| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Angela Cook | 1 | 1.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete all PPC85 in its entirety | Submitter considers that the proposed area should not be developed further, and notes concerns for ecosystems and wildlife. Submitter also considers that further commercial, retail and industrial provisions are not necessary given the three hubs already in existence. | N | N |
| Bronwyn Fanshawe | 2 | 2.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete proposed rezoning of land | Submitter considers that rezoning the land will put additional burden on existing infrastructure given that council requires every house to have tank water. Submitter notes that the demand on wastewater, electricity, rubbish collection, school size and available jobs need to be considered further. | N | Y |
| Dave and Ann Hurley | 3 | 3.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete proposed rezoning of land | Submitter considers that the rezoning takes away from rural character. Submitter also notes concern regarding infrastructure. | N | Y |
| David Medland-Slater | 4 | 4.1 | Freshwater | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Amend | Submitter considers that the reports provided do not address freshwater, and the submitter would like to see how dwellings will be provided with freshwater. | N | Y |
| David Medland-Slater | 4 | 4.1 | Wastewater | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Amend | Submitter considers that the reports do not provide sufficient detail on how wastewater will be discharged. | N | N |
| Elizabeth Nichols-Gill | 5 | 5.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete all PPC85 in its entirety | The submitter considers that this plan change, and other large, planned subdivisions will impact and increase pressure of infrastructure. Additionally, the submitter considers the plan change will further impact on traffic congestion. The submitter is also concerned with the potential for increase in rates. | N | N |
| Paul Brown | FS4 | FS4.2 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that is concerned with the potential for an increase in rates. | Y | Y |
| Elizabeth Nichols-Gill | 5 | 5.2 | Ecology | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete all PPC85 in its entirety | Submitter is concerned the plan change will negatively impact on wildlife through an increase in domestic cats. | | |
| Karen Staples | 6 | 6.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete all PPC85 in its entirety | The submitter details a number of concerns which are as follows;<br>1. Strain on health services – submitter is concerned that the plan change would increase population without plans to expand on existing healthcare services<br>2. Roading and traffic impacts – submitter considers that the existing roads are not sufficient to support the plan change, and the consequential increase in roading demand.<br>3. Schooling capacity – submitter is concerned that the existing schools would not be able to accommodate the additional demand<br>4. Limited employment opportunities – submitter is concerned that the limited number of jobs available will result in a significant portion of residents being required to commute for work.<br>5. Environmental Impact and Beach Overcrowding – submitter is concerned that the additional residential development will place further strain on beaches and natural environments, and result in overcrowding.<br>6. Strain on utilities and power supply – the submitter notes that Mangawhai intermittent power cuts and is concerned that the plan change will place additional pressure on the electrical infrastructure. | N | Y |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.26 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that the development facilitated by PC85 will not be able to be accommodated by existing infrastructure. | Y | Y |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Martina Tschirky | 7 | 7.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete all PPC85 in its entirety | Submitter is concerned that existing infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional development and considers there are already too many properties for sale.<br><br>The submitter also notes their concern regarding the location of the land to be rezoned, which is low-lying with some parts in the Tsunami zone. The submitter notes that the land also has a high-water table and does not consider it suitable for intense development.<br><br>Additional industrial zones are unnecessary. | Y | Y |
| Martina Tschirky | 7 | 7.2 | Rezoning | New proposed district plan | Oppose | Delete | The submitter considers that the PDP does not accommodate any more development in relation to the proposed plan change and therefore asks KDC to disallow the plan change. | | |
| John Seward | 8 | 8.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 as notified | The submitter considers that the area is much needed for growth in Mangawhai. The submitter notes that the land is predominantly flat which is ideal for housing. | N | Y |
| Juan Miguel Hamber | 9 | 9.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete all PPC85 in its entirety | Submitter considers that Mangawhai does not have sufficient infrastructure to accommodate the level of additional development that the plan change will bring.<br><br>The submitter also notes that the current roading infrastructure is not adequate to the support the plan change. Additionally, the submitter considers that there is sufficient provision for growth and development through other developments (The Hills). | N | Y |
| Clive Boonham | 10 | 10.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Not specified | The submitter provides a number of reasoning as to why they do not support the plan change, as follows;<br><br>• Amenity and ecology of the Mangawhai Estuary – submitter agrees with comments from submitter Joel Cayford<br>• Flood Risk – submitter is concerned that the approving the plan change will increase flood risk to future properties.<br>• Additional pressure on amenities and infrastructure of recent plan changes – the submitter is concerned that the development is uncontrolled and is destroying the appeal of Mangawhai. The submitter notes the number of previous plan changes that have been granted and considers that the full impact of the increase in population will not be noticeable for several years.<br>• Wastewater infrastructure – the submitter is concerned that the current capacity of the scheme is not sufficient. The submitter notes that they appealed PC78 with respect to wastewater capacity, and that the Environment Court held that wastewater capacity must be either physically available or the required capacity must be planned and funded in the long-term plan. The submitter notes that neither of these requirements have been met.<br>• Section 32 Strategic Direction for the Proposed District Plan -the submitter references sections of the s32 report which highlight that further development within the Mangawhai-Hakaru Growth area should be limited given the number of plan changes that have recently been approved in the area.<br>• NPSUD – the submitter considers that Tier 3 obligations under the NPSUD cannot apply to townships such as Mangawhai given it is bordered by the sea on one side, and does not have the space, amenities or the infrastructure to cope<br>• Commercial hubs – the submitter considers that an additional commercial hub is not necessary given that Mangawhai already has one larger and two smaller existing hubs. | Y | Y |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Paul Wilkes | 11 | 11.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Amend | The submitter notes a number of concerns with the proposed plan change as follows;<br>• Incompatible urban intensification – the submitter considers that the proposed plan change contradicts existing planning frameworks, including the spatial plan and the proposed district plan which designate the area as rural/residential.<br>• Infrastructure – the submitter considers the development should not proceed until all essential infrastructure, inclusive of roads, footpaths, cycleways, stormwater and wastewater systems are fully built and operational.<br>• Wastewater uncertainty – the submitter considers there is no credible plan for managing wastewater for the proposed development.<br>• Threat to coastal wildlife and natural landscape – the submitter notes their concern regarding the impacts of the plan change on wildlife and the natural landscape. The submitter notes the<br>• School overload – the submitter notes that the primary school is nearing its capacity limits. With no long-term solution proposed, the submitter is concerned that additional residents from the proposed development will place pressure on education resources.<br>• Traffic – submitter is concerned that potential increase in vehicle movements could be 7,000 – 8,000 per day and there is no planned intersection upgrade or traffic mitigation measures planned.<br>• Commercial hub – submitter notes that there are already three other commercial zones in existence and considers the plan change lacks justification for further commercial infrastructure.<br>• Housing demand – the submitter is concerned that the housing demand projections rely heavily on data from the past five years, which has a period of high growth. The submitter queries whether the additional proposed supply of housing is necessary or sustainable. | N | N |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.1 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that PC85 is inconsistent with the Mangawhai Growth Strategy (spatial plan). | Y | Y |
| Lena Nelson | 12 | 12.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete all PPC85 in its entirety | The submitter notes their concerns are around the current infrastructure which is struggling. They are also concerned with schooling capacity, medical facilities and traffic congestion. | N | Y |
| Margaret Brookes | 13 | 13.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete all PPC85 in its entirety | Submitter is concerned with the lack of services and estuary wide pollution | N | Y |
| Sue Fitzgerald | 14 | 14.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete all PPC85 in its entirety | Submitter considers that the plan change does not align with the District Plan or the spatial plan. Additionally, the submitter is concerned with that the ecology of the estuary will be negatively affected through an increase in sediment and overgrowth of mangroves damaging the estuary. | N | N |
| Grant Douglas | 15 | 15.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Put PPC85 on hold until the impact of the current three rezoned residential developments are fully, or at least partially implemented. | The submitter is concerned that another larger development will increase financial risk further when there are already three other large residential developments still to be implemented.<br>The submitter is also concerned that costs will be passed down to ratepayers. | N | N |
| Kristina Kahn | 16 | 16.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete all PPC85 in its entirety | The submitter is concerned that the proposed development will result in a large increase in traffic volume and therefore will increase traffic safety issues, with particular regard to school drop off and pickup. | N | Y |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kristina Kahn | 16 | 16.2 | Ecology | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | | Submitter agrees with reasons as stated in the Mangawhai Focus August 11 p3 'Mangawhai East plan stirs opposition'<br>Submitter considers the proposed development is high risk in terms of ecological values. | | |
| Peter Kemp | 17 | 17.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety | The submitter is concerned that the proposed development will result in additional pressure on the roads which already face high traffic volumes. | N | N |
| Peter Kemp | 17 | 17.2 | Ecology | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety | Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will result in further ecological risk for estuary, health, birdlife and risk of wastewater pollution. | | |
| Julie Riley | 18 | 18.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 as notified | Submitter considers there is a demand for coastal living opportunities on the eastern side of the estuary. The submitter also considered the proposed development will improve access to the harbour from the eastern side of the village. | N | Y |
| Heath Riley | 19 | 19.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 as notified | Submitter considers there is a demand for coastal living opportunities on the eastern side of the estuary. The submitter also considered the proposed development will improve access to the harbour from the eastern side of the village. | N | N |
| Peter Nicholas | 20 | 20.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety | The submitter notes a number of reasons as to why they do not support the proposed development;<br>• Consistency with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan – the submitter is concerned that the plan change does not align with the direction of the Spatial Plan.<br>• Consistency with the proposed District Plan – the submitter notes that the proposed district plan does not identify the proposed plan change area as an area for urban development or recommend that the area be rezoned. The submitter considers that the requirements of the NPSUD have already been met through previous developments that have been approved.<br>• Ecology values – the submitter is concerned that the proposed plan change will result in an increase in recreational activities along the estuary which puts endangered birds at risk.<br>• Sea defences – the submitter notes that Mangawhai Matters Society Inc has recently completed a series of studies which include investigations and modelling of inundation risks within Mangawhai and adjacent to the estuary posed by stormwater flooding. The submitter notes that one of the options is the construction of seawalls or bunds or another method of raising natural ground levels.<br>• Unplanned infrastructure – the submitter is concerned that the proposed plan change will result in the need for the extension to of infrastructure, including wastewater, roading, stormwater, and sea defences.<br>• Demand on facilities such as the boat ramp, Mangawhai Heads carpark and road access to the village. | Y | Y |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.2 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that PC85 is inconsistent with the Mangawhai Growth Strategy (spatial plan). | Y | Y |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.23 | Inundation | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point highlighting the investigations and modelling of inundation risks and the potential for sea defences. | | |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.25 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that the development facilitated by PC85 will not be able to be accommodated by existing infrastructure. | | |
| Hamish Hoyle | 21 | 21.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 as notified | Submitter considers the plan change supports the growth of Mangawhai. | N | Y |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hayden Poole | 22 | 22.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose in part | The submitter seeks the following requested relief:<br>• Reduce the scale and density of the proposed zoning.<br>• Require infrastructure and sewage upgrades before any large-scale subdivision or building consents are granted.<br>• Strengthen protections for the Mangawhai estuary and surrounding ecology, including greater setbacks from waterways and coastal hazard zones.<br>• Limit development in areas identified as high risk for coastal hazards and flooding. | The submitter opposes the plan change as currently drafted due to a number of reasons and concerns, as below;<br>• Infrastructure and services – the submitter notes that Mangawhai's existing infrastructure, inclusive of roads, water supply and stormwater systems<br>• Sewerage and wastewater – the submitter considers that Mangawhai's wastewater treatment plant has limited capacity and that additional development will put pressure on the existing network. The submitter considers that the development should not proceed until there is a proven plan to upgrade sewerage infrastructure that safeguards public health and he environment.<br>• Estuary and coastal protection – the submitter notes that the proposed development area sits within an ecologically sensitive environment and notes their concern around an increase in urban runoff, sedimentation and pollution. The submitter considers that given the climate change and sea level risk, intensive development should not expand into these areas.<br>• Ecological sensitivity – the submitter notes that while the plan change includes ecological feature maps, the rezoning rural land for more intensive use will place further pressure on these areas. | N | N |
| Jes Magill | 23 | 23.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety | The submitter considers the plan change goes against KDC's previous assessment of the area – that it should not be built on. The submitter considers the area is ecologically sensitive and that no further development should be allowed. | N | N |
| Richard Poole | 24 | 24.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety | The submitter notes the other large developments such as Mangawhai Central, Cove Road and Cullen Road and is concerned that the plan change will place additional pressure on infrastructure and roading.<br>The submitter notes the inconsistency with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan<br>and is concerned that allowing this plan change will set a precedent that KDC will allow unlimited development within the boundaries.<br>The submitter is also concerned on the potential effects on the estuary and birdlife. | N | N |
| Angela Bridson | 25 | 25.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety | The submitter is concerned that the plan change will increase pressure on the harbour with the increased number of dwellings, and that pollution in the harbour will increase from sedimentation and plant removal.<br>The submitter is concerned that existing infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic and waste from the additional housing. The submitter also notes their concern that the sand dunes will lose more sand and therefore the land could be more susceptible to flooding | N | N |
| Kirsti Burns | 26 | 26.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety | The submitter considers PPC85 does not align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan and the proposed district plan. The submitter makes reference to other large developments such as The Hills, The Rise, Mangawhai Central, Jessie Developments and other private approved sections. The submitter considers that there are enough small residential developments already available, and that the area should remain rural in nature. | Y | N |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.3 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that PC85 is inconsistent with the Mangawhai Growth Strategy (spatial plan). | Y | Y |
| Kirsti Burns | 26 | 26.2 | General | Staging of the development | Oppose | Not specified | The submitter is concerned that infrastructure will not be built until sections have been sold. The submitters considers that infrastructure, such as roads and stormwater drains, and site filling to mitigate flood risk should be established prior to any buildings. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kirsti Burns | 26 | 26.3 | General | Wastewater | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety | The submitter queries what wastewater system is being proposed, noting that the only septic system on this side of the estuary is the campground's private system, which is almost at capacity and is not built to handle to required volume of waste. The submitter queries whether this would result in running waste across the harbour and consider this would increase risks through contaminating the estuary. | | |
| Irene Dawn Sanson and Gavan Riley | 27 | 27.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety | The submitter is opposed to the plan change for a number of reasons, as follows;<br>• The plan change is not consistent with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan.<br>• The proposed area of development is close to the beach, sand dunes and estuary and the plan change increases risk to flora and fauna.<br>• The proposed development area is within the tsunami zone and considers it is likely to be affected by sea level rise, resulting in potential insurance problems.<br>• The plan change is inconsistent with the proposed district plan, which does not identify the land as suitable for urban development. The submitter references policy 7 of the NZ Coastal Policy, which requires councils to protect from inappropriate subdivision.<br>• The plan change will create traffic congestion around the entrance to Black Swamp Road.<br>• The plan change will result in adverse noise effects from the construction phase of the development, but also potential increase in noise from additional powered boats and jet skis. | Y | Y |
| Craig and Deidre Payne | 28 | 28.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain as notified, or with amendments within scope as necessary to ensure a quality environmental outcome as sought through the plan change application. | The submitter considers the plan change will provide Mangawhai with a quality urban environment and considers the plan change is an opportunity to significantly improve public amenity and access and is to be undertaken by a reputable locally owned company.<br>The submitter notes that development and growth in Mangawhai must be offset by well thought out and quality development to ensure ecological protection and to enhance public amenity. | N | Y |
