

Summary of Submissions – PPC83 The Rise Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
A. and J. Robb	1	1.1	Zoning	Concept Plans	Support	Retain as notified	Supports zone change to support future growth of Mangawhai.	N	Y
		1.2	Plan provisions	10.13.3a – dwellings	Support in part	Does not specify	Does not support lot sizes being less than 600sqm.		
		1.3	Plan provisions	13.10.12 – Permeable surfaces	Support in part	Does not specify	Does not support impermeable surface of any individual lot being less than 40%.		
		1.4	Plan provisions	13.10.13 – Building coverage	Support in part	Does not specify	Does not support site coverage of more than 35%.		
		1.5	Stormwater	-	Support in part	Seeks for public wastewater infrastructure to be ascertained through development contributions. Seeks for detailed assessment report and stormwater plan.	Current management of stormwater is not adequate given recent examples of flooding.		
		1.6	General	-	Support in part	Does not specify.	Submitter is not in support of provisions which allow access to adjacent lots for future infrastructure which may create development restrictions for sites.		
		1.7	Transport and Rooding	-	Support in part	Does not specify.	Submitter does not support policies which do not address infrastructure improvements given that the proposal will create more demand on the existing roading network.		
A. Mostert	2	2.1	Environmental	New provision	Support	Submitter seeks the addition of new provisions which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> prohibits cats and dogs require predator control 	Submitter notes that land to the north contains covenants which should be protected and enhanced to promote the use of wildlife corridors.	N	N
		2.2	Housing Density	13.10.3a – Dwellings	Oppose	Delete rule 13.10.3.a	Submitter views 400sqm is too small for a lot size, and 60% impermeable surface will increase risk in terms of flooding from stormwater overflow.		

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
		2.3	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC83 in its entirety.	<p>the submitter opposes PPC83 for the following reasons:</p> <p><u>Stormwater</u> The submitter notes that the Sanctuary Driveway has flooded twice in 2023, disrupting traffic. Submitter is concerned that if the plan change goes ahead, this will exacerbate flood risk to neighbouring properties.</p> <p><u>Wastewater</u> Submitter has raised concerns around the wastewater treatment plant capacity, and the cost of increasing wastewater infrastructure will have to be met by ratepayers.</p> <p><u>Roading and transport</u> Submitter is concerned that PPC83 will result in increased traffic congestion and require increased roading and transport infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Subdivision</u> The submitter is not in support of ad-hoc developments and views that subdivisions should occur in accordance with an overall subdivision plan.</p>		
		2.4	Transport and roading	Concept plan	Support in part	Retain proposed off-street pathway.	Submitter is in support of the proposed pathway on Cove and Mangawhai Heads Road.		
		2.5	General	-	Neutral	Does not specify.	Submitter acknowledges the conflict of interest between the PPC83 and the mayor.		
A. and V. Dark	3	3.1	General	PPC83 as a whole	Oppose	Decline PPC83 until an overarching infrastructure plan is established and defined for future subdivision.	<p>Submitter is not in support of PPC83 and they are concerned about lack of consultation with landowners. The submitter references the Environment Court settlement related to the Mangawhai Central Plan Change Application, and notes that this whilst this does not apply to the plan change area, it could provide a useful precedent for future planning decisions.</p> <p>The submitter is in support of the submission provided by the Sanctuary Residents Association.</p>	N	Y
Sanctuary Residents Association	4	4.1	General	PPC83 as a whole	Oppose	Delete PPC83 in its entirety unless requested changes are made.	<p>Submitter views that PPC83 should be declined unless provisions for infrastructure are improved.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned around the lack of overall subdivision plan and potential for fragmentation.</p>	Y	Y
		4.2	Housing Density	13.13.X	Oppose	Does not specify.	Submitter views that 400m ² lot sizes are too small.		
		4.3	Stormwater	13.10.12	Oppose	Does not specify.	The submitter is concerned that 60% impermeable surface is too high given potential increase for flooding due to stormwater.		

