173	I support the increases in rating fees for environmental protection work. NRC needs to be much more thorough when dealing with discharges to ground and discharges to water. NRC was warned about Ruakaka toxic waste site continuously for years and took no action. Probably due to the resource consent conditions being so business friendly, with business friendly lack of monitoring, lack of follow up that the poor resource consent conditions gave no grounds to intervene. A full and thorough investigation needs to be made of how this was permitted to happen. Shocking lack of regulatory procedure created an expensive and dangerous outcome that should never be repeated.
Melanie Gatfield	LTP21_70	I am primarily interested in finding out more about why Waipu beach and Estuary are experiencing more frequent algal blooms with more severe consequences, e.g. dying fish and other aquatic life, negative tourist impacts, dreadful smell of hydrogen sulphide. I understand plenty of data has already been collected which needs some science applied to it to understand the causes and to then understand what can be done. I understand that aspects of these blooms are a “natural event” and self limiting, but are becoming more frequent and severe. Currently opinion is a driving factor in people’s take on what action should be taken. (e.g. dredge the estuary) I would like to see a comprehensive report/study undertaken to find out what (if anything) can be done to remediate this situation. Thanks (photo attached to submission)

Area-specific: Ngunguru sandspit

Name / Organisation	Reference	Comments
Paul Mcdonald	LTP21_109	Support the purchase of land at Ngunguru sandspit.
Mr Jim Kilpatrick Chair Ngunguru Sandspit Protection Society	LTP21_124	Submission introduces the history and work of the Ngunguru Sandspit Protection Society Inc, and their efforts to protect the sandspit from inappropriate development through purchase and zone protection. Submitter raises concern that the land will be sold to a developer and requests that council contribute \$500,000 to assist in the purchase of the land as a natural heritage site. Submitter attaches their submission from the 2018 LTP and asks that this be given consideration. Submitter also attaches letters of support. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Mrs Helen Gilbert	LTP21_74	I support the submission which will be submitted by the Ngunguru Sandspit Protection Society Inc (NSaPS). NSaPS has since 2005 and for several years since submitted to NRC draft plans for its assistance in securing and protecting all the sandspit and Whakareora. Central Government in 2011 was successful in securing about two thirds of the Ngunguru Sandspit for public benefit and protection of a significant area. Evidence has been supplied to NRC on numerous occasions documenting the multiple and high values of this area. The Society's 2018 -2028 submission was particularly detailed, and it is hoped NRC will refer to that submission in which the time frame still falls within the current proposed LTP. Since the 2018 submission, the ownership of the topic area has changed and the new owner, Templeton Group, has given a fair figure to the Society that it will sell for. Negotiations are in place. The Society will seek funds from several sources to hopefully have a successful outcome. Conclusion The Ngunguru Sandspit and Whakareora are part of our special environment and it is requested that Northland Regional Council investigates and considers all available means to secure and protect this area and particularly assist in part funding its purchase. In 2018 the late Craig Brown was spokesperson for the Society at a power point presentation to NRC. One suggestion he had was that one option could be a possibility for NRC to help with funding the purchase by using the Local Authority Funding Agency which lends money to local authorities at a concessionary rate.

Area-specific: Other

Name / Organisation	Reference	Comments
D Mcnamara	LTP21_13	With the exception of the Kaipara Moana Remediation project there is little specific focus in the Kaipara. There are projects that Kaipara have developed recently that would benefit from NRC's attention, these include much needed funding for the Kaipara Kai Hub, protection of versatile soils for transformation to high value crops through work on stop banks - this would have a positive impact on the work that the Tai Tokerau Water Trust is looking to achieve for Kaipara's water storage. Funding of Kaipara Kai will keep a positive environmental and transformational linkages alive to support goals that regional council's are charged with caring for, as well as support Kaipara's economy.
Sadie Robinson	LTP21_14	There is a distinct lack of Kaipara in this Long Term Plan once again. Left alone, to continue doing what they've always done.
Lorraine Mecca	LTP21_19	Submitter formally requests that the waterway between Opuā and Ōkiato be declared a public road and included in the Long Term Plan 2021-2031. {Staff summary; please see original submission}
Hone Popata	LTP21_25	Please HELP us more up here in the far north Kaitiā Hone Popata from Oturu Marae Kaitiā
Mr John Pearce Chair Mangawhai Harbour Restoration Society	LTP21_49	Submission requests that council work in partnership to enable the ongoing restoration and enhancement of the Mangawhai harbour. Requests that council review the Sustainable Management Plan for the Mangawhai Harbour/Estuary in consultation with the society, KDC, DoC, and local Iwi. Submission requests that council ensure a strong flow of water in channels during tidal movements to flush the harbour, and requests investigation of partially replacing causeways in Insley Street and Molesworth Drive, that council consider the ongoing spread of mangroves, and ongoing dredging of channels to maintain tidal flow. Submission requests that council takes visible ownership with the ongoing restoration and maintenance of the Mangawhai Harbour/Estuary, and raises concern that the community is unaware of any significant contribution from council to the harbour, and that there is a perception that council is anti-Mangawhai following opposition to the rebuilding of the wharf. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Mr Geoff Wilson	LTP21_69	As chairman of Tinopai Residents and Ratepayers Improvement Society, I would like to take this opportunity to notify NRC of our desire to build a waterfront walkway. It is likely we will need to correspond with you further in due course.
Ms Janine McVeagh	LTP21_140	Acknowledge the Hokianga Harbour as a national taonga and put the kind of resources into it that have been invested in the Kaipara Harbour.
Mr Nick Chave Kauri Mountain Restoration Society	LTP21_157	Community-led project at Kauri Mountain (attachment - 'saving Kauri Mountain')
Ms Anna Curnow Acting Mayor Kaipara District Council	LTP21_177	Submission raises concerns about projected sea level rise and the impact on the Kaipara district including property, council services, and economy. {staff summary; please see original submission}