| Vicky and Timothy Andrew | 29 | 29.1 | Rezoning | DEV XP3-2 – transportation and connectivity | Oppose | Amend | Submitter considers that a right hand turn bay will be insufficient with the new development and the number of people during holiday and weekend periods. | Y | Y |
| Vicky and Timothy Andrew | 29 | 29.2 | Zoning | Business neighbourhood and mixed use centre zone, objectives and policies and rules | Oppose | Delete | Submitter considers there is sufficient urban commercial sprawl throughout Mangawhai and therefore the commercial element and associated effects in PC85 is unnecessary. | | |
| Vicky and Timothy Andrew | 29 | 29.3 | Density | DEV XLU R6 - Comprehensively designed residential development | Oppose | Delete rule and its associated objectives and policies | Submitter seeks to delete the rule and associated objectives as they consider that a site size of 350m$^2$ is too small for Mangawhai. The submitter considers that the level of proposed intensification is inappropriate. | | |
| Vicky and Timothy Andrew | 29 | 29.4 | Setbacks | DEV XLU S4 3A Setbacks from internal boundaries | Oppose | Delete rule | The submitter notes that the rule enables townhouse development which they consider to be appropriate for the area. | | |
| Vicky and Timothy Andrew | 30 | 30.1 | Zoning | DEV XSUB S1-1 | Oppose | The medium density residential zone should be changed to a low residential zone. | - | Y | Y |
| Vicky and Timothy Andrew | 30 | 30.2 | Esplanade | DEV XSUB S3 2 | Oppose | Amend the pest and weed control timeframe from 6 monthly to 5 years by the developer and then in perpetuity by the council. | - | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vicky and Timothy Andrew | 30 | 30.3 | Infrastructure | DEV XSUB S8 | Oppose | The submitter requests that the stormwater management plan be prepared with direct consultation from directly adjoining neighbours. | - | | |
| Vicky and Timothy Andrew | 30 | 30.4 | Subdivision | DEV X REQ 2 | Support | None-specified | The submitter supports the walkway to the village | | |
| Vicky and Timothy Andrew | 31 | 31.1 | Visitor accommodation | DEV X LU R3 Visitor accommodation | Oppose | Delete rule. | The submitter considers this is not in character with the area of Mangawhai and is not necessary. | Y | Y |
| Vicky and Timothy Andrew | 31 | 31.2 | Commercial activities | DEV X LU R4 | Oppose | Delete rule. | The submitter considers this is not in character with the area of Mangawhai and is not necessary. | | |
| Vicky and Timothy Andrew | 31 | 31.3 | Commercial activities | DEV X LU R6 | Oppose | Delete rule. | The submitter considers this is not in character with the area of Mangawhai and is not necessary. | | |
| Riverside Holiday Park 2007 Limited | 32 | 32.1 | Rezoning | Rezoning applied to 41 Black Swamp Road | Oppose | Retain the existing Rural zoning and that the low-Density Residential Zone set out in Appendix 2 is not adopted, with respect to 41 Black Swamp Road (the Riverside Holiday Park). | The submitter seeks the requested relief as they are concerned with the increase in rates that would occur given the site would be rezoned to an urban zone. The submitter notes they do not have any intention of discontinuing the holiday park or selling the site to a developer. | Y | Y |
| Riverside Holiday Park 2007 Limited | 32 | 32.2 | General | Structure plan/development area provisions | Support in part | For the balance of the plan change site excluding 41 Black Swamp Road, the submitter seeks the following requested relief:<br>• Provision for no-complaints covenants within the relevant zone standards that apply to the residential and rural lifestyle zones that adjoin 41 Black Swamp Road (Riverside Holiday Park).<br>• Deletion of the 'Coastal fringe enhancement and public walkway' from the Structure Plan in Appendix 4.<br>• The implementation of pedestrian and cyclist connectivity along Black Swamp Road.<br>• The need for implementation of traffic control measures (preferably a roundabout) at the intersection of Black Swamp Road, Tomarata Road, and Insley Street, which should be linked to development thresholds within the Rules and Standards within the Development Area Provisions in Appendix 3.<br>• The need for pedestrian and cycling improvements across the Insley Street Bridge, which should be linked to development thresholds within the Rules and Standards within the Development Area Provisions in Appendix 3. | The submitter identifies a number of concerns with the structure plan and development area provisions as follows:<br>• The proposed Coastal fringe enhancement and public walkway will not have the actual levels of public benefit. Additionally, the submitter is concerned that the practicality and costs have not been fully considered.<br>• Submitter queries whether the proposed alignment of the indicative road will provide the most efficient and appropriate mechanism given there appears to be little consideration in respect to upgrades and improvements to Black Swamp Road.<br>• Submitter notes there may be a need for traffic improvements, such as a roundabout, at the intersection of Black Swamp Road, Tomarata Road, and Insley Street. Submitter considers that required upgrades should be included in the development rules and triggered once certain development thresholds are met (e.g., number of dwellings or floor area).<br>• Submitter considers that the proposed cycleway across the Insley Street bridge requires further detail given the current pedestrian safety risks present. | | |
| Derek Westwood | FS2 | FS2.5 | General | Stormwater | Oppose | That limited weight be given to this submission where it conflicts with flood management requirements | The further submitter opposes the submissions focus on traffic/density while disregarding flooding impacts | Y | Y |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jason McQuarrie | 33 | 33.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 as notified, or with amendments within scope. | The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;<br>• Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also supports the inclusion of the structure plan.<br>• Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth. They particularly support the ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure.<br>• Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. | Y | Y |
| Paul Brown | FS6 | FS6.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge. | The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.<br>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area. | Y | Y |
| Krystal Hebden | 34 | 34.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 as notified, or with amendments within scope. | The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;<br>• Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also supports the inclusion of the structure plan.<br>• Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth. They particularly support the ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure.<br>• Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. | Y | Y |
| Paul Brown | FS6 | FS6.2 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge. | The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.<br>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area. | Y | Y |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Derek Smyth | 35 | 35.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety | The submitter opposes the plan change and provides a number of reasons as follows;<br>• Intensive urbanisation –the proposed plan change does not align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan and District Plan.<br>• Staging of the development – the submitter considers all infrastructure needs to be constructed and operational prior to the first dwellings being built to avoid risk to ratepayers.<br>• Wastewater – submitter considers that the proposed plan change does not adequately address wastewater management.<br>• Coastal bird taonga and outstanding natural landscape – submitter considers that these matters are not satisfactorily addressed.<br>• Traffic – submitter is concerned that the increase in will require intersection upgrades, however notes none have been proposed.<br>• Mixed use/commercial hub – queries whether another commercial hub is needed given there are three commercial areas already.<br>• Housing demand in Mangawhai – the submitter queries whether the current level of growth will continue, necessitating additional lots. | N | N |
| Ed Smyth | 36 | 36.1 | Rezoning | Zoning | Oppose | The submitter seeks the following requested relief;<br>• Amend the PPC85 zoning maps to apply Low Density Residential Zone (LDRZ) to Lot 1 DP 545009, 45 Windsor Way, Mangawhai.<br>• Provide consequential relief to the PPC85 provisions as needed to give effect to this submission and to achieve sustainable management.<br>• Ensure consistency in the application of zoning principles across PPC85 so that sites with equivalent physical suitability are zoned similarly.<br>• Amend provisions to integrate the provision of services and access, including subdivision and development, to enable the efficient and effective extension of infrastructure to all parts of the PPC85 area.<br>• Provide alternative relief with similar effect, to ensure the property can achieve the intended residential outcomes consistent with PPC85's objectives. | The submitter provides a number of reasons supporting their requested relief, as follows;<br>• The flood hazards on their property have been resolved.<br>• Zoning their property as LDRZ would be consistent with the approach as set out in the s32 report for PPC85.<br>• The Mangawhai Spatial Plan recommends that the proposed development area be zoned as RLZ.<br>• That additional provisions are required to ensure sufficient services and access is provided to the area.<br>• The submitter considers that the proposed plan change will impose additional restrictions on their property if their relief is not provided.<br>• The submitter considers that the proposed plan change will reduce their property's flexibility and use and PPC85 would not benefit the property. | Y | Y |
| Derek Westwood | FS2 | FS2.1 | Stormwater | Stormwater | Support | Allow the submission relief<br>That Council require downstream infrastructure upgrades and stormwater neutrality measures | The further submitter supports the submission point that highlights the existing flood constraints and risk of displacement from upstream works. | Y | Y |
| Hugh Benn | 37 | 37.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 as notified, or with amendments within scope. | The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;<br>• Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also supports the inclusion of the structure plan.<br>• Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth. They particularly support the ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, | Y | Y |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure.<br>• Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. | | |
| Paul Brown | FS6 | FS6.3 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge. | The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.<br>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area. | Y | Y |
| Kathleen McInerney | 38 | 38.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety | The submitter opposes the proposed Plan Change due to concern related to the pressure on existing infrastructure such as wastewater and schools. Additionally, the submitter notes concern with ecological values being compromised. | N | N |
| Patrick Fontein | 39 | 39.1 | Rezoning | Zoning | Support | Amend | The submitter supports the overall proposed plan change as it will provide opportunities for the overall growth of Mangawhai and will allow for diversity of property types.<br>The submitter expresses concern at the spread of town centre activities and would prefer a consolidation of town centre activities within Mangawhai Village as opposed to Black Swamp Road. | N | N |
| Arthur and Jocelyn Rutherford | 40 | 40.1 | Rezoning | Zoning map | Support in part | The submitter seeks to remove business zoning. | The submitter supports rezoning the site at 4 and 4A Black Swamp Road to Large Lot residential and Low Density residential.<br>The submitter does not support business zoning along Black Swamp Road | Y | Y |
| Arthur and Jocelyn Rutherford | 40 | 40.2 | Building standards | DEVX-LU-R3 Minor Residential Unit | Oppose | Reduce the maximum GFA of the minor residential unit to 65m². | The submitter considers that a GFA of 90m² is a small dwelling, not a minor residential unit. The submitter considers that a GFA of 65m² would be more appropriate. | | |
| Arthur and Jocelyn Rutherford | 40 | 40.3 | Building standards | DEVX-LU-S4 Setback from internal boundaries | Support in part | Amend as follows:<br>2(b) Where a building or structure **is located directly adjacent to** Lot 2 DP 392239, or subsequent legal description, then **a no build landscaped** setback shall be 8m minimum and the exceptions below do not apply. **This area shall include a bund to redirect stormwater runoff from development to the road.** | The submitter considers that this standard shall apply to buildings and/or structures that are directly adjacent to Lot 2 DP 392239 and that the landscaped area should not contain services to avoid disturbance in the future. | | |
| Arthur and Jocelyn Rutherford | 40 | 40.4 | Building standards | DEVX-LU-S1 Site Coverage | Oppose | Submitter seeks to amend the standard as follows (if it is retained);<br>**Low Density Residential**<br>**Building coverage – 25%**<br>**Impervious surface – 40%**<br>**Large Lot Residential**<br>**Building coverage – 25%**<br>**Impervious surface – 35%** | The submitter considers that site coverage between different residential zones needs to be clearly outlined. The submitter notes that as currently drafted, 45% building coverage is permitted and considers that the site coverage should be lower to better reflect the intended character of the zone. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Arthur and Jocelyn Rutherford | 40 | 40.5 | Transport | New standard | Support | Add a new standard as follows:<br>**1. <u>The intersection at Insley Street and Black Swamp Road shall be a roundabout intersection prior to s.224c approval for any development within the Development Area.</u>**<br>**2. <u>The roundabout intersection shall be designed to Austroad standards.</u>**<br>**3. <u>The intersection shall include landscaping and design features to achieve a quality entrance to the Development Area</u>**<br>4. **<u>A pedestrian footpath and cycleway, connecting the Development Area with Mangawhai township, along the estuary edge of Black Swamp Road shall be constructed to the engineering standards in conjunction with the any development in the Development Area.</u>** | The submitter seeks to include a requirement for the establishment of a roundabout at Insley Street and Black Swamp Road intersection. | | |
| Arthur and Jocelyn Rutherford | 40 | 40.6 | Transport | DEVX-G-S4 Traffic Intensity | Oppose | Amend standard as follows:<br>Accordingly**, <u>up to 18 daily one way vehicle movements per site, excluding construction traffic only,</u>** should be permitted**.** | The submitter notes that the standard traffic generation from a residential site can be up to 9 one-way vehicle movements, and that minor residential dwellings are permitted in all residential zones allowing for an additional 6 vehicle movements | | |
| Arthur and Jocelyn Rutherford | 40 | 40.7 | Density | DEVX-SUB-S1 Density / Minimum Site Size | Oppose | Amend the standard as follows:<br>(...)<br>Large lot residential zone → Large Lot Residential zone<br>~~a. 1,000m² when connected to a reticulated wastewater Network.~~<br>2,000m² ~~where a connection to the Reticulated Wastewater network is not available~~<br>(...) | The submitter considers that LLR zone should have a minimum site area of 2000m² and considers 1000m² is not appropriate for this zone. | | |
| Arthur and Jocelyn Rutherford | 40 | 40.8 | Density | DEVX-SUB-S1 Density / Minimum Site Size Low Density Residential zone 750m² | Support | Retain as notified. | The submitter supports the proposed density for the Low Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Arthur and Jocelyn Rutherford | 40 | 40.9 | Density | DEVX-SUB-S1 Density / Minimum Site Size Medium Density Residential zone 350m² | Oppose | Remove reference to 350m² and comprehensive developments. | The submitter considers that the proposed density for the Medium Density Residential zone is not appropriate. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Arthur and Jocelyn Rutherford | 40 | 40.10 | Subdivision | Information Requirements DEVX-REQ2 Subdivision or Development that will enable 50 or more residential units or residential unit equivalents in the Development Area | Oppose | The Development Area anticipates development /intensification and therefore the Developer should undertake an upgrade to the intersection of Insley Street and Tomarata Road and provide a roundabout intersection.<br><br>**Information Requirements DEVX-REQ2 Subdivision or Development in the Development Area** | The intersection of Insley Street and Tomarata Road/Black Swamp Road is a key entry point into Mangawhai. With future development, the submitter considers it should be upgraded to a roundabout to improve traffic flow and ensure pedestrian and cyclist safety. The submitter considers that, due to nearby property access and expected traffic growth, a roundabout is necessary as a safety measure. | | |
| Melanie Scott | 41 | 41.1 | Rezoning | Zoning maps | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety | The submitter considers that the proposed development area is unsuitable for commercial and high-density residential development given that it is low lying and flood prone. The submitter sets out a number of reasons for their opposition of the Plan Change:<br>• Stormwater - The submitter is concerned that a high level of impermeable surfaces will result in stormwater runoff into the estuary<br>• Wastewater management – the submitter is concerned that the existing wastewater system is not fit for purpose and is already over capacity.<br>• Ecology – the submitter considers that ecological values are at risk and have not been properly considered, in particular bird species such as the New Zealand Fairy Tern. | Y | N |
| Derek Westwood | FS2 | FS2.2 | Stormwater | Stormwater | Support | That mitigation measures ensure runoff is managed and hydrological neutrality enforced | The further submitter supports the submission point that highlights concerns about increased impervious coverage and runoff risk to estuary. | Y | Y |
| Gayle Forster | 42 | 42.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | | The submitter considers that land identified as “O” and “P” (from the Mangawhai Spatial Plan) are close to the estuary and is concerned that the proposed rezoning of these areas and the consequent construction would permanently affect the areas that attract people to Mangawhai.<br><br>The submitter has traffic concerns.<br><br>With consideration of area “Q”, the submitter is concerned that the area is highly restrained due the risk of sea level rise, and building on this land would result in an increase in flooding and permanent damage.<br><br>The submitter considers the Plan Change to be premature. | N | N |
| Northland Regional Council | 43 | 43.1 | Coastal flood hazard | Flood maps | | That the land identified as hazard prone in the NRC flood maps to the north-east and coastal estuarine areas of the proposed plan change area is not rezoned for intensive residential development. | The submitter considers that some areas are potentially affected by coastal inundation and subject to flooding during a 1-in-100-year storm event, taking into account projected sea level rise over the next 100 years and that there may be some residual risk. The submitter considers that risk must be avoided through avoiding inappropriate development in 10- and 100-year flood hazard areas and coastal hazard areas. | Y | Y |
| Northland Regional Council | 43 | 43.2 | Water Supply | Appendix 3: Development Area Provisions | | Add a provision to Appendix 3: Development Area Provisions<br><br>requiring 50,000 litres of on-site water storage for domestic use through rainwater collection for each residential unit. | The submitter is concerned that rezoning from rural to residential will provide for smaller lot sizes, and that it may be difficult to accommodate residential dwellings and the required water tanks on site. The submitter considers that the required water tank sizes should be made clear at the time of development to ensure that development can be planned to accommodate the tanks.<br><br>The submitter considers that this would provide better consistency with Policy 5.1.1 (d) and (h) and Policy 5.1.2 (d) of the RPS. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rosemarie Dunning | 44 | 44.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | | The submitter details the following reasons for not supporting the plan change:<br>• Significant alteration to current zoning – the submitter notes that the proposed district plan identifies the area to be rural lifestyle and is concerned that the plan change is seeking to change the zone before the PDP has been implemented.<br>• Housing – the submitter considers that PPC83 and PPC84 are sufficient in terms of aligning with outcomes sought by the NPSUD.<br>• Infrastructure – the submitter is concerned that the 900 proposed sections will not be able to be accommodated by the existing infrastructure, including wastewater, stormwater and roading.<br>• Ecology values – the submitter is concerned that the proposed plan change will result in negative effects on the estuary, which is a popular feeding ground for Tara iti.<br>• Mixed use and commercial hub – the submitter considers that Mangawhai does not need a 'fourth' hub. | Y | N |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.4 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that PC85 is inconsistent with the Mangawhai Growth Strategy (spatial plan). | Y | Y |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.24 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that the development facilitated by PC85 will not be able to be accommodated by existing infrastructure. | | |