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
		4.4	Wastewater	New provision	Support in part	Add a provision which advises that subdivision is not to be permitted unless additional wastewater capacity is in place.	Submitter notes that lots of up to 850m ² is considered to be too small to have private wastewater treatment services.		
		4.5	Transport and Rooding	Concept Plans	Support in part	Include a roundabout at Mangawhai Heads Road/Cove Road	Submitter is concerned around the proposed new road coming onto Cove Road from The Rise, given that the proposed road may cause potential difficulties for traffic turning right onto both The Rise and The Sanctuary.		
		4.6	Transport and Rooding	Proposed footpath	Support	Retain as notified	Submitter is in support of the proposed footpath on both Cove and Mangawhai Heads Road.		
		4.7	Environmental	New provision	Oppose	Submitter seeks for cats and dogs to be banned and for predator control to be required.	Submitter notes that land to the north contains covenants which should be protected and enhanced to promote the use of wildlife corridors.		
B. Ramsay-Turner and P. Rogers	5	5.1	Zoning	Concept Plans	Support in part	Rezone the land to Low Density Residential	Submitter views that rezoning the land to low residential will restrict the number of Lots and reduce impact on infrastructure.	Y	Y
		5.2	Plan Provisions	Rule 13.10.12	Support in part	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 (...)	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.		
		5.3	Plan provisions	Rule 13.10.13	Support in part	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. (...)	Refer submission point 5.2.		
		5.4	Plan Provisions	13.13X	Support in part	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.	Submitter views that the minimum lot sizes are too small. Lot sizes should be increased to be in keeping with the surrounding environment.		
		5.5	Plan Provisions	New policies	Support in part	Submitter seeks for a policy framework to be implemented to handle increase in demand for wastewater.	Submitter is concerned about the wastewater capacity for the development. Submitter views that a policy framework will ensure developer meets the cost of increasing wastewater infrastructure.		
		5.6	Transport and Rooding	Traffic Assessment	Oppose	Does not specify.	Submitter is concerned that the traffic assessment undertaken is not adequate.		
		5.7	Infrastructure		Oppose	Does not specify.	Submitter has an overall concern for how infrastructure will cope with the increased demand on services.		
B. Ashton	6	6.1	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Oppose	Amend – does not specify.	Submitter is concerned with the proposed development in terms of infrastructure, roading and footpaths. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter views that the roading assessment undertaken only show a snapshot of present traffic volumes and does not account for potential traffic. 	N	N

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter is concerned for potential stormwater runoff caused from the proposed development given the reduced lot sizes. Submitter notes that the smaller lot sizes are not compatible with the rural characteristics of the area. 		
B. Prangley	7	7.1	Plan provisions	Rule 13.13	Support in part	Submitter seeks for rule 13.13 be amended to increase minimum allotment size to at least 2000m ²	Submitter is concerned that the reduced allotment sizes and 60% permitted impermeable surfaces standard will result in adverse stormwater runoff.	Y	Y
		7.2	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC83 in its entirety.	Submitter is not in support of PPC83 for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stormwater management will be left to the individual property owner. The proposed development will result in loss of amenity value and loss of privacy. Wastewater management given the existing wastewater treatment plan is at capacity. Traffic management 		
		7.3	Transport and roading	Concept Plans	Support	Retain proposed pathway on Cove and Mangawhai Heads Road as notified	Submitter is in support of the proposed pathways		
Bream Tail Residents Association and Northern Farms Limited (c/- CPPC Planning)	8	8.1	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Oppose	Decline PPC83 in its entirety. If the plan change is to move forward, the submitter seeks the requested relief in the following submission points.	<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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>The submitter is concerned the increase in traffic through PPC83 will have adverse effect on the roading infrastructure. The submitter</p>	Y	Y

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
							<p>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 result 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> <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>		
		8.2	Plan provisions	New provision	Support	Insert a new provision into PPC83 as follows: <u>A 2-metre planted buffer within PPC83 land along the common boundary with the submitter's land.</u>	Refer submission point 8.1		
		8.3	General	Property title	Support	Insert a no complaints covenant into 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.	Submitter is concerned the proposed residential development may prompt complaints from residents around rural odours, noise from farming machinery, motorbikes, agricultural equipment and farm animals. A no complaints covenant would prevent such complaints.		
		8.4	Plan Provisions	New provision	Support	Insert a new provision into PPC93 which bans cats and mustelids on any lots within PPC83.	Refer submission point 8.1		
		8.5	Plan provisions	Rule 13.10.7a(1)	Support	Insert a new clause into rule 13/10.7a(1) which requires predator fencing shall be erected to ensure that no cats or mustelids can enter the submitter's land. Submitter has included a map showing location of the requested fence.	Refer to submission point 8.1.		