<p>Ms Rebecca Williams Secretary Tutukaka Coast Ratepayers and Residents Assoc</p>	<p>LTP21_179</p>	<p>Submission raises concern that the plan contains no specific projects for the Tutukaka Coast. Submission discusses a range of issues relating to the natural environment, civil defence planning and co-ordination, public transport, walk and cycle ways, impact of tourism and coastal leisure activities, cultural protection and promotion, and health and wellbeing, and makes a suite of recommendations. Those recommendations that do not fit with a specific area consulted on as part of the process, and therefore included in the summary for those topics, are included here: Submitter recommends that council allocate specific funding and resources over the 10 years of the Plan to work with the Tutukaka Coast community, and to commit to ongoing structured communication with Tutukaka Coast Ratepayers and Residents Association and the wider Tutukaka Coast community. Submitter recommends that current or already planned works are made easier for ratepayers to see/find in relation to planning processes and timelines. Submitter recommends that NRC make clear its plans the mechanisms for the necessary collaboration and co-ordination to address significant issues facing the District and Region, such as climate change. Submitter recommends that NRC give greater consideration of the needs of rural and coastal communities in relation to its transport planning. Submitter recommends that council work with WDC in supporting the Tutukaka Coast Community to develop its tourism activity with a view to a) recover from COVID-19, b) develop sustainable business practices, and c) exploring and developing eco-tourism opportunities. Submitter recommends that council commit to supporting the Tutukaka Coast Ratepayers and Residents Association, and wider Tutukaka Coast community in planning and implementing projects and initiatives in response to the priorities identified through our community survey. This includes setting aside a budget and internal resources.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
--	------------------	--

Northland Inc / economic development

Name / Organisation	Reference	Comments
Tania Aslund	LTP21_39	<p>What with climate change and Covid, Northlanders should be encouraged and supported to be more water resilient and food secure, and to create sustainable employment opportunities (self-employment and small business, community enterprise etc). Covid is probably not a one-off, so reliance on international tourism is not sensible (plus high carbon footprint).</p> <p>With regards to economic 'growth' in Northland, I would like to see preference given to local people, including environmental projects such as planting and pest control, as well as growing (especially organic) for local (rather than export) markets. Intensively grown, mostly for export, crops and produce are responsible for much of the water (freshwater, groundwater, seawater) and air (sprays) pollution - think dairy, kiwifruit, pine forestry, commercial fishing etc - with little real benefit to locals. Now we are left with cleaning up their mess.</p>
Mr Collin Blackman	LTP21_88	<p>Given the governments predilection for following W.H.O.s dictates in regard to the Covid business, 2020 shows graphically that data that was considered significant for the long term plan as envisaged in 2019, bears little relevance whatsoever to what happened in 2020. High time for the regional plan to focus entirely on "By Kiwis for Kiwis" without any emphasis on any skin colour or which sea going vessel arrived on these shores first or second. Now planning needs to step back and factor in the reality of the new tourist patterns, if there is to be any, especially in the event Auckland goes yet again into another pointless lockdown/s. Don't waste our rates until we know what we are dealing with.</p>
Ms Sophia Xiao-Colley	LTP21_93	6. Can NRC champion Zero-waste business? And leading the community to be able to have a zero waste lifestyle? 7
Heather Tomason	LTP21_116	Providing economic stimulus to benefit all Northlanders is important at this time.
Calvin Green	LTP21_136	<p>carry out a major review of northland ink. it is no longer fit for purpose and adds nothing to economic development that is not already being done by progressive industries. the funding provided to northland inc needs to be contestable. i.e. community development bodies need to have equal access to the funding. northland ink is a private company with only one rep from nrc. its business is conducted in private under the guise of commercial sensitivity. that in itself is a major problem for a body using public money. if it disappeared tomorrow the community at large would not notice. I daresay 80% of businesses in northland would not notice! a critical review of this organisation needs to be carried out. they do not have a good record of picking winners to say the least. we need community development more than ever. not a business lobby group.</p>
Hone Tiatoa	LTP21_143	<p>The sustainable development approach is described in section 14(h) of the LGA as: 'In performing its role, a local authority must act in accordance with the following principles: (h) in taking a sustainable development approach, a local authority shall take into account: (i) the social, economic, and cultural interests of people and communities; and (ii) the need to maintain and enhance the quality of the environment; and (iii) the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.'</p>