| Derek Westwood | FS2 | FS2.6 | General | Infrastructure | Oppose | That infrastructure based solutions are prioritised rather than outright rejection. | The further submitter opposes the submissions claims that there is no demand for housing and that is an unsuitable location. | Y | Y |
| Timothy Scott | 45 | 45.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 as notified. | The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;<br>• Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also supports the inclusion of the structure plan.<br>• Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth. They particularly support the ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure.<br>• Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. | Y | Y |
| Paul Brown | FS6 | FS6.4 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge. | The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.<br>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area. | Y | Y |
| Tern Point Recreation and Conservation Society Inc | 46 | 46.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety. | The submitter provides a number of reasons for their opposition of PPC85, as follows;<br>• NPS-UD – the submitter notes that whilst encouraged, tier 3 councils are not required to implement Medium Density Residential standards and therefore there is no need for PPC85 with respect to the NPSUD. The submitter considers there is more than sufficient provision for long term growth. | Y | N |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | • Spatial Plan – the submitter notes that the spatial plan discourages rezoning the proposed development area for further intensified development and noted a number of reasons as to why the proposed plan change does not align with the Spatial Plan.<br>• NPS HPL – the submitter considers that rezoning the proposed development area under PPC85 is contrary to the intended limitations of the Spatial Plan, noting that the land is identified as LUC-3 in the Spatial Plan.<br>• Proposed district plan –<br>- the submitter notes that the Proposed District Plan does not identify the proposed development area under PPC85 for urban development and does not recommend rezoning the land.<br>- the submitter considers that allowing PPC85 would be contrary to KDC's approach in terms of strategic planning. Additionally the submitter considers that the PPC85 would not be consistent with objectives and policies within the NZCPS.<br>• Environmental and guardianship issues –<br>- The submitter notes that the current and proposed rules limiting development in this area provide greater protection of fauna<br>- the submitter is concerned that the proposed plan change will result in environmental issues.<br>- The submitter is concerned that the proposed development will result in an influx of domestic cats, which could threaten the Fairy Tern habitat.<br>• Infrastructure issues –<br>- The submitter notes that the RMA is defines 'effect' and that where there is uncertainty and potential for serious or adverse harm, a precautionary approach is the default. The submitter considers that the campground being connected to the septic system is not justification for new residential development.<br>- the submitter also notes their concern as to who costs will fall to with respect to infrastructure.<br>- the submitter is concerned that the existing infrastructure, inclusive of roading and schools, cannot cope with the proposed level of development. | | |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.5 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that PC85 is inconsistent with the Mangawhai Growth Strategy (spatial plan). | Y | Y |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.8 | General | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that PC85 is inconsistent with the Proposed District Plan. | | |
| Derek Westwood | FS2 | FS2.7 | General | Flooding | Oppose | That ecological safeguards be adopted as conditions, not reasons to reject PPC85 | The further submitter opposes the submissions opposition to PC85 on ecological/infrastructure grounds. Overlaps with flood concerns but takes rejection stance. | Y | Y |
| AJ and MJ Eaves Family Trust | 47 | 47.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed. | The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;<br>• Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also supports the inclusion of the structure plan.<br>• Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth. They particularly support the ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure. | N | Y |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | • Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. | | |
| Paul Brown | FS6 | FS6.5 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge. | The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.<br><br>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area. | Y | Y |
| Black Swamp Limited | 48 | 48.1 | Rezoning | Zoning | Oppose in part | The submitter seeks the following amendments;<br>• Amend the PPC85 zoning maps to apply the Low Density Residential Zone to BSL's land at Black Swamp Road, Mangawhai (Lot 8 DP 565865).<br>• Amend the PC85 zoning maps to apply the Mixed Use or Neighbourhood Centre Zone to the land that is subject to the existing KDC land use consent for the brewery (RM210463). Alternatively, a Commercial Zone (COMZ) should be considered for this area, similar to what has been proposed under the Proposed Kaipara District Plan.<br>• Consequential relief to the PPC85 provisions as needed to give effect to this submission and to achieve sustainable management.<br>• Amend the provisions to integrate the provision of services and access, including subdivision and development to provide for the efficient and effective extension of services and access to all parts of the PPC85 area.<br>• Ensure consistency in the application of zoning principles across PPC85 so that sites with equivalent physical suitability are zoned similarly; or<br>• Alternative relief with similar effect. | The submitter requests that their land be rezoned from Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ) to Low Density Residential Zone (LDRZ) because the original flood hazard constraint—used to justify the RLZ—has been addressed through an approved resource consent (AUT.046759) that mitigates the hazard. The submitter considers that rezoning to LDRZ would align with PPC85's objective to support Mangawhai's high growth by increasing residential capacity.<br><br>The submitter also requests the land containing their consented brewery be rezoned to a Mixed Use Zone (MUZ), Neighbourhood Centre Zone (NCZ), or Commercial Zone (COMZ) to reflect its existing lawful use and avoid future compliance issues. They consider that retaining RLZ would reduce development efficiency, underutilise infrastructure, lower housing supply, and ignore site-specific mitigation work already done. Rezoning would enable more housing and better recognise existing land uses. | Y | - |
| Derek Westwood | FS2 | FS2.8 | General | Flooding | Oppose | That rezoning not proceed until a catchment-wide stormwater upgrade is secured. | The further submitter opposes the submission to seek rezoning intensification without addressing downstream stormwater. The further submitter considers this risks worsening flooding on Windsor Way. | Y | Y |
| Neil & Raewyn Cullen | FS3 | FS3.1 | Rezoning | Zoning | Oppose | Disallow the submission relief sought | The further submitter opposes the submission to seek rezoning their land from RLZ to LDRZ due to the increase in use of Windsor Way and the effect this will have on:<br>• The existing local residents<br>• Wildlife<br>• The country feel of the area | N | Y |
| Neil & Raewyn Cullen | FS3 | FS3.2 | Rezoning | Zoning | Oppose | Disallow the submission relief sought | The further submitter opposes the submission to seek rezoning some land to MUZ, NCZ or COMZ due to the effect on traffic and noise. | N | Y |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Darren and Kim Hughes | 49 | 49.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed. | The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;<br>• Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also supports the inclusion of the structure plan.<br>• Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth. They particularly support the ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure.<br>• Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. | Y | Y |
| Paul Brown | FS7 | FS7.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge. | The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.<br>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area. | Y | Y |
| Gavin Brannigan | 50 | 50.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed. | The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;<br>• Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also supports the inclusion of the structure plan.<br>• Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth. They particularly support the ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure.<br>• Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. | Y | Y |
| Paul Brown | FS7 | FS7.2 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge. | The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.<br>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area. | Y | Y |
| Jennifer Anne Readman and Mark Elliot Readman | 51 | 51.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed. | The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;<br>• Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also supports the inclusion of the structure plan.<br>• Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth. They particularly support the ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure. | Y | Y |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | • Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. | | |
| Paul Brown | FS7 | FS7.3 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge. | The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.<br>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area. | Y | Y |
| Joshua Membrey and Dorothy Nacewa o | 52 | 52.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed. | The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;<br>• Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also supports the inclusion of the structure plan.<br>• Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth. They particularly support the ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure.<br>• Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. | Y | Y |
| Paul Brown | FS7 | FS7.4 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge. | The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.<br>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area. | Y | Y |
| Lance Vale | 53 | 53.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed. | The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;<br>• Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also supports the inclusion of the structure plan.<br>• Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth. They particularly support the ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure.<br>• Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. | Y | Y |
| Paul Brown | FS7 | FS7.5 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge. | The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.<br>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area. | Y | Y |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mark and Jacqui Scheib | 54 | 54.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed. | The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;<br>• Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also supports the inclusion of the structure plan.<br>• Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth. They particularly support the ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure.<br>• Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. | Y | Y |
| Paul Brown | FS8 | FS8.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge. | The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.<br>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area. | Y | Y |
| New Zealand Steel Limited (NZ Steel) | 55 | 55.1 | Building Standards | DEV X-LU-S11(1)(b) | Support in part | Amend DEV X-LU-S11(1)(b) as follows:<br>In the Residential Large Lot zone all building, accessory building or structure exteriors shall:<br>…<br>b. Include at least 70% of the total painted or galvanised external surface of buildings (excluding windows) with a colour reflectance value of no greater than 35% and with a roof colour with a **colour** reflectance value no greater than 20%. | The submitter considers that as currently drafted, the standard could be misinterpreted as relating to Total Solar Reflectance (TSR) rather than Light Reflectance Values (LRVs), and that a TSR value of no greater than 20% would significantly limit roof colour options. | N | - |
| Derek Westwood, Thalia Ormerod, David & Fiona Collins, Tomasz Kus, Susan Hoskin, Lynette Nicholson. Kim and Shane Growden | 56 | 56.1 | Infrastructure | Stormwater Management Plan | Oppose in part | The submitters seek the following requested relief;<br>1. Provide a site specific hydraulic and hydrologic assessment for the Windsor Way sub catchment, including climate change and blockage scenarios.<br>2. Demonstrate swale, overland flow and outlet capacity for design AEP events in accordance with GD01 and GD04.<br>3. Prohibit reliance on infiltration based disposal unless supported by local infiltration testing and mounding analysis or drainage infrastructure.<br>4. Ensure any ground filling, if proposed is integrated with a coordinated drainage design to prevent ponding or backflow effects on adjoining land.<br>5. Alternative relief with similar effect.<br>In relation to DEV X-P7, DEV X-LU-S1, DEV X-SUB-S8, DEV X-REQ1 | The submitter raises the following concerns with the Stormwater Management Plan;<br>• That there is no site-specific hydraulic analysis<br>• That the proposed development area has high flood and ponding susceptibility presenting a high likelihood of inundation.<br>• That hydraulic neutrality via infiltration is not supported by local geotechnical or hydrogeological testing<br>• That minor filling could obstruct drainage, alter overland flow paths and induce long term peat settlement.<br>The submitter also notes that the council must manage the effects of land use to avoid or mitigate natural hazards. | Y | - |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Peter and Barbara Lambert | 57 | 57.1 | Rezoning | Zoning | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety. | The submitter is opposed to the rezoning for the following reasons<br>• The land adjoining Black Swamp Road is low lying and therefore unsuitable for housing<br>• The current infrastructure does not support the proposed development area and does not deal with effects from flooding.<br>• That a further town centre is not necessary. | N | Y |
| Heather Rogan and Dianne Piesse on behalf of the New Zealand Fairy Tern Trust | 58 | 58.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety. | The submitter is opposed to the plan change for a number of reasons;<br>• Spatial plan - The proposed plan change is not consistent with the Spatial Plan, as it does not anticipate residential development to the east of the estuary.<br>• Proposed district plan – the proposed plan change is not consistent with the proposed district plan.<br>• That PPC85 will enable development activities that could potentially threaten the ecology of the Estuary and potentially degrade the water quality of the estuary.<br>• That PPC85 will result in additional infrastructure being required, including wastewater, roading, stormwater and sea defences.<br>• Ecology values –the plan change will result in disturbing flora and fauna through increased development resulting in negative effects on water quality, and bird species such as the Fairy Tern. The proposed development will result in adverse effects from construction noise and vibration which could disturb breeding, nesting and feeding areas. | Y | Y |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.9 | General | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that PC85 is inconsistent with the Proposed District Plan. | Y | Y |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.19 | Ecology | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point highlighting that PC85 will adversely affect the habitats of native birds – particularly the Fairy Tern. | | |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.27 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that the development facilitated by PC85 will not be able to be accommodated by existing infrastructure. | | |
| Derek Westwood | FS2 | FS2.9 | General | Flooding | Oppose | That biodiversity safeguards be combined with stormwater neutrality conditions to allow balanced development. | The further submitter opposes the submissions focus on the Fairy Tern habitat risks. While a valid concern it does not address downstream flooding. | Y | Y |
| Wild Property Group | 59 | 59.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed. | The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;<br>• Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also supports the inclusion of the structure plan.<br>• Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth. They particularly support the ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure.<br>• Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. | Y | Y |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Paul Brown | FS8 | FS8.2 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge. | The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.<br>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area. | Y | Y |
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.1 | Infrastructure | Objective DEV X- O10 Infrastructure Servicing | Support in part | Amend as follows:<br>DEV X-O10 Infrastructure Servicing<br>**1.** Ensure all development, other than in the Rural Lifestyle zone and the Residential Large Lot zone, is connected to a reticulated wastewater network, **and** stormwater management network, and<br>**2. Ensure all development** ~~can~~ provide**s a reliable and** sufficient water supply for **both** potable and fire-fighting water use, **with fire-fighting water being continuously available to support emergency responses.**<br>or to similar effect. | The submitter seeks to amend the objective to ensure that all development in all zones are requires to provide a sufficient water supply for firefighting use. | Y | Y |
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.2 | Infrastructure | DEV X-P6 Infrastructure Servicing | Support in part | Amend as follows:<br>DEV X-P6 Infrastructure Servicing<br>1. Deliver reticulated water supply for fire-fighting.<br>2. Provide a reticulated wastewater network for all development, other than that in the Rural Residential and Residential Large Lot zones.<br>3. Design and implement development on sites to ensure that onsite **potable and fire-fighting** water supply can be provided by tanks located in visually screened locations or appropriately installed underground | The submitter seeks to amend the policy to clarify that onsite water supply includes both potable and firefighting supply, to be consistent with DEVX-O10. | | |
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.3 | Subdivision | Policy DEV X-P7 Subdivision | Support | Retain as notified | The submitter considers that the design and delivery of subdivisions where sites are connected to roads is essential for Fire and Emergency to response efficiently in an emergency. | | |
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.4 | Buildings | DEV X-LU-R1 Buildings, accessory buildings and structures | Support in part | Amend as follows:<br>DEV X-LU-R1 Buildings, accessory buildings and structures<br>1. Activity Status: Permitted<br>Where:<br>The construction, alteration, addition to, or demolition of any building, accessory building, or structure that complies with:<br>…<br>**m. DEVX-SUB-S7 Water Supply**<br>or to similar effect | The submitter considers that the requested relief would give better effect to Objective DEV X – O10 and DEV X -P6 which applies to all developments. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.5 | Buildings | DEV X-LU-R2 Residential unit | Support | Retain as notified | The submitter supports DEV X-LU-R2 to the extent that it requires residential units to comply with:<br>• xiv. DEVX-G-S3 Vehicle Crossings<br>• xvi. DEVX-SUB-S6 Roads, accessways, pedestrian walkways and cycleways<br>• xvii. DEVX-SUB-S7 Water Supply | | |
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.6 | Buildings | DEV X-LU-R1 Buildings and accessory buildings | Support in part | Amend as follows:<br>DEV X-LU-R1 Buildings and accessory buildings<br>1. Activity Status: Restricted discretionary<br>Where:<br>The construction of any building, accessory building, or structure that complies with DEV XLU-R1:<br>**a. DEVX-SUB-S7 Water Supply** | The submitter seeks that new buildings within the Business Neighbourhood Centre and Business Mixed Use Zone are assessed as a restricted discretionary activity if compliance can be achieved with DEVX—SUB-S7 so that buildings can be adequately provided with a firefighting water supply. | | |
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.7 | Visitor accommodation | DEV X -LU-R3 Visitor Accommodation | Support | Retain as notified | Submitter supports that the rule includes a matter of discretion which relates to firefighting water supply. | | |
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.8 | Commercial | DEV X-LU-R4 Commercial Activities, Educational Facilities, Care Centres and Community Facilities | Support | Retain as notified | Submitter supports that the rule includes a matter of discretion which relates to firefighting water supply. | | |
