

# Memo

<b>To:</b>	Jerome Wyeth ; Sarah Trinder	<b>Job No:</b>	1098025
<b>From:</b>	Jon Rix	<b>Date:</b>	11 December 2025
<b>cc:</b>			
<b>Subject:</b>	KFO Submission – Hearing 15D – Flooding Right of Reply1098025		

## Introduction and scope of memorandum

1. My name is Jon Rix. I am a Principal Flood Risk and Adaptation Consultant at Tonkin & Taylor Ltd. I have set out my relevant qualifications and experience in previous evidence<sup>1</sup> and agree to comply with the Environment Court's Code of Conduct.
2. This Flooding technical Memorandum has been prepared on behalf of Far North District Council ('Council'). It relates to the Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited submission ('KFO') on the Far North District Proposed District Plan ('PDP'). The Memorandum outlines my written response to a number of issues raised during the KFO hearing (Hearing 15D).
3. This Memorandum covers the following inter-related key topics:
  - a) Critical information gaps at rezoning stage
  - b) Increased downstream flood risk
  - c) Uncertainty about whether these issues can be remedied through the design of the floodway.
4. I confirm that the flooding related concerns I have identified with the KFO Proposal and discussed in my Evidence in Chief and Summary Evidence remain.

---

<sup>1</sup> Evidence in response to Kiwi Fresh Orange on behalf of FNDC

### Key topics right of reply

5. In my evidence and summary statement I highlighted the following critical information gaps that should be addressed at the rezoning stage because they may materially change information used to support the rezoning:
  - a) Confirmation on the use of stopbanks.
  - b) Confirmation of the appropriate level of protection for the flood protection scheme, including consideration of residual effects.
  - c) Downstream flooding effects on residential property.
  - d) An effects assessment on the wetland.
6. My view on these critical information gaps remains, and I highlight Mr de Boer's evidence for Northland Regional Council's (NRC) in relation to their assessment of a "Kerikeri River floodway" scheme to exemplify the potential consequence of the information gap.
7. I highlight NRC's 2016 assessment of the Kerikeri River floodway because of similarities with the scheme proposed by KFO. The NRC modelling found that "*downstream flood risk had increased unacceptably, with increases in flooding to around 30 downstream properties*". As a result of this evidence and Mr de Boer's responses under questioning, my concern in relation to the downstream information gap increased.
8. My concern increased because the flood management concept (i.e. to convey floodwaters along the floodway) appears fundamentally flawed due to increased downstream flood risk.
9. An alternative flood management concept that ensures that downstream flood risk is not increased would materially change information used to support the rezoning.
10. My points highlighted above in relation to downstream flooding effects relate to only one of the four critical information gaps which I consider could materially change the information used to support the rezoning. Whilst I have been able to indicate the potential consequences of the information gap relating to downstream flood risk (i.e. due to NRC's evidence) I am more uncertain about the consequences of the other information gaps.