

**Further Submission No.03
WITHDRAWN 19/10/23**



THE PLANNING
COLLECTIVE

17 October 2023

Kaipara District Council
Proposed Private Plan Change 83 – The Rise Limited
Via email: planchanges@kaipara.govt.nz

Dear Sir / Madam

RE: Further submissions to the proposed Private Plan Change 83 – The Rise Limited

The attached further submissions are made on behalf of Paul and Rose Boocock – Submitter Number 49 to the Kaipara District Plan private plan change Request #83 – The Rise

In summary, as detailed in the primary submission Paul and Rose Boocock consider the proposed site sizes are too small and the provisions of the plan change will not adequately address effects on the environment specifically rural character and amenity effects., reverse sensitivity effects, stormwater, traffic effects.

The attached Table lists all the submissions that further submissions are made in relation to, the particular parts of the submission Paul and Rose Boocock support or opposes and the reasons why.

Paul and Rose Boocock wish to be heard in support of its further submissions.

Yours sincerely

Burnette O'Connor
The Planning Collective Limited
Ph: 021422346
Email: burnette@thepc.co.nz

Attachments:

- A. -Further Submissions Table.

Further Submission on behalf of Paul and Rose Boocock – 16 October 2023

Sub #	Sub Point	Submitter	Provision #	Reason for Submission	Relief Sought	Further Submission		
						Support / oppose	Reasons	Decision requested
General								
4	4.1	Sanctuary Residents Association	PPC83 as a whole	Submitter views that PPC83 should be declined unless provisions for infrastructure are improved. Submitter is concerned around the lack of overall subdivision plan and potential for fragmentation.	Delete PPC83 in its entirety unless requested changes are made	Support	Refuse the proposed plan change unless there are specific, direct and robust provisions to properly manage the effects of the development that would be enabled by the plan change. Appropriate infrastructure is required to service the development and the effects of the proposed methods have to be assessed.	Amend provisions to address the matters set out in the primary submission of Paul and Rose Boocock.
8	8.1	Bream Tail Residents Association and Northern Farms Limited (c/- CPPC Planning)	PPC83 in its entirety	<p>The submitter details a number of reasons as to why they are opposed to PPC83, as detailed below.</p> <p><u>Reverse sensitivity</u> The submitter is concerned the proposed residential development will have an adverse impact on the ongoing use of the submitters property for permitted rural activities. The proposed development has the potential to see an increase in domestic pets, which could have consequential effects on the submitter’s property and the surrounding flora, fauna and native wildlife.</p> <p><u>Environmental</u> The submitter notes their property is recognised being within the Piroa/Brynderwyn High Value Biodiversity Area, with populations of Kiwi now residing on the property. The submitter is concerned the proposed residential development may have adverse impacts on ecological values.</p> <p><u>Social</u> The submitter is concerned that PPC83 will disrupt long term planning, as well as emotional and economic perspectives on how the property is to be managed ongoing.</p> <p><u>Traffic</u> The submitter is concerned the increase in traffic through PPC83 will have adverse effect on the roading infrastructure. The submitter views that the increase in traffic will have a negative flow on effect in terms of traffic congestion.</p> <p><u>Infrastructure</u> In terms of water supply, the submitter is concerned for the quantity of potable water supply available to the sites, given some of water will be required to be set aside for firefighting. In terms of wastewater, the submitter is concerned that the plan change does not provide clear indication in how the proposal will be able to accommodate the additional wastewater infrastructure for each new lot.</p> <p><u>Rural Character and amenity</u> The submitter notes that the proposed residential development will results in a loss of rural character and amenity. The submitter is concerned that the proposed residential development has potential to result in fragmentation of land through subdivision. The submitter views that the increase in population from the proposed development, will result in an adverse effect on the submitters anticipated rural character of the area.</p>	Decline PPC83 in its entirety. If the plan change is to move forward, the submitter seeks the requested relief in the following submission points. <u>A 2-metre planted buffer within PPC83 land along the common boundary with the submitter’s land.</u>	Support	Refuse the proposed plan change unless there are specific, direct and robust provisions to properly manage the effects of the development that would be enabled by the plan change. Will better manage effects on character and amenity.	Amend provisions to address the matters set out in the primary submission of Paul and Rose Boocock.