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.9 | Fencing and landscaping | DEV X-LU-S6 Fencing and Landscaping | Support in part | Clarify what “soft” landscaping is in relation to this standard. | Submitter notes that it is important for water tanks, which may be used for firefighting purposes, should not be screened with ‘soft’ landscaping that may inhibit access to tank couplings in a fire emergency. | | |
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.10 | Service connections | DEV X-LU-S12 Service Connections | Oppose | Clarify the application and relevance of this standard as it relates to firefighting water supply provision.<br>Define ‘occupied buildings’. | The submitter notes that the standard does not appear to have been applied to any rules in PPC85 and seeks clarification as to its application.<br>Additionally, the submitter notes that the table 1.2 is unclear as to whether the volumes stated account for firefighting water supply, and notes that there is no specification that firefighting capacity must be maintained at all times.<br>The submitter also notes that the term “occupied buildings” is not defined in the ODP and considers that a definition would provide further clarity. | | |
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.11 | Transport | DEV X-G-S3 Vehicle Crossings | Support in part | Amend as follows:<br>DEV X-G-S3 Vehicle Crossings<br>1. New vehicle crossings on to roads shall be designed, constructed and located in accordance with the Kaipara District Council Engineering Standards 2011 or any relevant update, and shall comply with the following:<br>…<br>e. For an accessway or driveway servicing up to 6 residential units the minimum width shall be 3.~~0~~5m.<br>… | The submitter seeks to increase the minimum vehicle crossing width from 3m to 3.5m to align with SNZ PAS 4509:2008 which requires a minimum width of 3.5m for fire appliances to access the site. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.12 | Subdivision | DEV X-R1 Subdivision | Support in part | Correct standard references so that DEV X R1(1)(m) is as follows:<br>iii. ~~DEV1-S13~~ **DEV X-SUB-S5** Vehicle Crossings<br>iv. ~~DEV1-S14~~ **DEV X-SUB-S6** Roads, Vehicle Access, Pedestrian Walkways and Cycleways<br>v. ~~DEV1-S15~~ **DEV X-SUB- S7** Water Supply | The submitter seeks to make sure the references in DEV X-R1 aligns with the Subdivision Standard references. | | |
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.13 | Subdivision | DEV X-SUB-S5 Vehicle Crossings | Support in part | Amend as follows:<br>DEV X-SUB-S5 Vehicle Crossings<br>1. New vehicle crossings on to roads shall be designed, constructed and located in accordance with the Kaipara District Council Engineering Standards 2011 or any relevant update, and shall comply with the following:<br>…<br>e. For an accessway or driveway servicing up to 6 residential units the minimum width shall be 3.~~0~~**5**m.<br>… | The submitter seeks to increase the minimum vehicle crossing width from 3m to 3.5m to align with SNZ PAS 4509:2008 which requires a minimum width of 3.5m for fire appliances to access the site. | | |
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.14 | Transport | DEVX-SUB-S6 Roads, Vehicle Access, Pedestrian Walkways and Cycleways | Support in part | Amend as follows:<br>DEV X-SUB-S6 Roads, Vehicle Access, Pedestrian Walkways and Cycleways …<br>2. Roads, **Vehicle Access**, Pedestrian and Cycle Networks shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the Kaipara District Council Engineering Standards 2011 or any relevant update, except as they relate to the following:<br>…<br>2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary<br>Matters over which discretion is restricted:<br>…<br>**o. Mitigation to address safety and/or efficiency, including access clearance requirements for emergency services.** | The submitter seeks the requested relief for the following reasons;<br>• To clarify to plan users what the standards apply to; and<br>• To add a new matter of discretion which requires consideration of access requirements where there is a non-compliance with the access standards. | | |
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.15 | Water supply | DEVX-SUB-S7 Water Supply | Support in part | Amend as follows:<br>DEV X-SUB- S7 Water Supply<br>…<br>**3. Where a public supply is not available or utilised, all developments shall demonstrate sufficient firefighting water supply is available.**<br>**Note: To determine what is a demonstrate sufficient and reliably available onsite firefighting water supply and to understand site-specific risks, Fire and Emergency New Zealand personnel are available to provide advice.**<br>or to similar effect.<br>And any consequential changes to give effect to the relief sought. | The submitter considers it to be unclear in table 1.2 whether the volumes account for firefighting water supply capacity. If it does, there is no specification for, how much water storage must be maintained at all times for firefighting water use.<br>Additionally, the submitter notes that the table only relates to required tank volumes for on-site residential activities. The submitter considers that the requested relief will provide clarity. | | |

<table>
<tr><th>Submitter name</th><th>Submitter number</th><th>Submission point #</th><th>Topic</th><th>Provision #</th><th>Support/Oppose/ Support in part</th><th>Relief sought</th><th>Reason for submission</th><th>Request to be heard</th><th>Joint heard where similar submission</th></tr>
<tr><td>Fire and Emergency New Zealand</td><td>60</td><td>60.16</td><td>Transport</td><td>Table DEV X Table 1.1 Mangawhai East Development Area Road, Private Way, Cycle Way and Property Access</td><td>Support in part</td><td>Amend as follows:<br>Road Hierarchy Private access:<br><u>1</u>. serving up to 6 units/lots, and<br><u>2.</u> less than 50m in length, <u>and</u><br><u>3. Where located in an area with a fully reticulated water supply system (including hydrants) available.</u><br>Private Accessway:<br><u>1</u>. serving 7-30 units/lots (not vested)<u>,</u> or<br><u>2.</u> serving up to 6 that is over 50m in length<u>, or</u><br><u>3. Where located in an area that does not have a fully reticulated water supply system (including hydrants) available.</u><br><table><tr><td>Road hierarchy</td><td>Minimum radius (m)</td></tr><tr><td>Private Accessway serving 7-30 units/lots (not vested) or serving up to 6 lots that is over 50m in length</td><td><s>6</s><u>10</u>m subject to vehicle tracking for<br>anticipated design vehicle</td></tr></table>And any consequential changes to give effect to the relief sought.</td><td>The submitter notes that as currently drafted, the table does not recognise scenarios where some non-reticulated lots are road fronting and FENZ will be able to access onsite waste supply for firefighting from the road. The requested relief will be able to accommodate for this scenario.<br>Additionally, the submitter notes that a 10m radius would be required to enable an 8m medium rigid truck to turn in accordance with Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency on-road tracking curves.</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Fire and Emergency New Zealand</td><td>60</td><td>60.17</td><td></td><td>Table DEV X Table 1.2 Required Tank Volumes for Onsite Residential Water Supply</td><td>Oppose</td><td>Clarify intent and application of this table.</td><td>The submitter considers it is unclear whether these volumes account for firefighting water supply capacity, and notes that if it does it needs to specify how much water storage must be maintained at all times for firefighting water use.</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Samuel Wilson</td><td>61</td><td>61.1</td><td>Rezoning</td><td>PPC85 in its entirety</td><td>Support</td><td>Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.</td><td>The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;<ul><li>Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also supports the inclusion of the structure plan.</li><li>Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth. They particularly support the ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure.</li><li>Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan.</li></ul></td><td>Y</td><td>Y</td></tr>
<tr><td>Paul Brown</td><td>FS8</td><td>FS8.3</td><td>General</td><td>PPC85 in its entirety</td><td>Oppose</td><td>Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge.</td><td>The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.<br>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area.</td><td>Y</td><td>Y</td></tr>
</table>

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.1 | Transport | DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity | Oppose | Amend the policy to require a roundabout | The submitter considers a right hand turn bay will not be sufficient. | Y | Y |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.2 | Ecology | DEV XP4 - Biodiversity and Ecological Values Section E | Oppose | Amend the policy to enable existing landowners to have cats in perpetuity. | The submitter considers that property owners do not agree with the restriction on having cats when property owners already have cats. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.3 | Zoning | Business Neighbourhood and Mixed Use Centre Zone, Objectives and Policies and Rules | Oppose | Delete | The submitter notes that Mangawhai has a number of commercial and business areas already which has created urban sprawl throughout Mangawhai and Mangawhai Heads. The submitter considers that another commercial area will potentially emphasise the ad hoc commercial sprawl through the area and it will result in adverse amenity effects. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.4 | Home businesses | DEV-XLU R4 - Home Business | Oppose | Amend the rule to allow existing businesses by the existing landowners that currently operate from home to continue; and<br>To allow existing landowners to undertake home businesses at their discretion with having to comply with this rule. | The submitter notes that they run a home business that would not comply with the rule. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.5 | Residential development | DEV - XLU - R6 - Comprehensively designed residential development | Oppose | Delete rule and associated objectives and policies. | The submitter considers that 350m$^2$ is too small for Mangawhai, and that the level of proposed intensification is not appropriate and not consistent with the character or amenity values of the township. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.6 | General rules | DEV- XLU- R8 - Any Activity Not Otherwise Provided for | Oppose | Delete or amend this rule. | The submitter is concerned that resource consent will be required to undertake agricultural activities in the Low-Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.7 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and Policies | Oppose | Add in an objective and policy related to reverse sensitivity. | The submitter notes that at present the sites are zoned as rural and land use is rural in nature. The submitter is concerned that neighbouring sites will complain about the rural uses on the site. Therefore, the submitter seeks to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity to avoid complaints from neighbours about adjacent farming. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.8 | Visitor accommodation | DEV-XLU-R3 1(a) Visitor Accommodation | Oppose | Delete rule. | The submitter considers the rule will result in adverse effects from traffic and noise and have adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the area. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.9 | Building standards | DEV XLU s4 3(a) Setbacks from Internal Boundaries | Oppose | Delete standard. | The submitter notes that the standard enables townhouse type development which is not appropriate for the area and will result in adverse effects on character and amenity values. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.10 | Earthworks | DEV XG R1 1 (f) Excavation and Fill | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter considers that this part of the rule is unclear that earthworks consents can be applied for in the Coastal Hazard Overlay within the Low-Density Residential zone. The submitter considers that earthworks should be allowed/consent required and considers that the NRC rules should be translated into the PPC for this area. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.11 | Noise | DEV XGR 31(b) Noise | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter is concerned that existing farming activities could trigger this rule and consent could be required. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.12 | Hazardous substances | DEV XGR 5 Hazardous Substances | Oppose. | Amend. | The submitter considers that this rule needs to be amended to ensure existing sites can continue to use and store fertilisers and farm sprays for existing rural uses. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.13 | Building standards | DEV XSUB S1-1 Density / Minimum Site Size and any relevant objectives and policies and other relevant rules | Oppose. | Amend/delete. | The submitter considers that the Medium Density Residential Zone, Low Density Residential Zone, Business Neighbourhood Centre Zone and Business Mixed Use Zone should be Large Lot Residential Zone. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.14 | Esplanade and reserves | DEV XSAUB S3 2 and DEV XSAUB S3 1 a & d<br>Esplanade and Other Reserve Enhancement | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter seeks to change the pest and weed control timeframe from 6 months to 5 years by the developer and then in perpetuity by the council.<br>The submitter opposes the proposed footpath between their boundary and the estuary. They consider it will adversely affect ecological values and their privacy and security. They also do not consider it necessary for a path to be on both sides of the watercourse. | | |
| Paul Brown | FS4 | FS4.1 | Esplanades and reserves | DEV XSAUB S3 2 and DEV XSAUB S3 1 a & d Esplanade and Other Reserve Enhancement | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point to not locate a footpath between their boundary and the estuary. | Y | Y |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.15 | Stormwater | DEV XSUB S8 Stormwater | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter notes that the stormwater rules mention a stormwater management plan, but there isn't one available. The submitter requests that the stormwater management plan be prepared in consultation with landowners. | | |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.16 | Stormwater | DEV XSUB S8 Stormwater | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point highlighting that a stormwater management plan is referenced but there is not one available. | Y | Y |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.16 | Subdivision | DEV X REQ 2 Subdivision or Development that will enable 50 or more residential units or residential unit equivalent in the development area | Support in part | None stated. | The submitter supports the walkway to the village. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.17 | Water supply | DEV X table 1.2 Required Tank Volumes for On Site Residential Water Supply | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter notes that the table requires less water tanks the larger a dwelling is, which they consider not to make sense. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.18 | Visitor accommodation | DEV XLU R5 1 a Home Stay Accommodation | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter considers that home stay accommodation should be enabled in a separate dwelling on site for existing landowners. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.19 | Wastewater | DEV X SUB S9 Wastewater Disposal | Oppose | Amend. | Submitter seeks for existing and compliant septic systems can stay in perpetuity. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.20 | Community services | Local educational and medical facilities | Oppose | Not stated. | The submitter notes that existing facilities are already struggling to cope with the additional population of Mangawhai over the last ten years and notes that the plan change does not appear to acknowledge this. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.1 | Transport | DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity | Oppose | Amend the policy to require a roundabout | The submitter considers a right hand turn bay will not be sufficient. | N | Y |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Paul Brown | FS9 | FS9.3 | Transport | DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that a right hand turn bay will be insufficient, and a roundabout is preferred. | Y | Y |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.2 | Ecology | DEV XP4 - Biodiversity and Ecological Values Section E | Oppose | Amend the policy to enable existing landowners to have cats in perpetuity. | The submitter considers that property owners do not agree with the restriction on having cats when property owners already have cats. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.3 | Zoning | Business Neighbourhood and Mixed Use Centre Zone, Objectives and Policies and Rules | Oppose | Delete | The submitter notes that Mangawhai has a number of commercial and business areas already which has created urban sprawl throughout Mangawhai and Mangawhai Heads. The submitter considers that another commercial area will potentially emphasise the ad hoc commercial sprawl through the area and it will result in adverse amenity effects. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.4 | Home businesses | DEV-XLU R4 - Home Business | Oppose | Amend the rule to allow continuation of existing businesses by the existing landowners that currently operate from home to continue; and<br>To allow existing landowners to undertake home businesses at their discretion with having to comply with this rule | The submitter notes that they run a home business, or would like to in the future, that would not comply with the rule. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.5 | Residential development | DEV - XLU - R6 - Comprehensively designed residential development | Oppose | Delete rule and associated objectives and policies. | The submitter considers that 350m$^2$ is too small for Mangawhai, and that the level of proposed intensification is not appropriate and not consistent with the character or amenity values of the township. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.6 | General rules | DEV- XLU- R8 - Any Activity Not Otherwise Provided for | Oppose | Delete or amend this rule. | The submitter is concerned that resource consent will be required to undertake agricultural activities in the Low-Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.7 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and Policies | Oppose | Add in an objective and policy related to reverse sensitivity. | The submitter notes that at present the sites are zoned as rural and land use is rural in nature. The submitter is concerned that neighbouring sites will complain about the rural uses on the site. Therefore, the submitter seeks to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity to avoid complaints from neighbours about adjacent farming. | | |
| Paul Brown | FS4 | FS4.5 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and policies | Support | Allow the submission relief. | The further submitter supports the submission point to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity. | Y | Y |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.8 | Visitor accommodation | DEV-XLU-R3 1(a) Visitor Accommodation | Oppose | Delete rule. | The submitter considers the rule will result in adverse effects from traffic and noise and have adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the area. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.9 | Building standards | DEV XLU s4 3(a) Setbacks from Internal Boundaries | Oppose | Delete standard. | The submitter notes that the standard enables townhouse type development which is not appropriate for the area and will result in adverse effects on character and amenity values. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.10 | Earthworks | DEV XG R1 1 (f) Excavation and Fill | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter considers that this part of the rule is unclear that earthworks consents can be applied for in the Coastal Hazard Overlay within the Low-Density Residential zone. The submitter considers that earthworks should be allowed/consent required and considers that the NRC rules should be translated into the PPC for this area. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.11 | Noise | DEV XGR 31(b) Noise | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter is concerned that existing farming activities could trigger this rule and consent could be required. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.12 | Hazardous substances | DEV XGR 5 Hazardous Substances | Oppose. | Amend. | The submitter considers this rule needs to be amended to ensure that existing sites can continue to use and store fertilisers and farm sprays for existing rural uses. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.13 | Building standards | DEV XSUB S1-1 Density / Minimum Site Size and any relevant objectives and policies and other relevant rules | Oppose. | Amend/delete. | The submitter considers that the Medium Density Residential Zone should be changed to Low Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.14 | Esplanade and reserves | DEV XSAUB S3 2 Esplanade and Other Reserve Enhancement | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter seeks to change the pest and weed control timeframe from 6 months to 5 years by the developer and then in perpetuity by the council. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.15 | Stormwater | DEV XSUB s8 Stormwater | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter notes that the stormwater rules mention a stormwater management plan, but there isn't one available. The submitter requests that the stormwater management plan be prepared in consultation with landowners. | | |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.17 | Stormwater | DEV XSUB S8 Stormwater | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point highlighting that a stormwater management plan is referenced but there is not one available. | Y | Y |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.16 | Subdivision | DEV X REQ 2 Subdivision or Development that will enable 50 or more residential units or residential unit equivalent in the development area | Support in part | None stated. | The submitter supports the walkway to the village. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.17 | Water supply | DEV X table 1.2 Required Tank Volumes for On Site Residential Water Supply | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter notes that the table requires less water tanks the larger a dwelling is, which they consider not to make sense. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.18 | Visitor accommodation | DEV XLU R5 1 a Home Stay Accommodation | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter considers that home stay accommodation should be enabled in a separate dwelling on site for existing landowners. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.1 | Transport | DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity | Oppose | Amend the policy to require a roundabout | The submitter considers a right hand turn bay will not be sufficient. | Y | Y |