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
		8.6	Plan Provisions	Rule 13.10.a(2)	Support in part	Amend rule 13.10.a(2) to exclude any minor dwellings or accessory buildings not contained within a single building	Refer submission point 8.1		
		8.7	Plan provisions	Rule 13.10.7(3)	Support in part	Amend rule 13.10.7(3) to increase setback from submitters land to 20m.	Refer submission point 8.1		
		8.8	Plan provisions	13.10.11(2)	Support in part	Amend Rule 13.10.11(2) to Increase the amount of private open space to 50% of the gross floor area of the dwelling.	Refer submission point 8.1		
		8.9	Plan provisions	Rule 13.10.13	Support in part	Reduce building coverage to 35%.	Refer submission point 8.1		
		8.10	Plan provisions	Rule 13.13	Support in part	Amend rule 13.13 to require every proposed allotment within the Northern Area as shown on Precinct Map 1, or where a boundary is shared with the submitter's property, to have a minimum net site area of 8000m ² .	Refer submission point 8.1		
C and L McLaughlin	9	9.1	General	Entirety of PPC83	Oppose	Delete PPC83 in its entirety.	Submitter is not in support of PPC83 given the proposed zone change will adversely affect rural character and amenity. Submitter views that current infrastructure cannot support the development.	N	N
C and K Tyndall	10	10.1	General	Entirety of PPC83	Oppose	Delete PPC83 in its entirety.	Submitters oppose PPC83 for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned with conflict of interest between the Mayor and proposed development. Concerned with lack of infrastructure with capacity to sustain the proposed development. Concerned with flooding that occurs on the proposed development area. Concerned with loss of rural amenity and character 	Y	Y
C. Silvester	11	11.1	Zoning	Concept Plans	Support in part	Submitter seeks for all sites along the Northern and Western edge of PPC83 to retain the 4000m ² allotment size standard.	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.	N	N
		11.2	Plan Provisions	13.13	Support in part	Submitter seeks that minimum allotment size in increased to 1000m ²	Submitter seeks to increase allotment size to achieve consistency with the operative district plan allotment size standards.		
		11.3	New Precinct	Concept Plan	Support	Retain as notified.	To protect ecological features, high quality urban design, and provide open space.		
		11.4	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Support in part	Submitter seeks for provisions to be added which sets out a complete ban on cats and other pest species. Submitter seeks for control on dogs.	Submitter views that control over pest management and control of dogs will assist in protection of kiwi and other native biodiversity. Submitter notes that the Rise has covenants in place prohibiting cats.		
		11.5	Cultural Effects Assessment	S10.4 Biodiversity P.25 Shared paths, off street cycle lands, parks.	Support	Submitter seeks for noted provisions to be incorporated into the plan change.	Submitter notes the provisions outlined in the cultural effects assessment will improve connectivity and provide opportunities for recreation.		
C. Boonham	12	12.1	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC83 in its entirety.	Submitter is opposed to the plan change for the following reasons:	Y	-

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
							<p><u>Demand for housing</u> Submitter is concerned that the demand for housing is not the role for Mangawhai given it does not have the infrastructure capacity to support the development.</p> <p><u>Amenities</u> 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><u>Infrastructure</u> The submitter is concerned that PPC83 will be faced with the same infrastructure issues that the Mangawhai Central development had.</p> <p><u>Wastewater</u> 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><u>Stormwater</u> 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><u>Water Supply</u> The submitter is concerned that existing water supply infrastructure will not be able to supply.</p> <p><u>Community</u> 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><u>Transport</u> 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>		