Sub #	Sub Point	Submitter	Provision #	Reason for Submission	Relief Sought	Further Submission		
						Support / oppose	Reasons	Decision requested
				<p><u>Higher order documents</u> The submitter views that PPC83 is not consistent in various aspects of higher order documents, such as the Mangawhai Spatial Plan, Exposure Draft Kaipara District Plan, Operative Kaipara District Plan, Northland Regional Policy Statement, with consistencies largely pertaining to density, rural character and amenity of the PPC83 area and surrounding vicinity</p>				
12	12.1	C. Boonham	Entirety of PPC83	<p>Amenities The submitter is concerned for the change in amenity and “easy lifestyle” of Mangawhai that the proposed residential development may have on the community and the area.</p> <p>Infrastructure The submitter is concerned that PPC83 will be faced with the same infrastructure issues that the Mangawhai Central development had.</p> <p>Wastewater The submitter is concerned that PPC83 does not provide definitive details as to how wastewater services will be provided., given that the existing wastewater scheme is nearing capacity. The submitter views that ad hoc development without an infrastructure plan is not appropriate. Submitter notes that the applicant is not a majority shareholder of the PPC83 area, and notes that some landowners may not wish to be part of the proposed development which may cause problems when trying to develop an overall wastewater scheme for the PPC83 site.</p> <p>Stormwater The submitter is concerned that leaving stormwater until subdivision will make it difficult to plan stormwater management across the whole site. The submitter also notes that a 60% impermeable surface standard may accentuate flow paths to neighbouring properties given the hilly terrain of the area.</p> <p>Water Supply The submitter is concerned that existing water supply infrastructure will not be able to supply.</p> <p>Community The submitter notes that PPC83 does not provide provisions which contribute to community facilities, and views that the development will create additional pressure on community facilities, with particular reference to schools.</p> <p>Transport Submitter notes that traffic issues on Cove Road will require expert input and consideration. Regarding internal roading, the submitter is concerned the section 32 report and Integrated Transport Assessment are misleading and incorrect and the proposed roading network for the Plan Change area may not be feasible.</p> <p>Lot Sizes The submitter is concerned that 400m² lot sizes are too small to provide for existing infrastructure, with reference to water supply. Submitter notes there is a difference in density standards between the Urban Design assessment and the proposed rules and asks for clarification as to the correct standard.</p>	Submitter seeks for noted provisions to be incorporated into the plan change.	Support	Refuse the proposed plan change unless there are specific, direct and robust provisions to properly manage the effects of the development that would be enabled by the plan change.	Amend provisions to address the matters set out in the primary submission of Paul and Rose Boocock.
14	14.1	D. Cornelius and O. Rowan	Entirety of PPC83	<p>Submitters oppose PPC83 for the following reasons: <u>Reverse sensitivity</u> The submitters are concerned with potential reverse sensitivity issues given the proposed residential development is adjacent to the rural zone, which has an anticipated rural amenity and character. The submitters</p>	Submitter seeks for PPC83 to be deleted in its entirety.	Support	Will better manage effects on character, amenity and infrastructure.	Amend provisions to address the matters set out in the primary submission of Paul and Rose Boocock.

Sub #	Sub Point	Submitter	Provision #	Reason for Submission	Relief Sought	Further Submission		
						Support / oppose	Reasons	Decision requested
				<p>concern relates to adverse effect from the residential development on adjacent farming operations.</p> <p><u>Traffic</u> The submitters are concerned with the potential effects from increase in traffic, and how this will be managed.</p> <p><u>Social</u> The submitter is concerned that PPC83 will disrupt long term planning, as well as emotional and economic perspectives on how the property is to be managed ongoing.</p> <p><u>Rural character and amenity</u> The submitters are concerned with the potential loss of rural character and amenity should PPC83 be approved. The submitter is concerned with the increase in light pollution from the proposed residential development, and the effects this may have on the amenity of the area.</p> <p><u>Flooding/Natural Hazards</u> The submitters are concerned with potential flooding issues with the change from rural to residential and an increase of impervious surfaces.</p> <p><u>Infrastructure</u> In terms of water supply, the submitter is concerned for the quantity of potable water supply available to the sites, given some of water will be required to be set aside for firefighting. In terms of wastewater, the submitter is concerned that the plan change does not provide clear indication in how the proposal will be able to accommodate the additional wastewater infrastructure for each new lot.</p> <p><u>Higher order documents</u> The submitter views that PPC83 is not consistent in various aspects of higher order documents, such as the Mangawhai Spatial Plan, Exposure Draft Kaipara District Plan, Operative Kaipara District Plan, Northland Regional Policy Statement, with consistencies largely pertaining to density, rural character and amenity of the PPC83 area and surrounding vicinity</p>				
18	18.1	E. Walker	Entirety of PPC83	<p>Submitter is concerned about the loss of character and amenity values. Submitter is also concerned about the increase in traffic volumes and noise.</p>	Not specified	Support	Refuse the proposed plan change unless there are specific, direct and robust provisions to properly manage the effects of the development that would be enabled by the plan change.	Amend provisions to address the matters set out in the primary submission of Paul and Rose Boocock.
28	28.1	J. Warden and A. Baird	Entirety of PPC83	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter views that supporting information supplied with PPC83 is does not create certainty on which areas are confirmed wetland or not, making references to areas which may be prone to flooding. • Submitter notes the proposed development will infringe on and have adverse effects on existing indigenous vegetation. • Submitter is concerned that the site is within the home range of the 'Nationally Critical' Australasian bittern, and if so, notes that PPC83 provisions require modification to suit their requirements. • Submitter notes that the NPS IB has not been incorporated into provisions for PPC83. • Submitter notes that current roading infrastructure is not sufficient for the PPC83 developments. • Submitter views that Mangawhai has public access issues to the main beach, and the proposed development will exacerbate this. 	Does not specify.	Support	Refuse the proposed plan change unless there are specific, direct and robust provisions to properly manage the effects of the development that would be enabled by the plan change.	Amend provisions to address the matters set out in the primary submission of Paul and Rose Boocock.

