

## Summary statement of position (Planning), Jonathan Clease on behalf of Kaipara District Council

---

### Introduction

1. My full name is Jonathan Guy Clease. My qualifications and experience were stated in the s42A report dated 1 December 2025. I have also prepared a supplementary statement (dated 23 January 2026) and a rebuttal statement (9 February 2026).

### The key remaining issue

2. In my view this application boils down to the integration of zoned capacity and the provision of the wastewater infrastructure necessary to service it.
3. The evidence exchange process has been helpful in either resolving or significantly narrowing all other issues. The amendments to the NPS-HPL removed what was, in my view, a significant policy hurdle (assuming 3.6(5) is not in play). If the Panel prefer Mr Matheson's submissions that 3.6(5) remains engaged then in my view the methodological steps necessary to determine 'the minimum necessary' test will be very similar to the process required before Central Government's amendments to the NPS-HPL under 3.6(4). namely an assessment of capacity, demand, shortfalls, and alternative locations.
4. I remain of the view that PC85 is not necessary to provide development capacity. In particular, relying on Mr Foy's evidence, there is approximately twice as much residentially zoned capacity in Mangawhai as is needed to provide for growth over the next 30 years.
5. All other matters are either resolved, or turn on discrete matters of merit – roundabout vs right turn bay; stormwater modelling now rather than at time of subdivision; brewery MUZ vs LDRZ; dog ban or management, boardwalks or not. Whilst important details to get right, in my view none of them are determinative of the overall recommendation regarding plan change approval.
6. Turning now to the key matter of debate. In terms of urban zoned extent and wastewater capacity, the Council has worked hard over recent years to align its zoning with its servicing, informed by structure planning exercises. At the moment the two are broadly in alignment.

7. It appears to be common ground that with the programmed upgrades the WWTP will enable capacity to be lifted from the current 2,900 HUEs to 6,500 HUEs. I understand from Mr Cantrell that the timing of these upgrades can be summarised as follows:
- Stage 1. In ground irrigation - Lifts capacity to 4,000 HUEs. Consented, funded, and programmed to be implemented by end of 2026;
  - Stage 2: increased in-ground volumes - Lifts capacity to 5,000 HUEs. Needs RC following monitoring. Programmed late 2028;
  - Stage 3: Above ground spray irrigation – Lifts capacity to 6,500 HUEs. Needs RC, funding and Golf Club lessee agreement. Anticipated 2029-30.
8. Together with recently approved plan changes, there is therefore sufficient zoned and serviced capacity to enable Mangawhai to more than double in size. In my view the Council is therefore making a significant provision for coordinated future growth through both its RMA and LGA responsibilities.
9. I understand from Mr Cantrell that there is a step-change in effluent disposal infrastructure required in order to go beyond 6,500 HUEs. The need for a step-change solution does not appear to be in dispute. Either a long ocean outfall or a large land-based disposal field with the right combination of location, topography, soil conditions, and separation from neighbours. Neither of these solutions are programmed, designed, consented, or funded. Indeed, neither have been investigated beyond high-level desk top exercises that helped to inform the golf course as the preferred option for now.
10. The PPC85 application process has been the catalyst for exploring the alignment between servicing and zoning across Mangawhai in more detail. Council’s knowledge in this regard has continued to grow, along with a better understanding of existing zoned capacity, Brown Farm disposal capacity (less than originally thought), the consenting requirements and conditions necessary to develop the golf course in a staged manner, and the challenges with confirming a step change solution beyond the golf course.
11. Zoned capacity is also largely not in dispute. Differences boil down to the degree to which Mangawhai Central build-out excludes the possibility of yield beyond 785 HUEs, and more importantly the level of Reasonably Expected to be Realised of infill and small vacant sections available. Mr Foy has undertaken a detailed assessment of infill potential, correctly refined from plan enabled capacity to provide a RER figure. To accommodate PPC85 there needs to be a high level of confidence that Mr Thompson is correct that the additional 800 units

enabled by the current PC78 zoning over and above the 700 units currently planned will never be developed AND realisable infill is less than half of Mr Foy's RER estimate. If EITHER of these assumptions proves to be incorrect then there is no capacity for PPC85.

12. Normally the solution is to simply build more infrastructure, funded by the growth that it enables. However here the combination of geography, cost, and consentability challenges makes the ability to rely on such a solution highly speculative.

13. Accordingly, in my view, as set out in my section 42A Report, the lack of wastewater servicing remains a fundamental constraint, and reason why I recommend PPC85 be declined.

### **Conclusion**

14. The applicant has worked diligently to resolve the outstanding issues, such that the plan change is now supportable across most thematic topics. If sufficient confidence was available that a wastewater solution could be delivered (and NPS-HPL 3.6(5) is not in play), then my recommendation would be that the plan change be approved. The lack of capacity within the existing programmed system to service more than the demand anticipated to be realised from the existing urban zoned areas, combined with the challenges in providing further wastewater capacity, means that the requisite level of confidence that the plan change can be serviced for wastewater does not currently exist. As such I remain of the view that the application should be declined.

Jonathan Clease

18 February 2026