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
							<p><u>Lot Sizes</u></p> <p>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>		
D. Beaven	13	13.1	Plan Provisions	13.13X	Support in part	Submitter seeks for rule 13.13X to be amended to increase minimum allotment size to 1000m ²	<p>Submitter raises the following concern:</p> <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. 	N	N
D. Cornelius and O. Rowan	14	14.1	General	Entirety of PPC83	Oppose	Submitter seeks for PPC83 to be deleted in its entirety.	<p>Submitters oppose PPC83 for the following reasons:</p> <p><u>Reverse sensitivity</u></p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <p>The submitters are concerned with the potential effects from increase in traffic, and how this will be managed.</p> <p><u>Social</u></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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.</p>	Y	Y

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
							<p>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>		
		14.2	Plan provisions	New provisions	Support	<p>Submitter seeks the following provisions be inserted into PPC83 should it be approved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>6-metre planted buffer within PPC83 land along the common boundary with the submitter's land.</u> • <u>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.</u> • <u>No cats or mustelids to be allowed on any lots within PPC83.</u> • <u>Predator fencing shall be erected to ensure that no cats or mustelids can enter the submitter's land.</u> • <u>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.</u> 	Refer to submission point 14.1		
		14.3	Plan Provisions	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	Support in part	<p>Amend rule 13.10.3a(2) as follows: <u>Exclude any minor dwellings or accessory buildings not contained within a single building.</u></p> <p>Amend rule 13.10.7(3) as follows: <u>Setback from submitter's land – 20 metres</u></p> <p>Insert new clause into rule 13.10.7a(1) as follows: <u>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.</u></p> <p>Amend rule 13.10.11(2) as follows: <u>Increase the amount of private open space to 50% of the gross floor area of the dwelling.</u></p>	Refer to submission point 14.1		

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
						<p>Amend rule 13.10.13 as follows: <u>Reduce building coverage to 35%.</u></p> <p>Insert new clauses into rule 13.13 as follows: <u>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.</u> <u>x. Every proposed allotment outside the Northern Area as shown on Precinct Map 1 shall have a minimum net site area of 1000m².</u></p> <p>Insert new clause into rule 13.10.23 as follows: <u>x. All outside lighting within Precinct Map 1 are to be downward pointing in best dark sky practice.</u></p> <p>Insert a new flood mitigation measure into PPC83.</p>			
D. Metland-Slater	15	15.1	Water supply and wastewater		Support in part	Submitter seeks for provisions to be added into PPC83 which clarify how potable water and wastewater will be managed.	Submitter is concerned PPC83 does not sufficiently address how potable water and wastewater will be managed within the proposed development. Submitter notes there was uncertainty around the same issue regarding Mangawhai Central and is concerned with ratepayers meeting the cost to upgrade infrastructure.	N	Y
D. Parker	16	16.1	General	Entirety of PPC83	Oppose	Delete PPC83 in its entirety.	<p>The submitter is concerns relate to infrastructure, in which they view will not meet anticipated demand. Submitter views that infrastructure will contravene Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS-UD.</p> <p>The submitter is opposed to the creation of a Precinct over Residentially zoned land, as they view this undermines the provisions of the Kaipara District Plan, as well as processes currently being undertaken by the Kaipara District Council in relation to the Draft Kaipara District Plan. The submitter views the proposed Precinct is not consistent with "beach" settlement character which is preserved within the Mangawhai Structure Plan.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned the anticipated increase in traffic from the proposed residential development will put an increased strain on Cove Road, which has been identified as a high stress area.</p> <p>The submitter considers that there is insufficient wastewater capacity available, and that there are also issues in relation to flooding and stormwater run-off.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned that if the 600m² standard is retained, then individual landowners may try to further reduce this size through resource consents.</p> <p>The submitter is also concerned as to how reserves and recreational space will be supported and views that the two parks identified on</p>	Y	Y