| Paul Brown | FS9 | FS9.4 | Transport | DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that a right hand turn bay will be insufficient, and a roundabout is preferred. | Y | Y |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.2 | Ecology | DEV XP4 - Biodiversity and Ecological Values Section E | Oppose | Amend the policy to enable existing landowners to have cats in perpetuity. | The submitter considers that property owners do not agree with the restriction on having cats when property owners already have cats. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.3 | Zoning | Business Neighbourhood and Mixed Use Centre Zone, Objectives and Policies and Rules | Oppose | Delete | The submitter notes that Mangawhai has a number of commercial and business areas already which has created urban sprawl throughout Mangawhai and Mangawhai Heads. The submitter considers that another commercial area will potentially emphasise the ad hoc commercial sprawl through the area, and therefore result in adverse amenity effects. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.4 | Home businesses | DEV-XLU R4 - Home Business | Oppose | Amend the rule to allow continuation of existing businesses by the existing landowners that currently operate from home to continue; and<br>To allow existing landowners to undertake home businesses at their discretion with having to comply with this rule | The submitter notes that they run a home business, or would like to in the future, that would not comply with the rule. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.5 | Residential development | DEV - XLU - R6 - Comprehensively designed residential development | Oppose | Delete rule and associated objectives and policies. | The submitter considers that 350m$^2$ is too small for Mangawhai, and that the level of proposed intensification is not appropriate and not consistent with the character or amenity values of the township. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.6 | General rules | DEV- XLU- R8 - Any Activity Not Otherwise Provided for | Oppose | Delete or amend this rule. | The submitter is concerned that resource consent will be required to undertake agricultural activities in the Low-Density Residential Zone. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.7 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and Policies | Oppose | Add in an objective and policy related to reverse sensitivity. | The submitter notes that at present the sites are zoned as rural and land use is rural in nature. The submitter is concerned that neighbouring sites will complain about the rural uses on the site. Therefore, the submitter seeks to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity to avoid complaints from neighbours about adjacent farming. | | |
| Paul Brown | FS5 | FS5.1 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and policies | Support | Allow the submission relief. | The further submitter supports the submission point to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity. | Y | Y |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.8 | Visitor accommodation | DEV-XLU-R3 1(a) Visitor Accommodation | Oppose | Delete rule. | The submitter considers the rule will result in adverse effects from traffic and noise and have adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the area. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.9 | Building standards | DEV XLU s4 3(a) Setbacks from Internal Boundaries | Oppose | Delete standard. | The submitter notes that the standard enables townhouse type development which is not appropriate for the area and will result in adverse effects on character and amenity values. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.10 | Earthworks | DEV XG R1 1 (f) Excavation and Fill | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter considers that this part of the rule is unclear that earthworks consents can be applied for in the Coastal Hazard Overlay within the Low-Density Residential zone. The submitter considers that earthworks should be allowed/consent required and considers that the NRC rules should be translated into the PPC for this area. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.11 | Noise | DEV XGR 31(b) Noise | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter is concerned that existing farming activities could trigger this rule and consent could be required. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.12 | Hazardous substances | DEV XGR 5 Hazardous Substances | Oppose. | Amend. | The submitter considers this rule needs to be amended to ensure that existing sites can continue to use and store fertilisers and farm sprays for existing rural uses. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.13 | Building standards | DEV XSUB S1-1 Density / Minimum Site Size and any relevant objectives and policies and other relevant rules | Oppose. | Amend/delete. | The submitter considers that the Medium Density Residential Zone should be changed to Low Density Residential Zone. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.14 | Esplanade and reserves | DEV XSAUB S3 2 Esplanade and Other Reserve Enhancement | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter seeks to change the pest and weed control timeframe from 6 months to 5 years by the developer and then in perpetuity by the council. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.15 | Stormwater | DEV XSUB s8 Stormwater | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter notes that the stormwater rules mention a stormwater management plan, but there isn't one available. The submitter requests that the stormwater management plan be prepared in consultation with landowners. | | |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.18 | Stormwater | DEV XSUB S8 Stormwater | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point highlighting that a stormwater management plan is referenced but there is not one available. | Y | Y |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.16 | Subdivision | DEV X REQ 2 Subdivision or Development that will enable 50 or more residential units or residential unit equivalent in the development area. | Support in part | None specified. | The submitter supports the walkway to the village. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.17 | Water supply | DEV X table 1.2 Required Tank Volumes for On Site Residential Water Supply | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter notes that the table requires less water tanks the larger a dwelling is, which they consider not to make sense. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.18 | Visitor accommodation | DEV XLU R5 1 a Home Stay Accommodation | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter considers that home stay accommodation should be enabled in a separate dwelling on site for existing landowners. | | |
| Marc Kaemper | 65 | 65.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete | The reasons the submitter does not support the plan change are as follows:<br>• The proposed plan change is an unnecessary intense development as there are a number of other current developments available.<br>• There is no clear solution for wastewater in a flood prone area.<br>• The proposed development area was a swamp, and the ground would need to be raised substantially, which could endanger adjoining properties.<br>• The increase in traffic could result in an increased risk on traffic safety. | Y | Y |
| Derek Westwood | FS2 | FS2.3 | Stormwater | Stormwater | Support | That PPC85 conditions require upgrades to wastewater and stormwater networks | The further submitter supports the submission point that highlights flooding and wastewater issues. | Y | Y |
| Heather and Colin Young | 66 | 66.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Decline PPC85 until the outlined issues are properly resolved. | The reasons the submitter does not support the plan change are as follows:<br>• Schooling and infrastructure – concerns that existing schools are already operating at or near capacity, and there is no local public high school. Lack of clear plan to expand education facilities.<br>• Sewerage water quality in Estuary – the submitter notes that the school is not on the Mangawhai sewerage scheme. Concerns with the water quality of the estuary from sewage runoff.<br>• Sewerage and wastewater management – questions whether the existing system can cope given historic challenges with wastewater management.<br>• Fairy Tern habitat – the plan change will disturb the Fairy Tern habitat through increased noise, humans and domestic animals<br>• Public transport deficiency – the lack of reliable public transport options and that the increase in population from the plan change will result in greater reliance on private vehicles.<br>• Road Infrastructure and quality – the roads are not equipped to handle the increase in traffic volumes from the plan change and that many of the existing roads are narrow, poorly maintained and lack pedestrian and cycling infrastructure. | N | Y |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.20 | Ecology | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point highlighting that PC85 will adversely affect the habitats of native birds – particularly the Fairy Tern. | Y | Y |
| Alan Rogers | 67 | 67.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed. | The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;<br>• Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also supports the inclusion of the structure plan.<br>• Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth. They particularly support the ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure.<br>• Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. | Y | Y |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Paul Brown | FS8 | FS8.4 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge. | The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.<br>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area. | Y | Y |
| David and Glenys Mather | 68 | 68.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety. | The submitter details a number of reasons why they oppose the plan change.<br>• The inconsistency with the spatial plan that favours retaining low level development in the area of the Plan Change.<br>• The inconsistency with the proposed district plan, given that the PDP does not identify the proposed development area for future residential and commercial development.<br>• The upper Mangawhai estuary is a sensitive ecological area and is the breeding ground for endangered birds such as the Fairy Tern. The submitter is concerned that the proposed plan change will result in adverse effects on ecological values, due to intensive recreational use of the upper estuary.<br>• The proposed plan change does not provide for sufficient infrastructure that would be required to support a development of this size. | N | - |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.21 | Ecology | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point highlighting that PC85 will adversely affect the habitats of native birds – particularly the Fairy Tern. | Y | Y |
| Isabelle McDell | 69 | 69.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety. | The submitter details a number of reasons why they oppose the proposed plan change;<br>• Change of zoning – the submitter considers that the area as currently zoned is appropriate and does not see why it should be changed now.<br>• Housing – the submitter notes the requirement for Urban Development has already been met by the two previous approved plan changes.<br>• Funding of infrastructure – the submitter is concerned that there is no mechanism for the developer to fund the infrastructure required to support the development. The submitter is concerned that costs will then fall to the ratepayer.<br>• Ecology values – the submitter considers that the rural zone provides a buffer between intensive urban areas on the west of the estuary and the DOC wildlife refuge. The submitter is concerned that the projected increase in residential development will increase predators. | Y | N |
| Derek Westwood | FS2 | FS2.10 | General | Flooding | Oppose | That enforceable conditions, not opposition, address Windsor Way's concerns. | The further submitter opposes the submission as it expresses distrust of developers and is not infrastructure-specific. The submission fails to engage with technical flooding issues. | Y | Y |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.1 | Transport | DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity | Oppose | Amend the policy to require a roundabout | The submitter considers a right hand turn bay will not be sufficient. | Y | Y |
| Paul Brown | FS9 | FS9.5 | Transport | DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that a right hand turn bay will be insufficient, and a roundabout is preferred. | Y | Y |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.2 | Ecology | DEV XP4 - Biodiversity and Ecological Values Section E | Oppose | Amend the policy to enable existing landowners to have cats in perpetuity. | The submitter considers that property owners do not agree with the restriction on having cats when property owners already have cats. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.3 | Zoning | Business Neighbourhood and Mixed Use Centre Zone, Objectives and Policies and Rules | Oppose | Delete | The submitter notes that Mangawhai has a number of commercial and business areas already which has created urban sprawl throughout Mangawhai and Mangawhai Heads. The submitter considers that another commercial area will potentially emphasise the ad hoc commercial sprawl through the area and therefore result in adverse amenity effects. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.4 | Home businesses | DEV-XLU R4 - Home Business | Oppose | Amend the rule to allow continuation of existing businesses by the existing landowners that currently operate from home to continue.<br>To allow existing landowners to undertake home businesses at their discretion with having to comply with this rule | The submitter notes that they run a home business, or would like to in the future, that would not comply with the rule. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.5 | Residential development | DEV - XLU - R6 - Comprehensively designed residential development | Oppose | Delete rule and associated objectives and policies. | The submitter considers that 350m$^2$ is too small for Mangawhai, and that the level of proposed intensification is not appropriate and not consistent with the character or amenity values of the township. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.6 | General rules | DEV- XLU- R8 - Any Activity Not Otherwise Provided for | Oppose | Delete or amend this rule. | The submitter is concerned that resource consent will be required to undertake agricultural activities in the Low-Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.7 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and Policies | Oppose | Add in an objective and policy related to reverse sensitivity. | The submitter notes that at present the sites are zoned as rural and land use is rural in nature. The submitter is concerned that neighbouring sites will complain about the rural uses on the site. Therefore, the submitter seeks to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity to avoid complaints from neighbours about adjacent farming. | | |
| Paul Brown | FS5 | FS5.2 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and policies | Support | Allow the submission relief. | The further submitter supports the submission point to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity. | Y | Y |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.8 | Visitor accommodation | DEV-XLU-R3 1(a) Visitor Accommodation | Oppose | Delete rule. | The submitter considers the rule will result in adverse effects from traffic and noise and have adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the area. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.9 | Building standards | DEV XLU s4 3(a) Setbacks from Internal Boundaries | Oppose | Delete standard. | The submitter notes that the standard enables townhouse type development which is not appropriate for the area and will result in adverse effects on character and amenity values. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.10 | Earthworks | DEV XG R1 1 (f) Excavation and Fill | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter considers that this part of the rule is not clear that earthworks consents can be applied for in the Coastal Hazard Overlay within the Low-Density Residential zone. The submitter considers that earthworks should be allowed/consent required and considers that the NRC rules should be translated into the PPC for this area. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.11 | Noise | DEV XGR 31(b) Noise | Oppose | Amend. | Submitter is concerned that existing farming activities could trigger this rule and consent could be required. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.12 | Hazardous substances | DEV XGR 5 Hazardous Substances | Oppose. | Amend. | Submitter considers this rule needs to be amended to ensure that existing sites can continue to use and store fertilisers and farm sprays for existing rural uses. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.13 | Building standards | DEV XSUB S1-1 Density / Minimum Site Size and any relevant objectives and policies and other relevant rules | Oppose. | Amend/delete. | The submitter considers that the Medium Density Residential Zone should be changed to Low Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.14 | Esplanade and reserves | DEV XSAUB S3 2 Esplanade and Other Reserve Enhancement | Oppose | Amend. | Submitter seeks to change the pest and weed control timeframe from 6 months to 5 years by the developer and then in perpetuity by the council. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.15 | Stormwater | DEV XSUB s8 Stormwater | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter notes that the stormwater rules mention a stormwater management plan, but there isn't one available. The submitter requests that the stormwater management plan be prepared in consultation with landowners. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.16 | Subdivision | DEV X REQ 2 Subdivision or Development that will enable 50 or more residential units or residential unit equivalent in the development area | Support in part | None stated. | The submitter supports the walkway to the village. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.17 | Water supply | DEV X table 1.2 Required Tank Volumes for On Site Residential Water Supply | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter notes that the table requires less water tanks the larger a dwelling is, which they consider not to make sense. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.18 | Visitor accommodation | DEV XLU R5 1 a Home Stay Accommodation | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter considers that home stay accommodation should be enabled in a separate dwelling on site for existing landowners. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.1 | Transport | DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity | Oppose | Amend the policy to require a roundabout | The submitter considers a right hand turn bay will not be sufficient. | Y | Y |