<p>Codie McIntyre Northland Inc</p>	<p>LTP21_146</p>	<p>1. Regional Economic Development Strategy- Funding Allocated in Long Term Plan In 2017 the S17a Review of Economic Development Arrangements in Northland report identified that despite having a number of strategies and plans that have helped to guide economic development activity and investment in transformational projects within the region, it does not have an agreed economic development strategy or development goals/priorities that link these together at a high level and that all stakeholders, including councils, buy into and support. Thus, through a collective approach and from a platform that supports long-term meaningful benefits for our communities, there is still an opportunity to develop a long-term economic development strategy that focuses on the transformation of the Northland economy. As part of the process of becoming a joint CCO of Northland Regional Council, Kaipara District Council and Far North District Council, all Council's have had the opportunity to feed into Northland Inc's latest Statement of Intent 2021/22-2023/24. The 'Development of a long-term economic development strategy for Tai Tokerau Northland' is one of the activities that they have included in this. Despite this, they are yet to assign any resourcing and through initial discussions with them, they have indicated that it should be funded outside of any contribution they will be making to the Investment and Growth Reserve (Northland Inc's operational funding). For Northland Inc we consider that this activity is urgent and should be undertaken as soon as possible, as the region needs to build on recent collaborative efforts and ensure that any investment, e.g. Provincial Growth Fund, that has been received recently is maximised and leveraged strategically. For the development of such a strategy to be effective and embraced by Te Tai Tokerau, it needs to be resourced properly and allow for whanau and community to engage and lead the process, as their economic wellbeing should be at the heart of any actions/outcomes. This means that it should not be funded as part of Northland Inc business-as-usual, but instead we encourage Northland Regional council to allocate a proportion of funding towards it in this LTP.</p> <p>2. Destination Management and Marketing One area of particular importance to Northland Inc is the enhancement of destination management and marketing, especially as this relates to the development of a destination management plan for the region and ongoing marketing and product development efforts. Through the recently administered RTO Strategic Tourism Asset Protection Programme (STAPP), MBIE have provided supplementary investment for three areas of domestic marketing, industry capability and product development and destination management, which is contractually contingent on the retention of local government funding, and once again, a fixed term investment finishing near the end of the next financial year. In regards to the former, The Tai Tokerau Northland Destination Management Plan has been developed by Northland Inc in partnership with Te Au Mārie Sester-centennial Trust, Te Hiringa Trust & Business Promotions and Te Puni Kokiri Tai Tokerau. It seeks to enhance the value of our visitor experiences in collaboration with iwi, hapū and other stakeholders for the benefit of our communities, businesses, the environment and future generations. It is also important to note that the successful implementation of the Regional Destination Management Plan will require adequate resourcing, of which there is currently very little funding secured to drive the implementation of the</p>
---	------------------	--

		<p>plan. For Northland Inc some areas we feel Council could potentially assist or provide funding for that is specific to the Destination Management plan are: '** Destination Management Plan Portfolio Support staff '** The development of a Regional Brand Strategy in partnership with industry, as recommended in both the Section 17A Review and recent Destination Management Plan consultations with sector stakeholders '** The development of a Regional Marketing Strategy, as recommended in consultations and included as an action in the Destination Management Plan.</p>
--	--	---