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
							the proposed are not sufficient to support the residential development. The submitter is concerned with the supply of power and makes reference to their own property which is close to the PPC83 area and notes that their property has existing power supply issues.		
D. Annandale	17	17.1	Transport and Rooding	Concept Plans	Oppose	Submitter requests for a North-South bound road.	Submitter is concerned about the transport network being able to sustain the increased amount of traffic that will be generated by the proposed development.	N	N
E. Walker	18	18.1	General	Entirety of PPC83	Oppose	Not specified.	Submitter is concerned about the loss of character and amenity values. Submitter is also concerned about the increase in traffic volumes and noise.	N	N
Fire and Emergency NZ	19	19.1	Fire Fighting	13.13X	Support in part	<p>Include the following clause into rule 13.13X:</p> <p><u>That site(s) is adequately serviced and/or services on-site are managed, in particular the extent to which: ... sufficient firefighting water supply is available, taking into account a risk based assessment.</u></p> <p><u>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:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>a. Within 90 metres of an identified building platform on each lot; and</u> <u>b. Existing or likely to be available at time of development of the lot; and</u> <u>c. Accessible and available year-round; and</u> <u>d. May be comprised of water tanks, permanent natural waterbodies, dams, swimming pools, whether located on or off the lot.</u> 	<p>Fire and Emergency NZ is concerned that the provisions for firefighting water supply have been left out.</p> <p>FENZ notes the requested relief comes from an agreed outcome from the Environment Court following ENV-2018-AKL-00012.</p>	Y	-
G. Clarke	20	20.1	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Support in part	<p>Submitter seeks provisions to be included into the plan change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of existing covenants • Existing private sewage and waters systems to remain unchanged. • No increases to rates 	<p>Submitters concerns primarily pertain to being able to subdivide their land if the plan change is approved.</p> <p>Submitter is also concerned about the possibility of a requirement to connect to other stormwater and wastewater systems, given they already have their own private systems in place on their property.</p> <p>Submitter is also concerned about the potential for rates to increase.</p>	Y	N
G. Duff	21	21.1	Plan Provisions	13.10.7	Oppose	<p>Amend rule 13. 10.7 to read the following: (...) (3) The Cove Road North Precinct Any building is a Permitted Activity if it is located outside the following setback distances (yards):</p>	<p>The submitter views the setback standard of 3m will appear out of proportion along the length of Mangawhai Heads Road given that the surrounding areas has a road boundary setback of 5m.</p> <p>Submitter views the rule should be amended to be consistent with adjoining areas zoned as Residential.</p>	N	Y

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/ Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
						a) Front yard - 3m <u>5m</u> (...)			
G. Mather	22	22.1	General	New provision	Support in part	Submitter seeks for inclusion of provisions which prohibit cats and monitor and control dogs.	Does not specify.	N	Y
G. Renall	23	23.1	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Support.	Retain as notified.	Submitter notes that more land is required for development.	Y	Y
H. Lups	24	24.1	Infrastructure		Oppose	Amend – does not specify	Submitter is concerned that the existing infrastructure is not sufficient to sustain the proposed development.	N	Y
Heritage NZ Pouhere Taonga	25	25.1	Heritage	PPC83 in its entirety	Support in part	Submitter requests the inclusion of a provision which seek to protect archaeology following the completion of an archaeological assessment by a suitably qualified archaeologist.	Submitter is concerned around the lack of provisions pertaining to protection of heritage and archaeological consideration. Submitter views PPC83 has not had an adequate archaeological assessment undertaken. Submitter notes that relying on the ADP is not sufficient means of management of potential archaeological sites and the risk of damaging archaeological artefacts remains. Submitter notes that historic heritage is a matter of national importance under Section 6(f) of the RMA.	Y	Y
Horizon Surveying	26	26.1	Zoning	Concept Plans	Support	Retain zone change as notified.	Rezoning the land with a structure plan on the periphery of Mangawhai will minimise ad hoc expansion of residential growth in inappropriate locations.	Y	Y
		26.2	Zoning	New precinct	Support	Add the Precinct provisions to the Kaipara Operative District Plan	Supports future residential development consistent with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan. Provides for the integrated management of future development.		
		26.3	Zoning	Cove Road North Precinct	Support	Retain Cove Road North Precinct as notified.	Achieves consistency with Part 2 of the RMA.		
		26.4	Infrastructure		Support in part	Submitter seeks a requirement for a Master Plan Strategy to extend the Mangawhai Community Wastewater System and to establish a Mangawhai Wastewater Treatment Plant Advisory Group.	Submitter has concerns in regard to the appropriate provision for wastewater, stormwater, and transport.		
J. and J. Horlock	27	27.1	Zoning	Concept Plans	Oppose	Submitter requests The Rise be zoned as Rural Lifestyle.	Submitter is concerned about loss of visual amenity. Submitters views that 400m ² is too small for a lot given the rural, low density character of the area.	N	N
		27.2	Environment	PPC83 in its entirety	Support in part	Submitter seeks provisions for environmental protection be incorporated into PPC83. Submitter seeks for the prohibition of cats, dogs and livestock from The Rise.	Submitter notes that kiwi and other wildlife endemic to the area require provisions for protection. The submitter refers to covenanted land to the North of The Rise.		
		27.3	Stormwater	PPC83 in its entirety	Support in part	Submitter seeks for strengthened stormwater provisions, including practical planting to offset impermeable surfaces.	Submitter is concerned with current stormwater provisions for The Rise and views that the proposed plan change does not include sufficient means for mitigating flood risk due to stormwater overflow, noting that the area is already prone to flooding.		
		27.4	Wastewater	Rule 13.13X	Support in part	Subdivision Design Rules: (...) 2. Any subdivision within the Cove Road North Precinct shall ensure:	Submitter views that 850m ² lot sizes would be a sufficient size for wastewater management, noting that the current wastewater treatment plant is nearing capacity.		