| Paul Brown | FS10 | FS10.1 | Transport | DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that a right hand turn bay will be insufficient, and a roundabout is preferred. | Y | Y |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.2 | Ecology | DEV XP4 - Biodiversity and Ecological Values Section E | Oppose | Amend the policy to enable existing landowners to have cats in perpetuity. | The submitter considers that property owners do not agree with the restriction on having cats when property owners already have cats. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.3 | Zoning | Business Neighbourhood and Mixed Use Centre Zone, Objectives and Policies and Rules | Oppose | Delete | The submitter notes that Mangawhai has a number of commercial and business areas already which has created urban sprawl throughout Mangawhai and Mangawhai Heads. The submitter considers that another commercial area will potentially emphasise the ad hoc commercial sprawl through the area and therefore result in adverse amenity effects. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.4 | Home businesses | DEV-XLU R4 - Home Business | Oppose | Amend the rule to allow continuation of existing businesses by the existing landowners that currently operate from home to continue.<br>To allow existing landowners to undertake home businesses at their discretion with having to comply with this rule | The submitter notes that they run a home business, or would like to in the future, that would not comply with the rule. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.5 | Residential development | DEV - XLU - R6 - Comprehensively designed residential development | Oppose | Delete rule and associated objectives and policies. | The submitter considers that 350m$^2$ is too small for Mangawhai, and that the level of proposed intensification is not appropriate and not consistent with the character or amenity values of the township. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.6 | General rules | DEV- XLU- R8 - Any Activity Not Otherwise Provided for | Oppose | Delete or amend this rule. | The submitter is concerned that resource consent will be required to undertake agricultural activities in the Low-Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.7 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and Policies | Oppose | Add in an objective and policy related to reverse sensitivity. | The submitter notes that at present the sites are zoned as rural and land use is rural in nature. The submitter is concerned that neighbouring sites will complain about the rural uses on the site. Therefore, the submitter seeks to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity to avoid complaints from neighbours about adjacent farming. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Paul Brown | FS5 | FS5.3 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and policies | Support | Allow the submission relief. | The further submitter supports the submission point to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity. | Y | Y |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.8 | Visitor accommodation | DEV-XLU-R3 1(a) Visitor Accommodation | Oppose | Delete rule. | The submitter considers the rule will result in adverse effects from traffic and noise and have adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the area. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.9 | Building standards | DEV XLU s4 3(a) Setbacks from Internal Boundaries | Oppose | Delete standard. | The submitter notes that the standard enables townhouse type development which is not appropriate for the area and will result in adverse effects on character and amenity values. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.10 | Earthworks | DEV XG R1 1 (f) Excavation and Fill | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter considers that this part of the rule is not clear that earthworks consents can be applied for in the Coastal Hazard Overlay within the Low-Density Residential zone. The submitter considers that earthworks should be allowed/consent required and considers that the NRC rules should be translated into the PPC for this area. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.11 | Noise | DEV XGR 31(b) Noise | Oppose | Amend. | Submitter is concerned that existing farming activities could trigger this rule and consent could be required. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.12 | Hazardous substances | DEV XGR 5 Hazardous Substances | Oppose. | Amend. | Submitter considers this rule needs to be amended to ensure that existing sites can continue to use and store fertilisers and farm sprays for existing rural uses. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.13 | Building standards | DEV XSUB S1-1 Density / Minimum Site Size and any relevant objectives and policies and other relevant rules | Oppose. | Amend/delete. | The submitter considers that the Medium Density Residential Zone should be changed to Low Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.14 | Esplanade and reserves | DEV XSAUB S3 2 Esplanade and Other Reserve Enhancement | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter seeks to change the pest and weed control timeframe from 6 months to 5 years by the developer and then in perpetuity by the council. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.15 | Stormwater | DEV XSUB s8 Stormwater | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter notes that the stormwater rules mention a stormwater management plan, but there isn't one available. The submitter requests that the stormwater management plan be prepared in consultation with landowners. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.16 | Subdivision | DEV X REQ 2 Subdivision or Development that will enable 50 or more residential units or residential unit equivalent in the development area | Support in part | None stated. | The submitter supports the walkway to the village. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.17 | Water supply | DEV X table 1.2 Required Tank Volumes for On Site Residential Water Supply | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter notes that the table requires less water tanks the larger a dwelling is, which they consider not to make sense. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.18 | Visitor accommodation | DEV XLU R5 1 a Home Stay Accommodation | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter considers that home stay accommodation should be enabled in a separate dwelling on site for existing landowners. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alex Flavell-Johnson | 72 | 72.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety. | The submitter provides a number of reasons for opposing the proposed plan change;<br>• That the plan change will threaten the ecology of Mangawhai, including at risk and threatened species.<br>• That the plan change will put pressure on infrastructure, including roads, wastewater and access to recreational spaces.<br>• That the proposed plan change will result in adverse effects on amenity and natural character of Mangawhai and the estuary.<br>• That the proposed plan change is not consistent with the Spatial Plan or the proposed district plan.<br>• That the development activities close to the boundary of the estuary enabled by the plan change will affect its ability to absorb present and future inundation<br>• That the plan change will enable development activities that will restrict natural processes and coastal retreat under the predicted sea level rise.<br>• That a fourth town centre is not necessary.<br>• That the proposed plan change will result in congestion at the main gateway in and out of Mangawhai (Black Swamp Rd, Tomarata Rd, Insley St).<br>• That sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand has already been achieved through previous plan changes. | N | Y |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.8 | General | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that PC85 is inconsistent with the Proposed District Plan. | Y | Y |
| Kerry Desmond | 73 | 73.1 | Rezoning | Zoning | Oppose in part | The submitter seeks the following requested relief;<br>• Reduce the proportion of low-density residential zoning in favour of a higher ratio of large lot residential to minimize urban encroachment into sensitive habitats.<br>• Exclude medium-density residential zoning from the plan entirely, as higher density housing increases human and pet activity near vulnerable sites.<br>• Mandate native planting requirements for all new subdivisions, drawing on previous council precedents such as the 4000m² per site with 50% native bush preservation (Council Subdivision Policy, 2016). | The submitter is concerned that the proposed rezoning of rural land poses a threat to native bird habitats, including the NZ Fairy Tern. | N | Y |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.11 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that the level of development proposed in PC85 is not supported by the Proposed District Plan. | Y | Y |
| | | FS1.22 | Ecology | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point highlighting that PC85 will adversely affect the habitats of native birds – particularly the Fairy Tern. | Y | Y |
| Kerry Desmond | 73 | 73.2 | Earthworks | General | Oppose in part | The submitter seeks the requested relief;<br>• Implement regulations that strictly prohibit raising the land surface above existing levels, in order to prevent exacerbating local flood risk.<br>• Require comprehensive sediment control measures to prevent silt and pollutants from entering the estuary during earthworks, such as silt fences and retention ponds, in accordance with best practice guidelines from the NIWA Estuarine Management Manual. | The submitter notes that the geotechnical reports indicate that 1.2 metres of soil needs to be removed and replaced with hardfill for housing and road construction. The submitter is concerned the large-scale earthworks will increase flood risk to neighbouring properties and result in sediment runoff into the estuary. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.12 | Earthworks | General | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point highlighting the risk of sediment runoff into the estuary during large-scale earthworks. | Y | Y |
| Derek Westwood | FS2 | FS2.4 | Stormwater | Stormwater | Support | That flooding impacts are mitigated through downstream capacity works | The further submitter supports the submission point that highlights flooding risk for neighbouring properties. | Y | Y |
| Kerry Desmond | 73 | 73.3 | Ecology | General | Oppose | The submitter seeks the requested relief;<br>• Enact a ban on domestic cats within the development zone, or alternatively, require cat containment policies similar to those implemented in other ecologically sensitive subdivisions. | The submitter is concerned that domestic cats will threaten endangered native birds, such as the NZ Fairy Tern. | | |
| Janet Hooper | 74 | 74.1 | Rezoning | Zoning | Oppose in part | The submitter seeks the following requested relief;<br>• Reduce the proportion of low-density residential zoning in favour of a higher ratio of large lot residential to minimize urban encroachment into sensitive habitats.<br>• Exclude medium-density residential zoning from the plan entirely, as higher density housing increases human and pet activity near vulnerable sites.<br>• Mandate native planting requirements for all new subdivisions, drawing on previous council precedents such as the 4000 m² per site with 50% native bush preservation (Council Subdivision Policy, 2016). | The submitter is concerned that the proposed rezoning of rural land poses a threat to native bird habitats, including the NZ Fairy Tern. | N | Y |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.10 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that the level of development proposed in PC85 is not supported by the Proposed District Plan. | Y | Y |
| Janet Hooper | 74 | 74.2 | Earthworks | General | Oppose in part | The submitter seeks the requested relief;<br>• Implement regulations that strictly prohibit raising the land surface above existing levels, in order to prevent exacerbating local flood risk.<br>• Require comprehensive sediment control measures to prevent silt and pollutants from entering the estuary during earthworks, such as silt fences and retention ponds, in accordance with best practice guidelines from the NIWA Estuarine Management Manual. | The submitter notes that the geotechnical reports indicate that 1.2 metres of soil needs to be removed and replaced with hardfill for housing and road construction. The submitter is concerned the large-scale earthworks will increase flood risk to neighbouring properties and result in sediment runoff into the estuary. | | |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.13 | Earthworks | General | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point highlighting the risk of sediment runoff into the estuary during large-scale earthworks. | Y | Y |
| Janet Hooper | 74 | 74.3 | Ecology | General | Oppose | The submitter seeks the requested relief;<br>• Enact a ban on domestic cats within the development zone, or alternatively, require cat containment policies similar to those implemented in other ecologically sensitive subdivisions. | The submitter is concerned that domestic cats will threaten endangered native birds, such as the NZ Fairy Tern. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.1 | Transport | DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity | Oppose | Amend the policy to require a roundabout | The submitter considers a right hand turn bay will not be sufficient. | Y | Y |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.2 | Ecology | DEV XP4 - Biodiversity and Ecological Values Section E | Oppose | Amend the policy to enable existing landowners to have cats in perpetuity. | The submitter considers that property owners do not agree with the restriction on having cats when property owners already have cats. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.3 | Zoning | Business Neighbourhood and Mixed Use Centre Zone, Objectives and Policies and Rules | Oppose | Delete | The submitter notes that Mangawhai has a number of commercial and business areas already which has created urban sprawl throughout Mangawhai and Mangawhai Heads. The submitter considers that another commercial area will potentially emphasise the ad hoc commercial sprawl through the area and therefore result in adverse amenity effects. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.4 | Home businesses | DEV-XLU R4 - Home Business | Oppose | Amend the rule to allow continuation of existing businesses by the existing landowners that currently operate from home to continue. | The submitter notes that they run a home business, or would like to in the future, that would not comply with the rule. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.5 | Residential development | DEV - XLU - R6 - Comprehensively designed residential development | Oppose | Delete rule and associated objectives and policies. | The submitter considers that 350m$^2$ is too small for Mangawhai, and that the level of proposed intensification is not appropriate and not consistent with the character or amenity values of the township. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.6 | General rules | DEV- XLU- R8 - Any Activity Not Otherwise Provided for | Oppose | Delete or amend this rule. | The submitter is concerned that resource consent will be required to undertake agricultural activities in the Low-Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.7 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and Policies | Oppose | Add in an objective and policy related to reverse sensitivity. | The submitter notes that at present the sites are zoned as rural and land use is rural in nature. The submitter is concerned that neighbouring sites will complain about the rural uses on the site. Therefore, the submitter seeks to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity to avoid complaints from neighbours about adjacent farming. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.8 | Visitor accommodation | DEV-XLU-R3 1(a) Visitor Accommodation | Oppose | Delete rule. | The submitter considers the rule will result in adverse effects from traffic and noise and have adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the area. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.9 | Building standards | DEV XLU s4 3(a) Setbacks from Internal Boundaries | Oppose | Delete standard. | The submitter notes that the standard enables townhouse type development which is not appropriate for the area and will result in adverse effects on character and amenity values. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.10 | Earthworks | DEV XG R1 1 (f) Excavation and Fill | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter considers that this part of the rule is not clear that earthworks consents can be applied for in the Coastal Hazard Overlay within the Low-Density Residential zone. The submitter considers that earthworks should be allowed/consent required and considers that the NRC rules should be translated into the PPC for this area. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.11 | Noise | DEV XGR 31(b) Noise | Oppose | Amend. | Submitter is concerned that existing farming activities could trigger this rule and consent could be required. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.12 | Hazardous substances | DEV XGR 5 Hazardous Substances | Oppose. | Amend. | Submitter considers this rule needs to be amended to ensure that existing sites can continue to use and store fertilisers and farm sprays for existing rural uses. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.13 | Building standards | DEV XSUB S1-1 Density / Minimum Site Size and any relevant objectives and policies and other relevant rules | Oppose. | Amend/delete. | The submitter considers that the Medium Density Residential Zone should be changed to Low Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.14 | Esplanade and reserves | DEV XSAUB S3 2 Esplanade and Other Reserve Enhancement | Oppose | Amend. | Submitter seeks to change the pest and weed control timeframe from 6 months to 5 years by the developer and then in perpetuity by the council. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.15 | Stormwater | DEV XSUB s8 Stormwater | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter notes that the stormwater rules mention a stormwater management plan, but there isn't one available. The submitter requests that the stormwater management plan be prepared in consultation with landowners. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.16 | Subdivision | DEV X REQ 2 Subdivision or Development that will enable 50 or more residential units or residential unit equivalent in the development area | Support in part | None stated. | The submitter supports the walkway to the village. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.17 | Water supply | DEV X table 1.2 Required Tank Volumes for On Site Residential Water Supply | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter notes that the table requires less water tanks the larger a dwelling is, which they consider not to make sense. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.18 | Visitor accommodation | DEV XLU R5 1 a Home Stay Accommodation | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter considers that home stay accommodation should be enabled in a separate dwelling on site for existing landowners. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.19 | Ecology | Ecological Features Map | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter references two areas on the map identified on their property as wetland. The submitter notes that this has not been identified on any other map and seeks it be removed. | | |
| Gareth and Sue Jones | 76 | 76.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety | The submitter details a number of reasons why they oppose the proposed plan change;<br>• Infrastructure – that there is not sufficient infrastructure to support the development, and that Mangawhai sewerage system is already at capacity. Additionally, the submitter is concerned that roading is not sufficient and roads are already congested.<br>• Environmental impact – that the increased development will lead to further decline in the health of the estuary from increased stormwater runoff.<br>• That there is no need for a fourth commercial hub and that an additional hub could lead to commercial closures and empty buildings.<br>• That Black Swamp Road is prone to waterlogging and flooding, and questions who will compensate home and business owners should the land flood?<br>• The submitter considers the area should remain rural with horticultural and agricultural activities only.<br>• The submitter considers that the increase in residential density will increase pressure on infrastructure. | N | Y |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.14 | General | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point highlighting the environmental impact to the estuary from increased stormwater runoff. | Y | Y |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.28 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that the development facilitated by PC85 will not be able to be accommodated by existing infrastructure. | | |
| Gareth Jones | 77 | 77.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety | The submitter details a number of reasons why they oppose the proposed plan change;<br>• Infrastructure – that there is not sufficient infrastructure to support the development, and that Mangawhai sewerage system is already at capacity. Additionally, the submitter is concerned that roading is not sufficient and roads are already congested.<br>• Environmental impact – that the increased development will lead to further decline in the health of the estuary from increased stormwater runoff. | N | N |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | • That there is no need for a fourth commercial hub and that an additional hub could lead to commercial closures and empty buildings.<br>• That Black Swamp Road is prone to waterlogging and flooding, and questions who will compensate home and business owners should the land flood?<br>• The submitter considers the area should remain rural with horticultural and agricultural activities only.<br>• The submitter considers that the increase in residential density will increase pressure on infrastructure. | | |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.15 | General | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point highlighting the environmental impact to the estuary from increased stormwater runoff. | Y | Y |
