

Summary of Further Submissions on Private Plan Change 83: The Rise Limited

Original Submitter Name and number	Further Submission Point	Original Submitter name	Original submitter number	Original Submission Point	Topic	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Decision	Reason
J. Cayford FS01	FS01.1	A. and V. Dark	3	3.1	Funding	Support	Allow submission point	Further submitter views that private plan changes which require public funded infrastructure should require that subdivisions cannot proceed until infrastructure funding is provided via the long term plan or annual plan.
	FS01.2	C. Boonham	12	12.1	Funding	Support	Allow submission point	Further submitter shares concerns that specific provisions need to be included which prevent subdivision and development incrementally occurring. The further submitter is concerned that allowing subdivisions to proceed without
	FS01.3	Others	Others	General	Infrastructure	Support	Allow submission point	Further submitter notes that several submitters expressing concern around funding for roading, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure which should not be paid for by other ratepayers.
	FS01.4	A. Mostert	2	2.1	Ecological	Support	Allow submission point	Further submitter agrees that areas of bush should be protected, and that bush area provides eco-corridor links across and within Mangawhai.
	FS01.5	B. Ramsay-Turner	5	5.4	Density	Support	Allow submission point	Further submitter agrees that lot sizes need to be in keeping with the surrounding environment.
	FS01.6	Bream Tail Residents Association and Northern Farms Limited (c/- CPPC Planning)	8	8.1	Density	Support	Allow submission point	Further submitter agrees that there is a need for organised density transitions between high and low density environments, with respect to cumulative effects on stock, privacy and plantings.
	FS01.7	C. Silvester	11	11.1 and 11.3	Density	Support	Allow submission point	The further submitter agrees that lot sizes along Northern boundaries should be larger and retained as rural.
	FS01.8	D. Cornelius and O. Rowan	14	14.1	Reverse sensitivity	Support	Allow submission point	Further submitter agrees that the PPC83 may be subject to reverse sensitivity with respect to the rural farming activities established in the area. Further submitter views that urban developments need to be sufficiently separated from said activities and their effects.
	FS01.9	A. and J. Robb	1	1.5	Stormwater	Support	Allow submission point	Further submitter agrees that PPC83 has insufficient information regarding provisions for stormwater.
	FS01.10	A. Mostert	2	2.3	Flooding	Support	Allow submission point	Further submitter views that current conditions and flooding should form part of the planning approach to stormwater.
	FS01.11	A & V. Dark	3	3.1	Infrastructure Funding	Support	Allow submission point	Further submitter acknowledges the reference to the environment court decision for Mangawhai Central and reiterates that publicly funded infrastructure should not allow subdivisions until the necessary infrastructure required are provided either via the Long Term Plan or the Annual Plan.
	FS01.12	K. Walker	36	36.1	Flooding	Support	Allow submission point	Further submitter agrees there is a lack of analysis regarding flooding and views that

Summary of Further Submissions on Private Plan Change 83: The Rise Limited

	FS01.13	K. Sullivan and S. Powley	37	37.5		Support	Allow submission point	Further submitter views that no subdivision consents should be granted until a detailed assessment report and stormwater management plan can demonstrate that
	FS01.14	Northland Regional Council	48	48.4	Regional Natural Hazard Maps	Support	Allow submission point	Further submitter agrees with relief sought by Northland Regional Council noting that the proposed precinct plan delineates the areas subject to 1:100 year coastal or river flood hazard on the Northland Regional Council hazards to which are seemed unsuitable for residential development.
R. & R. Davies FS02	FS02.1	A. and J. Robb	1	1.3	Stormwater	Support	Allow submissions points and seek that KDC address this further submission by amending the land use and subdivision provisions as outlined in their original submission.	Further submitter notes the relevant submission points raise similar concerns with respect to management of stormwater and the associated impacts on flooding within the surrounding environment.
		A. Mostert	2	1.5				
		Sanctuary Residents Association	4	2.2				
		B. Ramsay Turner and P. Rogers	5	2.3				
			6	4.3				
			7	5.2				
		B. Ashton	10	6.1				
		B. Prangley	12	7.1				
		C. and K. Tyndall	14	7.2				
		C. Boonham	16	10.1				
		D. Cornelius and O. Rowan	27	12.1				
			32	14.1				
		D. Parker	33	16.1				
		J. and J. Horlock	36	27.3				
		J. Cayford	38	32.				
		K. Sutherland	39	33.1				
		K. Walker	43	36.1				
		K. May	45	38.1				
		L. and N. Adams	47	39.1				
		M. Davies	52	43.1				
N. Nathan	53	45.1						
N. Smith	58	47.1						
P. Humphries	60	52.3						
P. and K. Barbour	62	52.5						
R. and H Hawkes	63	53.3						
S. Mackey-Wood	64	58.1						
S. Bray	67	60.1						
	68	62.3						

Summary of Further Submissions on Private Plan Change 83: The Rise Limited

		S. and C. Brotherton		63.1				
		S. Birkenhead		63.13				
		T. Gardner		64.2				
		W. Fairs		64.3				
				67.1				
				68.1				
P. & R Boocock FS02 (withdrawn)								