

**BEFORE A HEARINGS PANEL
OF THE FAR NORTH DISTRICT COUNCIL**

I MUA NGĀ KAIKŌMIHANA MOTUHAKE O TE HIKU O TE IKA

Under the	Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)
In the matter	of a request for rezoning of land in the Kerikeri-Waipapa area under the proposed Far North District Plan

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF JONATHON MICHAEL RIX IN SUPPORT OF
SECTION 42A REPORT FOR HEARING 15D**

FLOODING

6 October 2025



Sarah Mitchell / Tim Fischer
T: +64-9-358 2222
sarah.mitchell@simpsongrierson.com
tim.fischer@simpsongrierson.com
Private Bag 92518 Auckland

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 My name is Jonathon Michael Rix. I prepared a statement of evidence in relation to a rezoning request by Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (**KFO**) in the Kerikeri-Waipapa area under the proposed District Plan of the Far North District Council (**Council**). I refer to my qualifications and experience in my original statement, dated 10 September 2025, and do not repeat those matters here.

1.2 The purpose of this statement is to provide a brief summary of my evidence and to provide an initial response to the rebuttal evidence of KFO, noting that a full right of reply will be provided by the s 42A team (including additional expert input as required) following the hearing.

2. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

Flood hazard and site context

2.1 The 197 ha KFO site is located within the large Kerikeri River catchment. The contributing catchment area at the site is approximately 50 km² and flood modelling highlights that nearly 90 ha of the site currently sits within the 1% AEP floodplain.

2.2 The 1% AEP flood extent is not disputed, and I consider that e2 Environmental's model is suitable for the purposes of the rezoning. I have included a copy of their 1% AEP floodplain below for context:

2.6 Concept designs have inherent uncertainties due to the early-stage nature of the design, which is common across many civil-related projects. However, I consider that the proof-of-concept design for the floodway and the protections along the Kerikeri River lacks the level of detail and information required to support rezoning and there is little certainty of outcomes. Whilst some decisions can be deferred until later consenting phases, I consider that changes to the flood mitigation design could materially impact information relied on to support the rezoning decision.

2.7 I consider that more land could be required for flooding and flood mitigation than currently indicated, making less land available for development.

2.8 The critical information gaps that should be addressed at the rezoning stage are:

- (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; and
- (d) an effects assessment on the wetland.

3. RESPONSE TO MATTERS RAISED IN KFO REBUTTAL EVIDENCE

3.1 I have read Mr Kuta's statement of rebuttal evidence.

3.2 I do not consider it necessary to go through all the points raised by Mr Kuta, because we appear well aligned on matters requiring further consideration prior to resource consent. Our key point of difference relates to my view that some of the additional information on these matters should be available to support the rezoning decision, and it should not be deferred to resource consent stage.

3.3 In my view, responding to the critical information gaps (refer to paragraph 2.8 above) may materially change the information used to support the rezoning.

Jonathon Rix

6 October 2025