Financing and investment

Name / Organisation	Reference	Comments
Debbie Raphael	LTP21_60	Rather than going into a lot more debt allow rate payers to voluntarily pay the rate increase proposed for 10 years time. The LTP suggested a staggered increase. I personally would pay the full increase now if I knew what it was covering.
Geoff Sharples	LTP21_73	It is not clear to me that NRC's current funds are best allocated. I often hear in community meetings that money for projects "comes from NRC" or "the government" as if it is free money. The reality is that money comes from rates and rates are paid by rich and poor. In general, poor people should not be paying for things that only rich people really use - conference centres and arts centres. Poor people should not be subsidizing business owners by paying for flood management. Subsidies have a way of always ending up in the hands of folks who are best at getting them rather than most in need. The focus should be on the basics. clean water, native plants, climate change mitigation plans and communication. The plan said that more money was needed because Covid had caused losses in the investment portfolio. Many investment portfolios have actually done well this year. Why did the NRC investment portfolio lose money in a year where many gained value? Would now be a good time to reconsider how funds are invested and who is investing it?
Richard Doolan Hospitality New Zealand	LTP21_90	Submitter is not opposed to rates increases if they are funding infrastructure and tourism projects that will benefit the entire district. Requests that any rate increases be in line with an increase in the business differential. Supports a disbursement of rates charges across residential, commercial, industrial, and other lines. Raises concern about cyclical rates increases. Submitter agrees with many of the proposals in the consultation document and are encouraged that businesses do not carry an unfair proportion of the rates bill. Submission cites the 2019 Productivity commission report into Local Government Funding and Finance and supports the use of existing funding tools. Submission also raises the issues of Alcohol policies, freedom camping, and accommodation operators, which are district council issues. {staff summary; please see original submission}
Fiona King	LTP21_134	Need to have transparency to monies paid to Iwi monitoring, meeting attendance, etc. within the financial accounts on a project by project basis. i.e. Awanui river scheme.
Leslie Bell	LTP21_151	Submitter raises concern about the impacts of Covid-19 and recession. Raises concern about rate increases, and the proposed increase in debt when interest rates may not remain low. Notes that regional growth will result in more income for council. States that council should be concentrating on collecting money owed in rates. "My suggestion to Council is: 1. Limit increases to no more than the indexed inflation rate. 2. Strike no rates for new spending, at least until we emerge from recession and Covid19 is beaten. 3. Collect nothing for the Okuru Centre and leave it to private enterprise to fund it. 4. Live within existing budgets which have already bulged by more than 84% in 10 years." {Staff summary; please see original submission.}

<p>Mr Richard Gardner Senior Policy Advisor Federated Farmers of NZ</p>	<p>LTP21_170</p>	<p>Submission acknowledges the role of council and the LTP process under the Local Government Act, and the challenges faced due to Covid-19. Submission agrees that now is not the time for council to slow down, but rather to play its part in the economic recovery of the region. Submission raises concern about funding, with specific comments on rating policies. Submission supports the following principles: the use of modifiers such as differentials, to reduce the high general rates on farms; '</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the use of the UAGC and Targeted Rates; they are generally fairer for farms than is property value; ' • transparent processes, and a robust LTP consultation document that shows who pays for what; ' • the funding of expenditure on big new projects being transparent, particularly when they are based on property value rates; • the promotion of tourism or other businesses not being funded from rates on farm businesses: Farmers pay for their own industry promotion. <p>Submission favours the use of a capital value based rating system, over land value based systems. Capital value based rating systems better reflect the use made by individual ratepayers of Council assets and resources, than do land value based rating systems.</p> <p>Submitter recommendation: That Council: Undertake a thorough review of its operations Continue to move towards a capital value based rating system; Instigate a policy for the UAGC to reach the maximum level allowable under the law over the next few years, and decrease the general rate accordingly; Make greater use of targeted rates and user fees and charges; Ask central Government to provide for more equitable rating policies for local Government. {staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
<p>Ms Linda Kaye</p>	<p>LTP21_174</p>	<p>I wish to make the following submissions on the NRC long-term plan consultation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On "significance and engagement", I submit that you should phase out consultants. We want to speak to our elected representatives and our paid staffers kanohi ki te kanohi. If you are not willing to meet with us directly, you really shouldn't have stood for election. We need for you to be directly accountable to us, and for the employed staff to be directly accountable to you/us. 2. On "appointment of directors to CCO's" and on CEO's, I would like to see a salary cap provision. No director or CEO should receive a salary that exceeds 15% above the middle executive range. I think that both of these strategies would save a great deal of money, and would, potentially, substantially reduce some of your proposed increases in rates and other charges