Sub #	Sub Point	Submitter	Provision #	Reason for Submission	Relief Sought	Further Submission		
						Support / oppose	Reasons	Decision requested
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter refers to the wastewater infrastructure, which is already nearing capacity, and the submitter is concerned provisions for PPC83 do not adequately address these pre-existing issues. 				
29	29.1	J. Henschman	Entirety of PPC83	Submitter is concerned with the potential loss of amenity and character of the area, should the development go ahead. Submitter is concerned costs related to the development will fall to the ratepayers. Submitter views that current infrastructure will not sustain proposed development.	Delete PPC83 in its entirety.	Support	Refuse the proposed plan change unless there are specific, direct and robust provisions to properly manage the effects of the development that would be enabled by the plan change.	Amend provisions to address the matters set out in the primary submission of Paul and Rose Boocock.
32	32.1	J. Cayford	PPC83 in its entirety	<p>The submitter is not in support of PPC83 for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 400m2 is too small given water collection storage is required. 60% impermeable surface risks potential stormwater runoff and overland flow paths. Wastewater treatment plant is currently at capacity, to which the costs to upgrade infrastructure should fall on the developer. Submitter is concerned with potential fragmentation of lots, without an overall subdivision plan. Submitter is concerned if infrastructure is dealt with at the stage of each individual subdivision consent. Submitter notes the two streams which flow through the development area and will likely receive stormwater runoff. Submitter views that streams, and lowland wetland areas will need be enhanced and maintained to avoid overflow and potential flood risk. 	Delete PPC83 in its entirety.	Support	Amending the provisions will better manage effects.	Amend provisions to specify larger site sizes as sought in the primary submission of Paul and Rose Boocock.
36	36.1	K. Walker	Appendix 3 – Land Development report	Submitter views that the Land Development Report attached to PPC83 is out of date and does not account for the recent flooding in the area. Further to this, the submitter is concerned the Land Development Report does not sufficiently address stormwater management	Submitter requests a further report be undertaken to further assess flood risk for the site, and to assess wastewater management.	Support	Robust, peer reviewed assessments are required to ensure that the effects of the development will be acceptable now and in the future.	Amend provisions to address the matters set out in the primary submission of Paul and Rose Boocock.
38	38.1	K. May	Entirety of PPC83	<p>The submitter is opposed to the plan change for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter is concerned around the overall lack of stormwater management. With PPC83 proposing for stormwater management to be up to the individual property owner, the submitter is concerned that stormwater will not be sufficiently managed. 850m2 is considered to be too small for a site to have its own wastewater system, given that industry experience suggests sites should be at least 1500m2, with some installers recommending site sizes of 2000-2300m2 to accommodate a 3-4 bedroom dwelling. 400m2 is considered to be too small for the residential sites and will ruin the transition area between the countryside and the suburbs. The submitter acknowledges the conflict of interest of the mayor's involvement in the plan change. 	Does not specify.	Support in part	Will better manage effects. Sites in the sub-Precinct larger site area should be a minimum of 8000m ² .	Amend provisions to specify larger site sizes as sought in the primary submission of Paul and Rose Boocock.
43	43.1	M. Davies	PPC83 in its entirety	Submitter is concerned for the loss of amenity and character of the area. Submitter is concerned the proposed lot sizes will result in adverse flooding.	Does not specify	Support	Will better manage effects.	Amend provisions to address the matters set out in the primary submission of Paul and Rose Boocock.
50	50.1	P. and A Maroulis	PPC83 in its entirety	Submitter views existing infrastructure is not sufficient to sustain the proposed development. Submitter is concerned that 850m2 is too small for a site to sustain its own wastewater systems given the area required for dripper fields can be at least 300m2. Submitter is concerned that the traffic assessment undertaken does not reflect the anticipated traffic of the proposed development.	Submitter seeks for improved infrastructure in place before the development proceeds.	Support	Sites in the sub-Precinct larger site area should be a minimum of 8000m ² .	Amend provisions to specify larger site sizes as sought in the primary submission of Paul and Rose Boocock.