| Paul Humphries | 78 | 78.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Retain existing zoning | The submitter provides a number of reasons why they oppose the plan change:<br>• That the plan change will result in fractionization of the development and future growth of Mangawhai and Mangawhai Heads.<br>• That the additional development will result in negative effects on the health of Mangawhai estuary, spit and sand dunes.<br>• That the proposed area for development is not consistent with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan.<br>• That there is already enough residential development approved with previous plan changes to meet the medium and long term needs of the district.<br>• The submitter considers the proposed plan change does not bring any benefits to the community of Mangawhai. | N | N |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.1 | Transport | DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity | Oppose | Amend the policy to require a roundabout | The submitter considers a right hand turn bay will not be sufficient. | N | Y |
| Paul Brown | FS10 | FS10.2 | Transport | DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that a right hand turn bay will be insufficient, and a round about is preferred. | Y | Y |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.2 | Ecology | DEV XP4 - Biodiversity and Ecological Values Section E | Oppose | Amend the policy to enable existing landowners to have cats in perpetuity. | The submitter considers that property owners do not agree with the restriction on having cats when property owners already have cats. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.3 | Zoning | Business Neighbourhood and Mixed Use Centre Zone, Objectives and Policies and Rules | Oppose | Delete | The submitter notes that Mangawhai has a number of commercial and business areas already which has created urban sprawl throughout Mangawhai and Mangawhai Heads. The submitter considers that another commercial area will potentially emphasise the ad hoc commercial sprawl through the area, and therefore result in adverse amenity effects. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.4 | Home businesses | DEV-XLU R4 - Home Business | Oppose | Amend the rule to allow continuation of existing businesses by the existing landowners that currently operate from home to continue.<br>To allow existing landowners to undertake home businesses at their discretion with having to comply with this rule. | The submitter notes that they run a home business, or would like to in the future, that would not comply with the rule. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.5 | Residential development | DEV - XLU - R6 - Comprehensively designed residential development | Oppose | Delete rule and associated objectives and policies. | The submitter considers that 350m$^2$ is too small for Mangawhai, and that the level of proposed intensification is not appropriate and not consistent with the character or amenity values of the township. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.6 | General rules | DEV- XLU- R8 - Any Activity Not Otherwise Provided for | Oppose | Delete or amend this rule. | The submitter is concerned that resource consent will be required to undertake agricultural activities in the Low-Density Residential Zone. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.7 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and Policies | Oppose | Add in an objective and policy related to reverse sensitivity. | The submitter notes that at present the sites are zoned as rural and land use is rural in nature. The submitter is concerned that neighbouring sites will complain about the rural uses on the site. Therefore, the submitter seeks to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity to avoid complaints from neighbours about adjacent farming. | | |
| Paul Brown | FS5 | FS5.4 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and policies | Support | Allow the submission relief. | The further submitter supports the submission point to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity. | Y | Y |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.8 | Visitor accommodation | DEV-XLU-R3 1(a) Visitor Accommodation | Oppose | Delete rule. | The submitter considers the rule will result in adverse effects from traffic and noise and have adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the area. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.9 | Building standards | DEV XLU s4 3(a) Setbacks from Internal Boundaries | Oppose | Delete standard. | The submitter notes that the standard enables townhouse type development which is not appropriate for the area and will result in adverse effects on character and amenity values. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.10 | Earthworks | DEV XG R1 1 (f) Excavation and Fill | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter considers that this part of the rule is not clear that earthworks consents can be applied for in the Coastal Hazard Overlay within the Low-Density Residential zone. The submitter considers that earthworks should be allowed/consent required and considers that the NRC rules should be translated into the PPC for this area. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.11 | Noise | DEV XGR 31(b) Noise | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter is concerned that existing farming activities could trigger this rule and consent could be required. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.12 | Hazardous substances | DEV XGR 5 Hazardous Substances | Oppose. | Amend. | The submitter considers this rule needs to be amended to ensure that existing sites can continue to use and store fertilisers and farm sprays for existing rural uses. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.13 | Building standards | DEV XSUB S1-1 Density / Minimum Site Size and any relevant objectives and policies and other relevant rules | Oppose. | Amend/delete. | The submitter considers that the Medium Density Residential Zone should be changed to Low Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.14 | Esplanade and reserves | DEV XSAUB S3 2 Esplanade and Other Reserve Enhancement | Oppose | Amend. | The Submitter seeks to change the pest and weed control timeframe from 6 months to 5 years by the developer and then in perpetuity by the council. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.15 | Stormwater | DEV XSUB s8 Stormwater | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter notes that the stormwater rules mention a stormwater management plan, but there isn't one available. The submitter requests that the stormwater management plan be prepared in consultation with landowners. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.16 | Subdivision | DEV X REQ 2 Subdivision or Development that will enable 50 or more residential units or residential unit equivalent in the development area | Support in part | None stated. | The submitter supports the walkway to the village. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.17 | Water supply | DEV X table 1.2 Required Tank Volumes for On Site Residential Water Supply | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter notes that the table requires less water tanks the larger a dwelling is, which they consider not to make sense. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.18 | Visitor accommodation | DEV XLU R5 1 a Home Stay Accommodation | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter considers that home stay accommodation should be enabled in a separate dwelling on site for existing landowners. | | |
| Sue McKay | 80 | 80.1 | Transport | DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity | Oppose | Amend the policy to require a roundabout | The submitter considers a right hand turn bay will not be sufficient. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Paul Brown | FS10 | FS10.3 | Transport | DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that a right hand turn bay will be insufficient, and a round about is preferred. | Y | Y |
| Sue McKay | 80 | 80.2 | Zoning | Business Neighbourhood and Mixed Use Centre Zone, Objectives and Policies and Rules | Oppose | Delete | The submitter notes that Mangawhai has a number of commercial and business areas already which has created urban sprawl throughout Mangawhai and Mangawhai Heads. The submitter considers that another commercial area will potentially emphasise the ad hoc commercial sprawl through the area, and therefore result in adverse amenity effects. | | |
| Sue McKay | 80 | 80.3 | Residential development | DEV - XLU - R6 - Comprehensively designed residential development | Oppose | Delete rule and associated objectives and policies. | The submitter considers that 350m$^2$ is too small for Mangawhai, and that the level of proposed intensification is not appropriate and not consistent with the character or amenity values of the township. | | |
| Sue McKay | 80 | 80.4 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and Policies | Oppose | Add in an objective and policy related to reverse sensitivity. | The submitter notes that at present the sites are zoned as rural and land use is rural in nature. The submitter is concerned that neighbouring sites will complain about the rural uses on the site. Therefore, the submitter seeks to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity to avoid complaints from neighbours about adjacent farming. | | |
| Paul Brown | FS5 | FS5.5 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and policies | Support | Allow the submission relief. | The further submitter supports the submission point to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity. | Y | Y |
| Sue McKay | 80 | 80.5 | Visitor accommodation | DEV-XLU-R3 1(a) Visitor Accommodation | Oppose | Delete rule. | The submitter considers the rule will result in adverse effects from traffic and noise and have adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the area. | | |
| Sue McKay | 80 | 80.6 | Building standards | DEV XLU s4 3(a) Setbacks from Internal Boundaries | Oppose | Delete standard. | The submitter notes that the standard enables townhouse type development which is not appropriate for the area and will result in adverse effects on character and amenity values. | | |
| Sue McKay | 80 | 80.7 | Building standards | DEV XSUB S1-1 Density / Minimum Site Size and any relevant objectives and policies and other relevant rules | Oppose. | Amend/delete. | The submitter considers that the Medium Density Residential Zone should be changed to Low Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Sue McKay | 80 | 80.8 | Esplanade and reserves | DEV XSAUB S3 2 Esplanade and Other Reserve Enhancement | Oppose | Amend. | Submitter seeks to change the pest and weed control timeframe from 6 months to 5 years by the developer and then in perpetuity by the council. | | |
| Sue McKay | 80 | 80.9 | Subdivision | DEV X REQ 2 Subdivision or Development that will enable 50 or more residential units or residential unit equivalent in the development area | Support in part | None stated. | The submitter supports the walkway to the village. | | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.1 | Ecology | Mangawhai East Plan Change Planning Report: July 2025 (Planning report) | Oppose in part | The submitter seeks the following requested relief;<br>• Undertake additional ecological impact assessment to address the gaps identified in this submission point.<br>• Use this information to revise proposed provisions as necessary to give effect to the NZCPS, NPSIB and Northland RPS. This is likely to involve methods to avoid or minimise additional human (and pet) presence along | The submitter considers that neither of the two ecological impact assessments adequately assess the implications of the rezoning and associated development beyond the boundaries of the plan change area.<br>Additionally, the submitter considers that there is insufficient field work to detect lizards or bats, and insufficient work to define the location and use of threatened birds. | Y | Y |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | the coast of Mangawhai Estuary and Harbour, in order to minimise disturbance of fauna, particularly birds. Methods of this kind are outlined in the submission points below, as follows:<br>- Amending the zoning pattern shown in the proposed structure plan, so that land near the coast either remains rural-zoned or is rezoned to rural lifestyle rather than low density residential<br>- Provision of public open space away from the coast, to give alternative options for recreation<br>- A ban on the keeping of dogs as pets within the plan change area, unless an alternative approach is put forward that can avoid adverse effects on threatened and at-risk wildlife in the Mangawhai Estuary and Harbour, and is supported by an ecological impact assessment<br>- Establishment of the walkway alongside the Insley Causeway prior to development of the plan change area, provided that appropriate measures are taken to manage additional access from Mangawhai<br>- Revision of proposals to create new/enhanced walking tracks through SNAs and along the coast and estuary<br>- Removal of proposals to create new boating access to the harbour and a new route across the harbour<br>- Setback of buildings, structures, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance from the coast. | | | |
| Cabra Mangawhai Limited and Pro Land Matters Company | FS11 | FS11.1 | Ecology | Mangawhai East Plan Change Planning Report: July 2025 (Planning report) | Oppose | Do not require further ecological assessments. | The further submitter opposes the submission point to require further ecological assessments. | Y | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.2 | Ecology | Structure plan - Reference to 'potential future harbour access', and depiction of crossing route from this harbour access to Moir Street, Mangawhai | Oppose | Amend the Structure Plan to remove:<br>• the reference to and depiction of 'potential future harbour access', and<br>• the depiction of crossing route from this new access to Moir Street, Mangawhai | The submitter is concerned that the proposed harbour access from Raymond Bull Road, and the crossing route will result in disturbance to wildlife, inclusive of shorebirds and therefore the proposed access and crossing are not supported. | | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.3 | Ecology | Structure plan – zoning of land adjacent to the coast | Oppose in part | Amend the zoning pattern in the Structure Plan so that land adjacent to the coast either remains rural-zoned or is rezoned to rural lifestyle rather than low density residential. The zoning pattern should be informed by the additional ecological impact assessment requested in the submission point above. | The submitter considers that the proposed areas to be rezoned low density residential should remain in the rural zone, or be rezoned rural lifestyle as they are concerned the low density residential could impact on shorebirds and the harbour environment. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cabra Mangawhai Limited and Pro Land Matters Company | FS11 | FS11.2 | Ecology | Zoning | Oppose | Retain the proposed zoning. | The further submitter opposes the submission point relating to the proposed zoning and sets out that the proposed provisions require an assessment to deliver ecological protection identified in the Mangawhai East Structure Plan. | Y | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.4 | Ecology | Structure plan - Proposed location of public walkways along the coast and the banks of the estuary | Oppose in part | Amend the Structure Plan as follows:<br>• Clarify the relative location of the walkways and the planted buffers<br>• Remove proposed walkway traversing the saltmarsh, "natural inland wetland D"<br>• Any new walkways should be separated from ecological features by a planted buffer | The submitter notes it is currently unclear how the proposed walkways will interact with the proposed plant buffers around ecological features. The submitter supports the plant buffers but notes that the structure plan shows the walkway intersecting with the buffer areas. Additionally, the submitter notes that the walkways appear to be proposed across the saltmarsh in the northwest of the site and considers that a walkway in this area could result in potential adverse effects on avifauna. | | |
| Paul Brown | FS4 | FS4.3 | Ecology | Public walkway | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point related to the proposed walkway noting the sensitive nature of the esturine environment and the potential for adverse ecological effects. | Y | Y |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.5 | Ecology | Structure plan - Absence of proposed reserves or public open space areas, except for the coastal and estuary reserves | Oppose | • Amend the Structure Plan to indicate the location of proposed reserves/public open space areas away from the coast. | The submitter considers that adequate proposed public open space has not been shown on the structure plan map.<br>The submitter considers it vital that appropriate public open space is provided for residents, as it brings the public into closer contact with wildlife, including tara iti. | | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.6 | Ecology | Structure plan - Proposed walkway alongside the Insley Causeway | Support | The proposed walkway alongside the Insley Causeway is established prior to subdivision and development of the plan change area, provided that appropriate measures are taken to manage additional access from Mangawhai. | The submitter notes that whilst the walkway is outside of the proposed plan change area, it should be established prior to development, to reduce disturbance of harbour wildlife. | | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.7 | Ecology | Planning maps - Proposed "Northern SNA area" and "Southern SNA area" shown on the final planning map in Appendix 2 to the Planning report | Support in part | • retain proposed Northern and Southern SNAs<br>• amend the Structure Plan to include the SNAs<br>• amend the development area provisions to directly refer to SNAs | The submitter notes the planning maps provided with the application show two SNA areas, however they are not directly referred to in the Development Area provisions and are not labelled on the structure plan. | | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.8 | Ecology | DEVX-O4 Indigenous Biodiversity and Ecological Values | Support in part | Amend as follows:<br>Protect and enhance the ecological and habitat values of the Development Area ~~including~~ **and of** adjacent land **and** estuarine environments **in** the coastal marine area **so that there is at least no net loss and preferably a net gain in indigenous biodiversity values.** | The submitter supports the objective and considers the requested relief will provide better clarity, and give better effect to the NPSIB, NZCPS and the Northland RPS 2016. | | |
| Cabra Mangawhai Limited and Pro Land Matters Company | FS11 | FS11.4 | Ecology | DEVX-O4 Indigenous Biodiversity and Ecological Values | Support | Allow the submission relief. | The further submitter supports the submission point and changes to the Development Area provisions that give effect to the NPS-IB. | Y | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.9 | Ecology | DEV X-O5 Freshwater Management | Support in part | Amend as follows;<br>~~Ensure~~ **Protect and enhance** freshwater resources in the Development Area ~~are protected and enhanced~~ **so that there at least no net loss and preferably a net gain in freshwater values** | The submitter supports the objective with minor amendments for clarity. | | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.10 | Ecology | DEV X-O6 Coastal and Erosion Hazards Management | Support | Retain as notified. | The submitter supports the objective, and they consider it gives effect to the RMA and RPS. | | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.11 | Ecology | DEV X-O7 Landscape Character and Amenity | Support in part | Either amend this objective and associated Policy DEV X-P5, or add a new objective and policy, to give effect to NZCPS Policies 13 and 14 and RPS Policy 4.6.1, including by:<br>• Requiring that significant adverse effects on the natural character values of the High Natural Character Areas adjacent to and within the site are avoided, and other adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated.<br>• Providing for restoration or rehabilitation of natural character.<br>The policy should be designed for use when assessing applications for resource triggered by proposed rules applying in the plan change area, where there are potential effects on the natural character values of the High Natural Character Areas.<br>This would include but not necessarily be limited to the following rules (as amended by submission points in this submission), where applications affect the HNC Areas:<br>• DEV X-LU-S7 – Setback from natural features (including requested change at the submission point on this rule below, to add a setback from the coast)<br>• DEV X-G-R1 – Earthworks (including requested change at the submission point on this rule below, to add a setback of earthworks from the coast)<br>• DEV X-G-R2 – Indigenous vegetation clearance (including requested change at the submission point on this rule below, to add a setback of indigenous vegetation clearance from the coast).<br>• DEV X-R1 – Effects of subdivision on natural character values. | The submitter notes they are in support of the intent of the objective. However, they seek amendments to give better effects to NZCPS policy 13, as well as RPS policy 4.6.1 and NZCPS policy 14. | | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.12 | Ecology | DEV X-O10 Infrastructure servicing | Support in part | The submitter seeks that evidence is provided to demonstrate that the proposed housing can be serviced with wastewater infrastructure in a way that will not have adverse effects on the harbour. | The submitter considers that insufficient information has been provided on the route of wastewater piping and the impacts of its establishment and use. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.13 | Ecology | DEV X-P4 Biodiversity and Ecological Values | Support in part and oppose in part | Amend proposed Policy DEV X-P4:<br>• Add references to bans on the keeping of mustelids and dogs as pets, at clause e<br>• Delete clause b<br>• Add references to additional methods to manage potential impacts on harbour wildlife from disturbance caused by human activity and pets, including:<br>- provision of public open space away from the coast, to give alternative options for recreation<br>- setback of buildings, structures, earthworks and vegetation clearance from natural inland wetlands, water bodies and the coast.