Agrichemicals and toxins

Name / Organisation	Reference	Comments
Michael Drayton	LTP21_36	I'd like to see more work done on water and air quality monitoring across the region, particularly when it comes to the use of chemical sprays by intensive horticulture. If such sprays must be used then I think operators have a responsibility to prevent drift affecting neighbouring properties, rainwater collection areas and waterways. Independent recording of wind speeds and directions while spraying takes place would enable regulations around use of sprays to be enforced. Similarly, independent monitoring of water quality downstream from intensive horticulture would detect any leakage or spills into waterways.
Tania Aslund	LTP21_39	When it comes to land-use management in general, the regional council obviously needs to work closely with district councils to ensure the most effective outcomes. I agree with Michael Drayton: I'd like to see more work done on water and air quality monitoring across the region, particularly when it comes to the use of chemical sprays by intensive horticulture. If such sprays must be used then I think operators have a responsibility to prevent drift affecting neighbouring properties, rainwater collection areas and waterways. Independent recording of wind speeds and directions while spraying takes place would enable regulations around use of sprays to be enforced. Similarly, independent monitoring of water quality downstream from intensive horticulture would detect any leakage or spills into waterways.
MS Nora Shayeb Member Northland Toxin Awareness Group	LTP21_193	"To protect the health of our environment; water ways; air quality; human and animal health, we ask the Northland Regional Council to implement an immediate moratorium on all aerial and roadside spraying with toxic chemical pesticides... The continued and indiscriminate use of toxic pesticides is a breach of one of our most basic human rights - the right to health! On this basis, we believe it is our right that we ask all our government agencies to exercise the precautionary principle and place an immediate moratorium on Glyphosate and all other HHPs in aerial and roadside spraying - until proven safe by independent scientific research... There are many non-toxic methods for roadside maintenance and weed management, which are regenerative, sustainable and could bring many permanent jobs into our communities, if the roadside maintenance contracts were assigned to each individual community by WDC. As a community operated business under the guidance of specialists in this field, like NRC Councillor Jack Craw, our communities can actively participate in targeting and achieving positive outcomes for our collective health." {Staff summary; please see original submission}

Other: ungrouped

Name / Organisation	Reference	Comments
Mr Alan Agnew	LTP21_40	Submitter requested that his submission to the 2020/21 annual plan process be re-submitted to this event and provided two new pieces of information to add. Points raised in this submission included: - The need for a recreation centre for the elderly and disabled, citing the ex-Countdown building as a possible site. Note - submitter provided new paperwork relating to a trespass notice he had been served at the Kensington site on 6 December. - Concern about fire bans in summer. Note - submitter provided new paperwork on an incident logged by the Fire Authority, relating to a fire he lit on his property in protest of the fire ban. - Kauri die back being caused by borer beetles - {Staff summary; please see original submission}
Mr Stephen Rush Environment Officer Te Runanga o Whangaroa	LTP21_67	The NRC subsidiary - Harbour master authority is operating autonomously and needs to be reviewed in light of meaningful consultation with iwi and hapū on harbour matters. Where NRC has policies the roll-out of these to the harbour master role is, at times, inconsistent. e.g. Regional Coastal Plan designated mooring areas where the harbour master is exercising discretionary authority without consultation or notification to do so. This is a serious concern for the long term plan, particularly where planning for long term coastal and marine matters are at issue.
C Cotton	LTP21_81	I haven't seen any mention of protecting our Esplanade Reserves from eroding into the sea. At present the Esplanade Reserve above the One Tree Point Cliffs is disappearing into Whangārei Harbour creating more silting. This erosion is undermining the cliffs creating overhangs which topple from time to time on to the beach below. As Bream Bay's population increases more and more people are using the Esplanade Reserve and are in danger of falling the 5 - 8 metres off the cliff, or their weight near one of the many overhangs may trigger a landslide on to someone below. Likewise the children and young adults who climb and swing from the beautiful pohutukawas on the cliff edge risk these undermined trees toppling into the ocean or beach on to anyone that may be below. The erosion has also created sandstone caves which children play in - a potentially dangerous situation which would not be tolerated at a work site. I suggest the sea retaining rock wall built on some parts of the cliff be continued up harbour from the One Tree Point boat ramp.
Quinn Miller	LTP21_130	The adventure tourism potential of the Bay of Islands and the coastline north of there could be improved by creating a series of campgrounds aimed at kayakers. Currently there is the DOC campgrounds on Urupukapuka island, but that only allows day trips, rather than moving along the area. In Auckland there is the Te Moana trail and Northland would be well suited to doing something similar.
Guy Ralls	LTP21_150	Submitter puts submission forward as a formal notice to NRC. Requests that NRC acknowledge the limits to its authority set