Sub #	Sub Point	Submitter	Provision #	Reason for Submission	Relief Sought	Further Submission		
						Support / oppose	Reasons	Decision requested
59	59.1	R. Kitchener	PPC83 in its entirety	Submitter seeks the requested relief for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of rural amenity and character values for the proposed development site. Proposed development has the potential to increase traffic safety, with regard to the proposed roads being developed in proximity to properties with young children. 	Delete PPC83 in its entirety.	Support	Will better manage effects.	Amend provisions to address the matters set out in the primary submission of Paul and Rose Boocock.
60	60.1	S. Mackey-Wood	PPC83 in its entirety	The submitter opposes the PPC83 for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of rural character and amenity values. Concerns with lack of consultation with landowners 400m² lot sizes are too small. 60% impermeable surface is too high given existing stormwater issues. Safety issues with traffic and pedestrians (particularly small children) 	Reject PPC83 in its current form	Support	Will better manage effects.	Amend provisions to address the matters set out in the primary submission of Paul and Rose Boocock.
63	63.1	S. and C. Brotherton	PPC83 in its entirety	Submitter is opposed to PPC83 in its entirety for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> submitter is concerned the proposed development does will have adverse noise effects from traffic and will result in congestion. Submitter is concerned the proposal will result in increased stormwater runoff given the proposed higher density. Loss of rural character and amenity values Increase in light spill from increase in development Concerns that the proposed development do not give effect to higher order documents such as National Policy Statements, Northern Regional Policy Statement, as well as the operative Kaipara District Plan and the Mangawhai Spatial Plan 	Delete PPC83 in its entirety however seeks amendments if approved.	Support	Refuse the proposed plan change unless there are specific, direct and robust provisions to properly manage the effects of the development that would be enabled by the plan change.	Amend provisions to address the matters set out in the primary submission of Paul and Rose Boocock.
Plan Provisions								
5	5.2	B. Ramsay-Turner and P. Rogers	Rule 13.10.12	Stormwater infrastructure and its management should be a focus for council going forward. Submitter is concerned that the permitted 60% impermeable surface standard is too high and that reduction to 40% will reduce flood risk from stormwater overflow, whilst ensuring a maximum amount of permeable surface.	Amend rule 13.10.12. (...) (2) The Cove Road North Precinct Any activity is a Permitted Activity if: a) The area of any site covered by buildings and other impermeable surfaces is less than 40% 60% of the net site area; and (...)	Support	Reducing the maximum permitted impermeable surfaces will better manage effects.	Amend the provisions.
	5.3	B. Ramsay-Turner and P. Rogers	13.13X	Submitter views that the minimum lot sizes are too small. Lot sizes should be increased to be in keeping with the surrounding environment.	Amend rule 13.13x as follows: Increase minimum lot sizes from 400m ² to 750m ² . Increase minimum lot sizes to 1000m ² in the Northern Area of the development.	Support	Sites in the sub-Precinct larger site area should be a minimum of 8000m ²	Amend provisions to specify larger site sizes as sought in the primary submission of Paul and Rose Boocock.
13	13.1	D. Beaven	13.13X	Submitter raises the following concern: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conflict of interest with the mayor's involvement in the plan change Submitter views 400m² allotment size is too small given potential stormwater issues Submitter is concerned that reducing minimum allotment size will have an adverse effect on traffic, as well as on wildlife. 	Submitter seeks for rule 13.13X to be amended to increase minimum allotment size to 1000m ²	Oppose	Sites in the sub-Precinct larger site area should be a minimum of 8000m ²	Amend provisions to specify larger site sizes as sought in the primary submission of Paul and Rose Boocock.
14	14.2	D. Cornelius and O. Rowan	New provisions	Submitters oppose PPC83 for the following reasons: <u>Reverse sensitivity</u> The submitters are concerned with potential reverse sensitivity issues given the proposed residential development is adjacent to the rural zone, which has an anticipated rural amenity and character. The submitters concern relates to adverse effect from the residential development on adjacent farming operations.	Submitter seeks the following provisions be inserted into PPC83 should it be approved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6-metre planted buffer within PPC83 land along the common boundary with the submitter's land. 	Support	Will better manage effects.	Amend provisions to address the matters set out in the primary submission of Paul and Rose Boocock.