<br><br>Either amend proposed Policy DEV X-P4 or add a new policy to:<br>• give effect to NZCPS Policy 11 and NPSIB policies 7 and 8, in relation to protecting indigenous biodiversity in the coastal environment and indigenous biodiversity within and outside SNAs – with specific reference to the new SNAs proposed for the area, as shown in the planning maps. The submitter notes that giving effect to these higher order provisions will include making clear that adverse effects on taxa listed as threatened, and their habitats, are to be avoided.<br>• link to proposed rules that manage the effects of activities on indigenous biodiversity and provide direction for how activities that require consent under these rules should be assessed. This would include but not necessarily be limited to the following rules (as amended by submission points in this submission):<br>- DEV X-LU-S7 – Setback from natural features<br>- DEV X-G-R1 – Earthworks (including requested change at the submission point on this rule below, to define “riparian yards”)<br>- DEV X-G-R2 – Indigenous vegetation clearance<br>- DEV X-R1 – Effects of subdivision on indigenous biodiversity values. | The submitter considers that to implement the proposed objective, and relevant higher order provisions, it will be vital to manage potential impacts on harbour wildlife from disturbance.<br><br>The submitter considers that amendments are required to give better effect to the NZCPS policy 11 and NPSIB policies 7 and 8 in relation to protecting indigenous biodiversity. Additionally, the submitter considers that a link to proposed rules that manage the effects of activities on indigenous biodiversity and provide directions as to how activity that require consent under these rules should be assessed.<br><br>The submitter also considers that clause e of the policy should be amended to refer to the ban on the keeping of mustelids to align with clause i of rule DEV X -R1 subdivision. Additionally, the submitter seeks to amend the clause to include reference to a ban on dogs unless an alternative approach is initiated to avoid adverse effects on the wildlife.<br><br>The submitter notes that clause b of the policy, with respect to the formation of a walking/cycling track on the esplanade reserve is opposed to the extent that it would result in a new track across the saltmarsh in the northwest of the site. | | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.14 | Landscape values | DEV X-P5 Landscape Character and Amenity | Support in part | Refer submission point 87.11 | Refer submission point 87.11 | | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.15 | Infrastructure | DEV X-P6 Infrastructure Servicing | Support in part | Refer submission point 87.12 | Refer submission point 87.12 | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.16 | Subdivision | DEV X-P7 Subdivision | Support | Retain as notified | Submitter supports clause 4 and 5 of this policy as they consider it helps to give effect to higher order provisions in relation to management of risk from hazards and protection of indigenous biodiversity. | | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.17 | Coastal hazards | DEV X-LU-R7 – Buildings for vulnerable activities in the Coastal Hazard overlay | Support in part | Amend provisions as necessary so that the overlay is referred to consistently as either the “Coastal Hazard overlay” or “Coastal inundation overlay”. | Submitter seeks the amendment to the terminology used for consistency. | | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.18 | Natural features | DEV X-LU-S7 – Setbacks from natural features | Support in part | Amend Rule DEV X-LU-S7 (or add a new rule) to add a setback of buildings and structures from the coast. The length of this setback should be informed by the additional ecological impact assessment, requested in this submission.<br><br>Amend Rule DEV X-LU-S7.2, with respect to the exemptions to setbacks from wetlands, streams, riparian planting, wetland planting and indigenous vegetation, as necessary to address points made elsewhere in this submission regarding the location of proposed walkways – i.e. that walkways should not traverse SNAs, and that any new walkways should be separated from ecological features by a planted buffer. | The submitter notes they generally support as the required setbacks assist in giving effect to higher order documents in relation to protection of waterbodies, wetlands and indigenous biodiversity.<br><br>The submitter notes that a setback of buildings and structures from the coast should be added to assist in reducing disturbance to harbour wildlife. | | |
| Cabra Mangawhai Limited and Pro Land Matters Company | FS11 | FS11.3 | Natural features | DEV X-LU-S7 – Setbacks from natural features | Oppose | Retain the rule as proposed. | The further submitter opposes the submission point and makes a point of clarification that the requirement to provide esplanade reserves will generally ensure a setback from the coast greater than the proximity of existing development will be achieved. | Y | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.19 | Earthworks | DEV X-G-R1 – Earthworks – Excavation and Fill | Support with amendments | Amend rule as follows:<br>• clarify that “riparian yards” has the following meaning, in line with Rule DEV X-LU-S7:<br>- 15m from the edge of natural wetlands, intermittent and permanent streams; unless the stream has an average width of 3m or greater in which case the setback shall be 20m.<br>- 5m from the edge of riparian planting, wetland planting, and indigenous vegetation.<br>• add a setback of earthworks from the coast. The length of this setback should be informed by the additional ecological impact assessment, requested in this submission. | The submitter notes that the intent of the rule is supported but notes that the term ‘riparian yards’ is not defined in the proposed plan change documents or in the operative plan.<br><br>Additionally, the submitter requests the earthworks setback from the coast. | | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.20 | Indigenous vegetation clearance | DEV X-G-R2 – Indigenous Vegetation Clearance | Support in part | Amend Rule DEV X-G-R2 as follows:<br>• to refer to the new Northern and Southern SNAs proposed in the planning maps<br>• not to permit indigenous vegetation clearance in SNAs where clause b is met; the only exemptions to requirement for consent for indigenous vegetation clearance in SNAs should be the activities listed at clause c | The submitter considers that the requested relief would better give effects to relevant higher order documents, and the rule should be amended to specifically refer to the new Northern and Southern SNAs proposed in the planning maps. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | • to remove the exemption for consent requirement for indigenous vegetation clearance for the purpose of formation of walking tracks in SNAs<br>• to reduce permitted width of clearance of indigenous vegetation on either side of an existing or new fence, and<br>• to add a required setback of indigenous vegetation clearance from the coast<br>– the length of this setback should be informed by the additional ecological impact assessment, requested in this submission. | | | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.21 | Radioactive material | DEV X-G-R6 – Radioactive material | Support in part | Amend clause 2 as follows:<br>2. Activity status when compliance not achieved: ~~Discretionary~~ **Non-complying** | The submitter considers that a non-complying activity status more appropriate than discretionary | | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.22 | Lighting | DEV X-G-R7 – Lighting | Support in part | Amend clause 2 to add new matters of discretion;<br>• Effects on natural character values of the Mangawhai High Natural Character Areas<br>• Effects on indigenous biodiversity values, including the values of the Northern and Southern Significant Natural Areas | The submitter notes that lighting has the potential to cause adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity and natural character. The submitter seeks the requested relief give effect to higher order documents and to the proposed objectives of the plan change. | | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.23 | Earthworks | DEV X-G-S1 Earthworks | Oppose in part | Amend as follows:<br>2. The maximum height or depth of any cut or fill face shall not exceed 1.5m over a continuous distance of ~~less than~~ **more than** 50m within a site. | The submitter considers the wording as notified is confusing and results in a meaning that is unintended. | | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.24 | Subdivision | DEV X-R1 Subdivision | Support in part | • For clause h – see submission point on DEV X-O10, above (refer submission point 87.12).<br>• For clause c – see submission point on the Structure Plan, above, regarding the need to clarify the relative location of the walkways and the planted buffers.<br>• Retain as notified clauses d and e, and the requirement in clause c for native revegetation planting, to a minimum of 10m from the edge of natural wetlands, intermittent and permanent streams, and indigenous vegetation identified within the Mangawhai East Structure Plan, to be established and protected in perpetuity.<br>• Amend clause l to include a ban on the keeping of dogs.<br>• Add the following matters of discretion:<br>- Effects on natural character values of the Mangawhai High Natural Character Areas<br>- Effects on indigenous biodiversity values, including the values of the Northern and Southern Significant Natural Areas<br>• Clarify which area is covered by the "Landscape Protection Area" referred to at clause f of the matters of discretion. | The submitter seeks a number of amendments to the rule for the following reasons<br>- Clause h – refer submission point 87.12<br>- Clause c – refer submission points above<br>- Clauses d and e – submitter supports these clauses<br>- Clause l – the submitter supports the clause with a recommendation to also ban dogs due to risks to threatened wildlife.<br>- Landscape protection area – the submitter considers further clarification is needed as it isn't shown or explained in the Structure Plan or planning maps. | | |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.25 | Esplanade | DEV X-SUB-S3 Esplanade and other reserve enhancement | Support in part | Revise provisions relating to the construction of a pathway to facilitate public walking access on the existing coastal esplanade reserve and the proposed estuary esplanade reserve, in the light of additional ecological impact assessment requested in this submission.<br><br>Amend clause 2 to remove the reference to a minimum period of 6 months for weed and pest control. Provisions should be drafted to ensure ongoing weed and pest control. | The submitter considers that a walkway area across the saltmarsh in the northwest of the site may result in adverse effects on avifauna via human disturbance.<br><br>The submitter supports the proposed signage relating to keeping dogs on leads however the submitter is concerned that new or upgraded cycling access along the coast and estuary could lead to increased human and pet activity that could disturb wildlife.<br><br>Additionally, the proposals for weed and pest control are generally supported, however the submitter considers that the proposed 6-month duration is insufficient, and that weed and pest control is needed in perpetuity. | | |
| Paul Brown | FS4 | FS4.4 | Esplanade | DEV X-SUB-S3 Esplanade and other reserve enhancement | Oppose | Do not enable a walkway in the estuarine environment | The further submitter opposes the submission point related to the proposed walkway noting the sensitive nature of the estuarine environment and the potential for adverse ecological effects. | Y | Y |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.26 | Subdivision and development | DEVX-REQ2 Subdivision or Development that will enable 50 or more residential units or residential unit equivalents in the Development Area | Support in part | • Retain clauses 1.c, 1.e and 1.f as notified, subject to revisions to DEVX-REQ2 and DEVX-REQ4 as necessary to remove duplication.<br>• Revise provisions relating to the construction of a pathway to facilitate public walking access on the existing coastal esplanade reserve and the proposed estuary esplanade reserve, in the light of additional ecological impact assessment requested in the submission point above. | In relation to the reference to "a defined walkway along the coastal esplanade reserve", at clause 1.d, refer to submission point 87.25<br><br>The submitter notes they are in support of the requirements contained in clauses 1.c, 1.e and 1.f a.<br><br>The submitter considers that the content of clauses c - f do not align well with the earlier reference to a "transport assessment and civil engineering design". The submitter notes there is also some duplication between REQ2 and REQ4. | | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.27 | Ecology | DEVX-REQ4 Ecological Enhancement – Coastal Esplanade and Riparian areas | Support in part | • Retain clauses 1.l, 1.m and 2, subject to revisions to DEVX-REQ2 and DEVXREQ4 as necessary to remove duplication.<br>• Revise provisions relating to the upgrade of the coastal esplanade reserve, including the proposed construction of a pathway to facilitate public walking access on the existing coastal esplanade reserve and the proposed estuary esplanade reserve, in the light of additional ecological impact assessment requested in the submission point above. | In relation to the reference to "a defined walkway along the coastal esplanade reserve", at clause 1.d, refer to submission point 87.25<br><br>The submitter supports the requirements contained in clauses 1.l, 1.m and 2.<br><br>The submitter notes there is some duplication between REQ2 and REQ4. | | |
| Hamish Wright | 82 | 82.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed. | The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;<br>• Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also supports the inclusion of the structure plan.<br>• Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth. They particularly support the ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure.<br>• Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. | Y | Y |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Paul Brown | FS8 | FS8.5 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge. | The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.<br>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area. | Y | Y |
| Nick Smith | 83 | 83.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed. | The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;<br>• Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also supports the inclusion of the structure plan.<br>• Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth. They particularly support the ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure.<br>• Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. | Y | Y |
| Paul Brown | FS9 | FS9.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge. | The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.<br>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area. | Y | Y |
| Mark Morgan Kemp | 84 | 84.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed. | The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;<br>• Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also supports the inclusion of the structure plan.<br>• Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth. They particularly support the ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure.<br>• Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. | Y | Y |
| Paul Brown | FS9 | FS9.2 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge. | The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.<br>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area. | Y | Y |
| Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | 85 | 85.1 | Archaeological | PPC85 in general | Support in part | The submitter seeks the following note to be included in any earthwork sections of the PPC and resource assessment criteria;<br>• **An Archaeological Authority under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 will be required for any development** | The submitter considers that site specific heritage, cultural and archaeological assessments should be included within resource consent criteria within the proposed plan change. The submitter recommends that a Heritage Management Plan be required for the plan change area to outline the process for managing any discovered archaeological features, including engagement with iwi. | Y | Y |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | • **in the immediate vicinity of the identified archaeological sites and features and adjacent areas, which are highly archaeologically sensitive.**<br>• **That where any archaeological assessment is completed, the recommendations of the archaeologist shall be followed in any resource consent implementation activity.** | | | |
| Cabra Mangawhai Limited and Pro Land Matters Company | FS11 | FS11.5 | Archaeological | PPC85 in general | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point to require archaeological, heritage and cultural assessment.<br>The further submitter supports formal surveying of Midden R08/256 and clarification of whether it will be contained in a future esplanade reserve or not and provision of a requirement for protective fencing if required and appropriate. | Y | |
| Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | 85 | 85.2 | Cultural | Cultural effects assessment | Support | None specified. | The submitter acknowledges that the Te Uri o Hau have developed a culturally based environmental management plan that includes the area within the proposed plan change. The submitter notes that the environmental management plan advocates and supports kaitiakitanga and the management and development of natural resources within the statutory area of Te Uri o Hau.<br>The submitter also notes that parts of the plan change area are identified as areas of Significance to Māori in the Operative and proposed Kaipara District Plan. | | |
| Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | 85 | 85.3 | Planning matters | DEV1 X-R1. e | Support in part | Any area of archaeological, cultural or spiritual significance is identified and physically and legally protected **and avoided. If the site is modified or destroyed, obtain an Authority ~~is obtained~~ from Heritage New Zealand.** | The submitter seeks to amend the plan change to include the implementation of the Accidental Discovery Protocol, either as an advice note or rule. | | |
| Cabra Mangawhai Limited and Pro Land Matters Company | FS11 | FS11.6 | Archaeological | PPC85 in general | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point to require provisions to reflect the Accidental Discovery Protocols. | Y | |
| Douglas Algie Lloyd | 86 | 86.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety. | The submitter provides a number of reasons why they oppose the plan change;<br>• Spatial Plan – the submitter notes that the spatial plan references the proposed development area and does not recommend an intensified development pattern.<br>• Proposed district plan – the submitter notes that the proposed district plan does not identify the land in PPC85 for urban development or recommend re-zoning.<br>• Lack of infrastructure – the submitter is concerned that the existing infrastructure cannot accommodate the proposed development. | Y | Y |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.6 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that PC85 is inconsistent with the Proposed District Plan. | Y | Y |
| Derek Westwood | FS2 | FS2.11 | General | Flooding | Oppose | That the Council impose conditions ensuring stormwater and flooding neutrality, allowing PPC85 to proceed responsibly. | The further submitter opposes the submission as it opposes PPC85 in its entirety citing the Spatial Plan. | Y | Y |

| Submitter name | Submitter number | Submission point # | Topic | Provision # | Support/Oppose/ Support in part | Relief sought | Reason for submission | Request to be heard | Joint heard where similar submission |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jennifer Budelmann | 87 | 87.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety | The submitter provides a number of reasons why they oppose the proposed plan change;<br>• Intensive urbanisation –the proposed plan change does not align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan and District Plan.<br>• Mixed use/commercial hub – queries whether another commercial hub is needed given there are three commercial areas already.<br>• Staging of the development – the submitter considers all infrastructure needs to be constructed and operational prior to the first dwellings being built to avoid risk to ratepayers.<br>• Wastewater – submitter considers that the proposed plan change does not adequately address wastewater management.<br>• Traffic – the submitter is concerned that the proposal will result in an increase in safety issues.<br>• Housing demand in Mangawhai – the submitter queries whether the current level of growth will continue, necessitating additional lots.<br>• Mangawhai primary school – the submitter notes that the school is nearly at its capacity and is concerned that the proposed development will place pressure on the school.<br>• Coastal bird taonga and outstanding natural landscape – submitter considers that these matters are not satisfactorily addressed. | N | N |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.7 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that PC85 is inconsistent with the Proposed District Plan. | Y | Y |