		<p>out under He Whakaputanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nu Tirene, the Declaration of Independence of the United Tribes of New Zealand 1835.</p> <p>Raises concern that the LTP will include a framework to implement United Nations Agenda 2030 objectives to "re-wild" rural areas of Northland in a way that would limit human domestic and agricultural use of privately held or Māori land, and that this would not be in the interests of the people of Northland / Te Tai Tokerau.</p> <p>Raises concern about the designation of land as Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes ("ONFLs"), Significant Natural Areas ("SNAs"), Significant Ecological Areas or similar.</p> <p>Submission discusses this in detail, with media article referenced.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Mr James Murray	LTP21_166	<p>Submitter makes reference to matters of Regional Planning including Aquaculture Management Areas and the Regional Coastal Plan. {staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Mr Shane Hyde Eco-land Ltd	LTP21_167	<p>Please ensure the following are not enabled with the plan: '</p> <p>** Physical or biotech technologies of which are not retractable from the natural or physical environment regardless if this limitation be in physical sense or financial sense '</p> <p>** Please ensure pollution is mitigated, charged to and regulated at point of source '</p> <p>** Please ensure those that have profited through enabling permanent ecological burden are held responsible for the clean-up or remedial work. '</p> <p>** Please insure those that promote and undertake sustainable land management with no need of funding assistance are supported through the enforcement of present legal policy</p> <p>'** Please do not dissolve property owner vegetation rights to those who have historically enhanced / enabled vegetated remain in marginal production zones. It would be considered unfair to make such land owners burdened by climate change carbon sequestration at the economic advantage of those land owners that already have sponsored tree denuded productive grass landscapes. '</p> <p>** Please do not regulate or make farm timber collection a permitted fee chargeable activity regardless of tree species involved.</p> <p>'** Please do not diminish grandfather rights of historic water take for domestic and livestock use</p>
Dr Lily George Policy Analyst Nga Tai Ora	LTP21_172	<p>Submitter makes comment on various topics and makes the following recommendations that are not relevant to any specific consultation point:</p> <p>Wastewater recommendations: That NRC establishes a process to ensure the safe management of on-site effluent disposal, and consider the cumulative effects of these systems, not just the individual effects of each system · That NRC considers systematic realisation of wastewater treatment plants for all Northlanders, and seeks to develop a plan/strategy for this.</p> <p>Stormwater recommendations: That NRC take into consideration the predicted impacts of climate change on stormwater systems when developing water catchment management plans, and upgrading stormwater systems. 'Flood relief for isolated rural communities' recommendation: That</p>

		<p>the NRC works with the regional councils and government organisations to develop viable flood and climate change relief for isolated rural communities such as Waikare.</p> <p>'Covid-19 pandemic, epidemic and pandemic preparedness and response' recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · That NRC has a comprehensive pandemic plan in place to deal with the current and future pandemics, and that the plan is reviewed regularly · That NRC takes a 'green recovery' approach, i.e. as we recover from the COVID-19 pandemic taking the opportunity to create the healthy decarbonised region we need (as outlined in the section on climate change) · That NRC recognises and prepares for the risk novel of infectious disease outbreaks as a result of climate change e.g. vector borne diseases like dengue fever · Pandemic preparedness: that adequate planning is in place to manage the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, and future pandemics, and that NRC takes a 'green recovery' approach. <p>Wellbeing recommendations: That NRC structure their strategic objectives, business activities and targets to explicitly align with the wellbeing framework (social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing) articulated in the LGA.</p> <p>Engagement with Ngā Tai Ora/Public Health Northland (Northland DHB) recommendations: The establishment of a working group between Ngā Tai Ora/Public Health Northland (Northland DHB) and NRC to identify projects and a way forward.</p> <p>'Sustainable development goals' recommendation: We encourage NRC to engage with this process as appropriate, and would welcome collaboration on relevant projects.</p> <p>Conclusion recommendation: Perhaps the strongest recommendation we can make, however, is that NRC apply a health/wellbeing and equity lens over all their activities, and work more closely with Ngā Tai Ora/Public Health Northland (Northland DHB) to facilitate this. This would help achieve the 'four wellbeings' outcomes that are sought, and steer the region through the challenges it faces into a healthy sustainable future.</p> <p>{staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Mr David Lourie	LTP21_173	<p>I support Regional Council purchasing properties suitable for regional parks that are or could be connected to public transport services. Properties chosen for location, landscape features, biodiversity, cultural and historic protection with said areas protected with other areas run as public open space, model farming best practices, camp ground, lodge accommodation, cater for school trips, workshops, model wetland restoration, model stream management and environmental resource centre. Regional parks have the potential to be at least partly self funding. I support exploring further funding options such as bequests of cash and land, asking people if they would donate to different projects, many people donate time, why not cash rich time poor people have a chance to donate money for projects they support. Regional parks could be part funded by selling time shares in lodge accommodation, but still managed entirely in house.</p>