Sub #	Sub Point	Submitter	Provision #	Reason for Submission	Relief Sought	Further Submission		
						Support / oppose	Reasons	Decision requested
				<p><u>Traffic</u> The submitters are concerned with the potential effects from increase in traffic, and how this will be managed.</p> <p><u>Social</u> The submitter is concerned that PPC83 will disrupt long term planning, as well as emotional and economic perspectives on how the property is to be managed ongoing.</p> <p><u>Rural character and amenity</u> The submitters are concerned with the potential loss of rural character and amenity should PPC83 be approved. The submitter is concerned with the increase in light pollution from the proposed residential development, and the effects this may have on the amenity of the area.</p> <p><u>Flooding/Natural Hazards</u> The submitters are concerned with potential flooding issues with the change from rural to residential and an increase of impervious surfaces.</p> <p><u>Infrastructure</u> In terms of water supply, the submitter is concerned for the quantity of potable water supply available to the sites, given some of water will be required to be set aside for firefighting. In terms of wastewater, the submitter is concerned that the plan change does not provide clear indication in how the proposal will be able to accommodate the additional wastewater infrastructure for each new lot.</p> <p><u>Higher order documents</u> The submitter views that PPC83 is not consistent in various aspects of higher order documents, such as the Mangawhai Spatial Plan, Exposure Draft Kaipara District Plan, Operative Kaipara District Plan, Northland Regional Policy Statement, with consistencies largely pertaining to density, rural character and amenity of the PPC83 area and surrounding vicinity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No complaints covenants on titles of all lots contained within PPC83 advising them that farming, and pest control activities are operated, with rural noises, smells and activities being undertaken near the proposed subdivision. No cats or mustelids to be allowed on any lots within PPC83. Predator fencing shall be erected to ensure that no cats or mustelids can enter the submitter's land. • People proof fencing shall be erected along the common boundary with land owned by the submitter or properties managed by the BTRA, so that no people can enter. 			
14.3	D. Cornelius and O. Rowan	Residential Performance Standards Rule 13.10.3.a(2) Rule 13.10.7(3) Rule 13.10.7.a(1) Rule 13.10.11(2) Rule 13.10.13 Rule 13.13 Rule 13.10.23	Refer to submission point above	<p>Amend rule 13.10.3a(2) as follows: Exclude any minor dwellings or accessory buildings not contained within a single building.</p> <p>Amend rule 13.10.7(3) as follows: Setback from submitter's land – 20 metres</p> <p>Insert new clause into rule 13.10.7a(1) as follows: x. Predator and people proof fencing shall be constructed along the common boundary between PPC83 and the submitter's land and any land owned and managed by the BTRA.</p> <p>Amend rule 13.10.11(2) as follows: Increase the amount of private open space to 50% of the gross floor area of the dwelling.</p> <p>Amend rule 13.10.13 as follows: Reduce building coverage to 35%.</p>	Support in Part	Will better manage effects.	Amend provisions.	

Sub #	Sub Point	Submitter	Provision #	Reason for Submission	Relief Sought	Further Submission		
						Support / oppose	Reasons	Decision requested
					<p>Insert new clauses into rule 13.13 as follows:</p> <p>x. Every proposed allotment within the Northern Area as shown on Precinct Map 1, or where a boundary is shared with the submitter's property, shall have a minimum net site area of 8000m2 .</p> <p>x. Every proposed allotment outside the Northern Area as shown on Precinct Map 1 shall have a minimum net site area of 1000m2.</p> <p>Insert new clause into rule 13.10.23 as follows:</p> <p>x. All outside lighting within Precinct Map 1 are to be downward pointing in best dark sky practice.</p> <p>Insert a new flood mitigation measure into PPC83</p>			
30	30.1	J. Hook	Rule 13.13X	Submitter views that 400m ² and 600m ² is not a sufficient lot size.	<p>Submitter seeks the following requested relief:</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>2. Any subdivision within the Cove Road North Precinct shall ensure:</p> <p>a. . Every allotment has a minimum net site area of 1000m2 if serviced (on sewerage) and within an Overlay Area.</p> <p>b. If un-serviced and within an Overlay area, minimum, lot size must be 3000m2 .</p> <p>400m2 except where the proposed allotment is located within the Northern Area as shown on Precinct Map 1; or b. Every proposed allotment within the Northern Area as shown on Precinct Map 1 has a minimum net site area of 1000m2; and</p> <p>c. Proposed allotments have an average size of at least 600m2.</p> <p>(...)</p>	Oppose	Sites in the sub-Precinct larger site area should be a minimum of 8000m ²	Amend provisions to specify larger site sizes as sought in the primary submission of Paul and Rose Boocock.
31	31.1	J. Coop	Rule 13.13X Concept Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter requests a minimum allotment size of 1000m2 for serviced sites, and 3000m2 for un-serviced sites to achieve consistency with the operative district plan and the spatial plan. • Submitter notes that septic fields on clay soil are required to be of minimum 300m2, to which this would not be achievable on a 400m2 site. • Submitter supports the creation of a precinct over residentially zones land. 	<p>Submitter seeks the following requested relief:</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>2. Any subdivision within the Cove Road North Precinct shall ensure:</p> <p>a. . Every allotment has a minimum net site area of 1000m2 if serviced (on sewerage) and within an Overlay Area.</p>	Oppose	The Submitter seeks larger site sizes to properly manage the effects of the development that would be enabled by the plan change	Amend provisions to specify larger site sizes as sought in the primary submission of Paul and Rose Boocock.