Rates and general

Rates and costs: concern

Name / Organisation	Reference	Comments
Mr Carl Mather	LTP21_27	I think the proposed spending of \$45million on some very vague work claims on the natural environment is totally unnecessary, and as I said before the environment has got to where it is with you lot 'looking after it' so I don't think you are the right people to be continuing in this role.
Mr Guy Wilson	LTP21_29	<p>Very disappointed to not see any attempt or offer to reduce rates in your proposals.</p> <p>A 19.8% increase in rates, followed by 14.5% then 10%, is unacceptable. No other business could sustain taking such steps and maintain their customer base, ratepayers are a captive market but not there to be exploited. All household would have dreams for lifestyle improvements but they are tempered by the reality of their income stream and live within it. Such increases would create a massive inflationary pressure. Nearly every business and household in the country has had to suck it in over the past year, for a council to increase charges by so much is surely irresponsible and should be avoided for the benefit and support of the ratepayers. Business and households that have managed to reign in spending to survive during crisis generally then continue to run lean and more efficiently, council should aspire to do the same. My income has never been inflation adjusted and is just basically diminished by increase council charges. There are a lot of "nice to haves" in the proposal, stick to the "must haves" and take some pressure off ratepayers, the "don't do this work" option would cut proposed costs significantly.</p>
Mr Alan Agnew	LTP21_40	NRC too focused on revenue and collecting rates. {Staff summary; please see original submission}
Clive Ball	LTP21_66	An increase of almost 20% is outrageous. And to then state that you will put a cap on increases in the next ten years of 15% shows a total disregard for ratepayers. While many in the community have had their income decrease because of covid, no workers in the public sector have been affected. Council should be doing the bare minimum, and should get rid of the "nice to have" add-ons. Council should not be involved in any commercial ventures as they have repeatedly shown they are not capable. Ratepayers are not the underwriters for Council financial folly. Cut back, and allow us to spend our (already taxed) dollars where we want to.
Kevin Pugh	LTP21_76	Review the entire plan to produce no more than a 5% increase in rates.
Ms Sarah Cameron Senior Policy Analyst NZ Kiwifruit Growers Inc	LTP21_84	A 19.8% rates increase is being proposed for the 2021/22 year followed by 14.5% in 2022/23. Council has proposed two rate increases for 2023/24 10% and 11.3% (page 53). It is not clear what option the proposed rate increases are for. This needs to be made clear. In relation to the 19.8% rates increase, NZKGI is responding on behalf of kiwifruit growers only, however it is acknowledged that this is a substantial increase that some communities may find challenging. NZKGI agrees that there is much to be done in Northland particularly on environmental matters and supports a rate increase to fund this work however finds that the proposed increases are excessive, and

		we would like to see a greater use of cost-benefit analysis to ensure significant new spending provides benefits to the region that outweigh the costs.
Mr Neil Doherty	LTP21_85	I'm broke. NRC are just another leech sucking my already depleted blood supply. No more.
Ms Sophia Xiao-Colley	LTP21_93	Is there something tangible and measurable to achieve that the 20% rate increase can justify?
Mr Peter Doel	LTP21_95	You have once again seriously let ratepayers down. You should be ashamed of yourselves. Your total disrespect of the majority of ratepayers is typical of your arrogance, self-serving nature and deceitfulness.
E Metz	LTP21_100	Council need to avoid the nice to have options, especially when we're all struggling in these COVID economic times.
Te Arapera Tauri	LTP21_113	I don't agree with the significant increase in rates that are planned not only for next year but for the next several years. There are a number of people that are already struggling to make ends meet without having such a significant rates increase added on top of the struggles that have come about because of the effects of COVID. People are struggling to get in to home ownership already.
Neville Walker	LTP21_119	We would like to give feedback about the planned increase in the rates collection. This form does not seem to include an option for feedback on section 05. (What It Means For The Money) of the Long Term Plan Consultation document. So I will record here our request that the NRC put these increases on hold while many ratepayers are experiencing a lot of uncertainty and even a downturn financially - mainly due to the effects (mostly indirect) that the covid pandemic has had - especially on the Tourism and related sectors of the community. Quite a number have experienced economic loss and the added outlay and stress of having to find or create new sources of income - if they have been able to do so. Small and large tourism related businesses, of which there are many in this part of Northland, are already finding increasing costs difficult to cope with and the large rate increases planned both by the NRC and the FNDC will only add to the financial burden of many ratepayers in the district. The option to postpone rate payments only adds to debt and the accompanying stress, which combined with all other rising costs and reduction in revenue, could mean further business closures and job losses. Surely the timing of these increases is not good. At the present time cost cutting, such as putting on hold of any unnecessary projects, etc (that can be put on hold) - these measures will help towards meeting the shortfall with Council costs and balancing the books, and in the process will take some of the burden off the ratepayer. Thank you
Richard Morris Ruakaka Residents and Ratepayers Association	LTP21_142	Our greatest concern is around a proposed 19% rates increase next year followed by other significant increases across the ten years of the plan. This does not reflect a fair rates burden on the Northland community. We are broadly supportive of initiatives to improve water quality and biodiversity ie the first five initiatives listed in your consultation document. Items further down the list could either be deferred, scaled back or ceased. We do not support the proposed convention centre. The proposed rates increase of 19.8% next year is simply too high. Across the ten years, an average rate of \$371.74 in 2020/21 will increase to \$622.20 in ten years; a 67% increase. Much of the 'blame' for the proposed rates rise is attributed to central government expectations including water