Sub #	Sub Point	Submitter	Provision #	Reason for Submission	Relief Sought	Further Submission		
						Support / oppose	Reasons	Decision requested
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The requested relief of 4000m2 for land on the Northern and Western edges of PPC83 will assist to achieve a buffer zone of protection for kiwis and other native wildlife. 	<p>b. If un-serviced and within an Overlay area, minimum, lot size must be 3000m2 . 400m2 except where the proposed allotment is located within the Northern Area as shown on Precinct Map 1; or b. Every proposed allotment within the Northern Area as shown on Precinct Map 1 has a minimum net site area of 1000m2; and e. Proposed allotments have an average size of at least 600m2. (...) Submitter requests land on the northern and western edges of PPC83 have a minimum allotment size of 4000m2</p>			
37	37.2	K. Sullivan and S. Powley	13.10.12	Submitter does not support a permitted impermeable surface standard of 60% given the topography of the environment in which they view will result in loss of amenity values.	Amend rule 13.10.12 as follows: (...) (2) The Cove Road North Precinct Any activity is a Permitted Activity if: a) The area of any site covered by buildings and other impermeable surfaces is less than 40% 60% of the net site area; and (...)	Support	Will better manage effects.	Amend provisions
	37.3	K. Sullivan and S. Powley	13.10.13	Refer to submission point 37.3	Amend rule 13.10.13 as follows: (...) (2) The Cove Road North Precinct Any activity is a Permitted Activity if: a) Building coverage on a site is less than 35% 45% of the net site area (...)	Support	Will better manage effects.	Amend provisions
	37.4	K. Sullivan and S. Powley	13.13X	Submitter does not support proposed lot sizes of 400m2 as they view this will negatively impact visual amenity.	Amend rule 13.13x as follows: (...) Any subdivision within the Cove Road North Precinct shall ensure: a. Every allotment has a minimum net site area of 600m2 400m2 except where the proposed allotment is located within the Northern Area as shown on Precinct Map 1; or (...)	Support in Part	Supported to the extent that the minimum site size in the Sub-precinct is 8,000m ²	Amend provisions
	37.7	K. Sullivan and S. Powley		Submitter views that the applicant for PPC83 has provided limited mitigation provisions in relation to PPC83.	Submitter seeks for the word "mitigate" to be removed and the word "avoid" be reinstated	Support in part	Avoid should be used where appropriate.	Amend provisions
41	41.2	Mangawhai Matters Society Incorporated	Rule 13.13X	Submitter is concerned that lots sizes of 400m2 will have adverse effects on stormwater runoff.	Increase minimum allotment size to a minimum of 600m2	Support in part	Supported to the extent that the minimum site size in the Sub-precinct is 8,000m ² and elsewhere in the Cove Road Precinct the minimum site size should be at least 600m ²	Amend provisions

Sub #	Sub Point	Submitter	Provision #	Reason for Submission	Relief Sought	Further Submission		
						Support / oppose	Reasons	Decision requested
	41.3	Mangawhai Matters Society Incorporated	New precinct	Submitter views a precinct plan would assist in addressing concerns around ecological values of the area, as well as public space, infrastructure, roading and transport and pedestrian networks.	Submitter seeks the adoption of a precinct plan with policies and rules which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide consistent and comprehensive design provisions to be applied to the entire site which recognise its transitional nature within an important non-urban landscape; Ensure integrated provision of public space (including ecological reserves), wastewater collection and disposal, stormwater infrastructure, and on-site road, cycle, and pedestrian networks and their linkages to the rest of Mangawhai 	Support	Amended provisions will achieve better and more appropriate outcomes.	Amend provisions
50	50.2	P. and A Maroulis	13.13X	Submitter views 400m2 is too small for a site to collect and dispose of water, given up to 60% of the site is permitted to be impermeable.	Amend rule 13.13X as follows: Increase minimum allotment size to 500-600m2 .	Support in Part	The minimum site size outside the sub-Precinct should be 600m ² .	Amend provisions
52	52.2	P. Humphries	13.13X	Submitter seeks requested relief to better align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan. Submitter views that the proposed density standard will have an adverse impact on amenity values and an adverse effect on the character of the area.	Amend rule 13.13X as follows: Subdivision Design Rules: 2. Any subdivision within the Cove Road North Precinct shall ensure: a. Every allotment has a minimum net site area of 400m2 650m2 except where the proposed allotment is located within the Northern Area as shown on Precinct Map 1; or b. Every proposed allotment within the Northern Area as shown on Precinct Map 1 has a minimum net site area of 1000m2; and c. Proposed allotments have an average size of at least 600m2 750m2 .	Support in Part	Supported to the extent that the minimum site size in the Sub-precinct is 8,000m ² and elsewhere in the Cove Road Precinct the minimum site size should be at least 600m ²	Amend provisions
	52.3	P. Humphries	13.10.12	Submitter is concerned that a permitted impermeable standard of 60% is too high and has potential to exacerbate flooding from stormwater overflow.	Amend rule 13.10.12 to be consistent with the operative district plan standard of 45% impermeable surfaces be applied.	Support	Will better manage effects.	Amend provisions
57	57.2	R. Humphries	Rule 13.13X	Does not specify.	Amend rule 13.13X as follows: (...) 2. Any subdivision within the Cove Road North Precinct shall ensure: a. Every allotment has a minimum net site area of 400m2 650m2 except where the proposed allotment is located within the Northern Area as shown on Precinct Map 1; or b. Every proposed allotment within the Northern Area as shown on	Support in Part	Supported to the extent that the minimum site size in the Sub-precinct is 8,000m ² and elsewhere in the Cove Road Precinct the minimum site size should be at least 600m ²	Amend provisions

Sub #	Sub Point	Submitter	Provision #	Reason for Submission	Relief Sought	Further Submission		
						Support / oppose	Reasons	Decision requested
					Precinct Map 1 has a minimum net site area of 1000m ² ; and c. Proposed allotments have an average size of at least 600m² . 750m² (...)			
	57.3	R. Humphries	13.10.7	Submitter seeks for setbacks to be amended to be consistent with the operative district plan setback standards.	Amend rule 13.10.7 as follows: (...) a) Front yard - 3m 5m ; b) Side yards - 1.5m one of 1.5m and one of 3m (Residential Zone), two of 3m in Overlay Areas ; c) Rear yards - 1.5m 3m except on rear sites where one yard of 1.5m may be provided ; d) Cove Road legal boundary - 5m; e) Rural Zone - 3m. (...)	Support in Part	The Submitter seeks those buildings at the northern boundary be setback at least 10 metres from the boundary to better manage reverse sensitivity, amenity value and character effects.	Amend provisions
61	61.1	S. Waring	Rule 13.13X	Submitter seeks the requested relief as they consider that increasing minimum allotment size from 400m ² to 800m ² will assist in retaining rural character and amenity values. Submitter is also concerned with the density of 400m ² lots and how stormwater will be managed.	Amend rule 13.13x to increase minimum allotment size to 800m ² .	Support in Part	Supported to the extent that the minimum site size in the Sub-precinct is 8,000m ² and elsewhere in the Cove Road Precinct the minimum site size should be at least 600m ²	Amend provisions
63	63.9	S. and C. Brotherton	Rule 13.10.11(2)	Submitter is opposed to PPC83 in its entirety for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • submitter is concerned the proposed development does will have adverse noise effects from traffic and will result in congestion. • Submitter is concerned the proposal will result in increased stormwater runoff given the proposed higher density. • Loss of rural character and amenity values • Increase in light spill from increase in development • Concerns that the proposed development do not give effect to higher order documents such as National Policy Statements, Northern Regional Policy Statement, as well as the operative Kaipara District Plan and the Mangawhai Spatial Plan. 	Increase the amount of private space to 50% of the gross floor area of the dwelling.	Support	Will better manage effects on character and amenity.	Amend provisions
	63.10	S. and C. Brotherton	Rule 13.10.13	Please refer to reason 63.9	Reduce building coverage to 35%.	Support	Will better manage effects on character and amenity.	Amend provisions
	63.11	S. and C. Brotherton	Rule 13.13X	Please refer to reason 63.9	Amend rule 13.13X to increase minimum allotment size to 8000m ² for proposed allotments within the Northern Area as shown on precinct map 1, or where a boundary is shared with the submitter's property, or land owned or managed by the BTRA.	Support	Supported to the extent that the minimum site size in the Sub-precinct is 8,000m ² and elsewhere in the Cove Road Precinct the minimum site size should be at least 600m ²	Amend provisions
Zoning								
11	11.1	C. Silvester	Concept Plans	Submitter views that sites along the Northern and Western boundaries of PPC83 are within environmentally sensitive areas and should be retained as rural. Submitter views that retention of allotment sizes in these areas will assist in protecting Kiwi and other native wildlife.	Submitter seeks for all sites along the Northern and Western edge of PPC83 to retain the 4000m ² allotment size standard.	Support in Part	Larger sites are required but the minimum site size should be 8,000m ² .	Amend provisions to require minimum site sizes of 8,000m ² in the sub- Precinct.
Transport and Rooding								