		<p>management. Our farmers are also being hit by the cost of climate change and water management legislation. Many of the items driving rates increases are not related to legislative requirements. The approach taken to budgeting has been to add up the list of desired projects, calculate the cost, then determine the impact on rates. A preferable approach would be to work out what is affordable to ratepayers then tailor the work programme accordingly. The plan tries to make significant progress on everything from water quality to public transport, Council IT, emergency management and so on. The proposed work programme does not seem to have been prioritised. As Northland's population grows, so will the NRC's rating base.. Thank you for the opportunity to submit.</p>
Leslie Bell	LTP21_151	<p>Submitter raises concern about the impacts of Covid-19 and recession. Raises concern about rate increases, and the proposed increase in debt when interest rates may not remain low. Notes that regional growth will result in more income for council. States that council should be concentrating on collecting money owed in rates.</p> <p>"My suggestion to Council is: 1. Limit increases to no more than the indexed inflation rate. 2. Strike no rates for new spending, at least until we emerge from recession and Covid19 is beaten. 3. Collect nothing for the Okuru Centre and leave it to private enterprise to fund it. 4. Live within existing budgets which have already bulged by more than 84% in 10 years."{Staff summary; please see original submission.}</p>
Mr Richard Gardner Senior Policy Advisor Federated Farmers of NZ	LTP21_170	<p>Submitter recommendation: That Council: Undertake a thorough review of its operations Continue to move towards a capital value based rating system; Instigate a policy for the UAGC to reach the maximum level allowable under the law over the next few years, and decrease the general rate accordingly; Make greater use of targeted rates and user fees and charges; Ask central Government to provide for more equitable rating policies for local Government. {staff summary; please see original submission}</p>

Rates support and general

Name / Organisation	Reference	Comments
Inge Bremer	LTP21_12	An excellent and easy to work with plan: comprehensive, detailed enough, clear indications of alternatives. congratulations!
Ian Heape	LTP21_17	born and bred in Whangārei i want to see continual progress for our region and this can only be achieved by committing to continual improvement and funding for the benefit of our current and future population
Mr David Lourie	LTP21_173	I support the increases in rating fees for environmental protection work.
Mrs Nan Pullman	LTP21_185	Overall I support the plan's goal of a thriving natural environment, resilient communities and more chances to fulfil our region's potential.
Ian Reeves	LTP21_20	Congratulations on covering these complex and crucial issues for the future of our community.
Jeroen Jongejans	LTP21_4	I like the direction we are taking- I like to see a more active and visionary input into the 30% protection of our Ocean and coastal waters by 2030, and I like the Oruku landing opportunity- focus on climate change policies, better land and water management with a team of dedicated enthusiastic staff and leaders is what we need to meet the challenges coming our way. Thank you for your work.
Mr James Ryan General Manager NZ Farm Environment Trust	LTP21_56	Submitter acknowledges the support of council to the NZ Farm Environment Trust and acknowledges the value of the Ballance Farm Environment Awards, particularly given the regulatory change that farmers and growers are facing through the NPS (Freshwater) and other government reforms. Submitter acknowledges positive relationship/partnership with council, notes exciting opportunities to complement the role of regional council (not specifically listed), and thanks council for ongoing support. {staff summary; see original submission}
Mr Oliver Krollmann	LTP21_8	I'm impressed by the detail and quality of your consultation documents, and I can finally see a shift towards recognising and addressing climate change, thinking about wellbeing, improving engagement with Māori, as well as increasing measuring and building knowledge. Please do not listen to the "zero rates increase" faction - go for all of it and more, as I've responded above. So many property owners, including me, easily make \$20k or more every year in tax-free capital gain on the land we own. A few hundred bucks more in rates for all the right things shouldn't even be worth discussing.

Northland Regional Council

P 0800 002 004

E info@nrc.govt.nz

W www.nrc.govt.nz