Sub #	Sub Point	Submitter	Provision #	Reason for Submission	Relief Sought	Further Submission		
						Support / oppose	Reasons	Decision requested
5	5.6	B. Ramsay-Turner and P. Rogers	Traffic Assessment	Submitter is concerned that the traffic assessment undertaken is not adequate.	Does not specify	Support	Robust comprehensive traffic assessment is required to ensure the effects on the immediate and wider environment are identified and addressed.	Review assessment and refuse consent is effects are not able to be appropriately addressed.
41	41.4	Mangawhai Matters Society Incorporated		Submitter views that on-site roads should be finalised through PPC83 prior to subdivision. Submitter views that pedestrian and cycle access will not significantly displace increase in vehicle traffic volumes. Submitter is concerned the traffic assessment undertaken is not representative of current traffic volumes given it was not taken in during the peak of summer	Submitter seeks for revision of the Integrated Transport Plan	Support	Robust comprehensive traffic assessment is required to ensure the effects on the immediate and wider environment are identified and addressed.	Review assessment and refuse consent is effects are not able to be appropriately addressed.
44	44.5	M. and A. Geary	Integrated Transport Assessment	Submitter is concerned that the transport assessment undertaken is not sufficient	Submitter seeks for an updated transport assessment be undertaken.	Support	Robust comprehensive traffic assessment is required to ensure the effects on the immediate and wider environment are identified and addressed.	Review assessment and refuse consent is effects are not able to be appropriately addressed.
Infrastructure								
5	5.7	B. Ramsay-Turner and P. Rogers		Submitter has an overall concern for how infrastructure will cope with the increased demand on services.	Does not specify	Support	If the Plan Change is approved the provisions need to ensure appropriate infrastructure is in place or can be provided.	Review assessments and plan provisions or refuse the proposal.
Wastewater								
52	52.4	P. Humphries		Submitter is concerned with wastewater management being up to the individual property owner.	Submitter seeks for a comprehensive wastewater management plan be implemented for the PPC83 area.	Support	Appropriate infrastructure is required to service the development and the effects of the proposed methods have to be assessed.	If appropriate solutions with acceptable effects are not provided the proposal should be refused.
53	53.4	P. and K. Barbour	-	Submitter is concerned that the Mangawhai wastewater treatment plant is already at capacity. Submitter is concerned the cost to upgrade the facility will fall to the ratepayers.	Costs of upgrades to the wastewater treatment facility should not fall to the ratepayers.	Support	Appropriate infrastructure is required to service the development and the effects of the proposed methods have to be assessed.	If appropriate solutions with acceptable effects are not provided the proposal should be refused.
Water Supply								
48	48.1	Northland Regional Council	Rule 13.10.3a	Submitter views that the land pertaining to the proposed development does not have sufficient water supply with respect to the 2019/2020 droughts. NRC views that 50,000l of water storage on site will be a sufficient amount of water supply to account for long term climate change projections and the increased risk of wildfire.	Amend rule 13.10.3a as follows: (2) The Cove Road North Precinct a. Construction of a dwelling is a permitted activity if: i. After completion, it will be the only dwelling on the site. ii. 50,000 litres of onsite potable water storage is provided.	Support in Part	Water supply methods needs to be demonstrated and the effects of the proposed methods have to be assessed.	If appropriate solutions with acceptable effects are not provided the proposal should be refused.
	48.2	Northland Regional Council	Rule 13.14.6	The submitter notes that the wastewater treatment plant is nearing capacity and is concerned that the proposed development may not be able to sustain the increased capacity required. The submitter notes the original wording of the rule 13.10.6	Submitter seeks the following requested relief: That Rule 13.14.6 - Wastewater Disposal in the district plan applies to development in the Cove Road North Precinct and the alternative wording for the rule proposed in the plan change documents not adopted.	Support	Appropriate infrastructure is required to service the development and the effects of the proposed methods have to be assessed.	If appropriate solutions with acceptable effects are not provided the proposal should be refused.
Subdivision								
41	41.5	Mangawhai Matters Society Incorporated		Submitter is concerned that the urban design assessment does not reference water reticulation.	Submitter seeks for revision of the Integrated Transport Plan	Support	Appropriate infrastructure is required to service the development and the effects of the proposed methods have to be assessed.	If appropriate solutions with acceptable effects are not provided the proposal should be refused.
Fire Fighting								
19	19.1	Fire and Emergency NZ	13.13X	Fire and Emergency NZ is concerned that the provisions for firefighting water supply have been left out. FENZ notes the requested relief comes from an agreed outcome from the Environment Court following ENV-2018-AKL-00012.	Include the following clause into rule 13.13X: That site(s) is adequately serviced and/or services onsite are managed, in particular the extent to which: ...	Support	Appropriate infrastructure is required to service the development and the effects of the proposed methods have to be assessed.	If appropriate solutions with acceptable effects are not provided the proposal should be refused.

Sub #	Sub Point	Submitter	Provision #	Reason for Submission	Relief Sought	Further Submission		
						Support / oppose	Reasons	Decision requested
					<p>sufficient firefighting water supply is available, taking into account a risk based assessment.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, an example of sufficient firefighting water for a single residential dwelling will generally include (subject to site-specific risks) 10,000 litres of water from sources that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Within 90 metres of an identified building platform on each lot; and b. Existing or likely to be available at time of development of the lot; and c. Accessible and available year-round; and d. May be comprised of water tanks, permanent natural waterbodies, dams, swimming pools, whether located on or off the lot. 			