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
						a. Every allotment has a minimum net site area of 400m² 850m² 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 1000m ² ; and c. Proposed allotments have an average size of at least 600m² 850m² . (...)			
		27.5	Transport and Rooding	Concept Plans	Support in part	Submitter seeks for council to consider alternative options for junctions	Submitter views that the proposed entry to The Rise is not sufficient given the high traffic volume and has potential to create adverse traffic safety issues for vehicles exiting Cove Road.		
J. Warden and A. Baird	28	28.1	General	Entirety of PPC83	Oppose	Does not specify.	<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. 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. 	N	Y
J. Henschman	29	29.1	General	Entirety of PPC83	Oppose	Delete PPC83 in its entirety.	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.	N	Y
J. Hook	30	30.1	Plan Provisions	Rule 13.13X	Oppose	Submitter seeks the following requested relief: (...) 2. Any subdivision within the Cove Road North Precinct shall ensure:	Submitter views that 400m ² and 600m ² is not a sufficient lot size.	N	Y

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
						<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</p> <p>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>			
		30.2	Environment	Entirety of PPC83	Support in part	Submitter seeks a total ban on cats and dogs within the proposed development.	Submitter notes that the proposed development site is situated in proximity to Kiwi and Bittern habitats which are both endangered species.		
		30.3	Roading and Transport	Concept Plans	Support	Retain as notified.	Submitter is in support of proposed provisions for off street cycles lanes and walkways within The Rise as they help achieve a sense of community.		
J. Coop	31	31.1	Plan Provisions	Rule 13.13X Concept Plans	Support in part	<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</p> <p>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> <p>Submitter requests land on the northern and western edges of PPC83 have a minimum allotment size of 4000m²</p>	<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. • 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. 	N	Y
		31.2	Environment	PPC83 in its entirety	Support in part	Submitter requests provisions be included in PPC83 which prohibit cats and dogs.	Submitter is concerned the development will introduce cats, dogs and other predators to the area which have potential to threaten wildlife, such as Kiwi populations.		
		31.3	Roading and Transport	Concept Plans.	Support	Retain proposed shared pathways and off street cycle lanes as notified on the Concept Plan.	Not specified.		

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
J. Cayford	32	32.1	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC83 in its entirety.	The submitter is not in support of PPC83 for the following: <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. 	Y	Y
K. Sutherland	33	33.1	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Oppose	Does not specify.	Submitter is opposed to the proposed development for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential traffic congestion Lack of provisions for stormwater and wastewater Lack of provisions for wildlife and ecology 	N	N
K. Ruiterman	34	34.1	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports growth of Mangawhai.	N	N
K. van Werkum	35	35.1	Infrastructure	PPC83 in its entirety	Oppose	Does not specify.	Submitter is concerned with the capacity of infrastructure to support the proposed development.	N	N
K. Walker	36	36.1	General	Appendix 3 – Land Development report	Oppose	Submitter requests a further report be undertaken to further assess flood risk for the site, and to assess wastewater management.	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.	N	N
K. Sullivan and S. Powley	37	37.1	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Support in part	Does not specify.	Submitter is in support of the proposed rezoning north of Mangawhai from rural to residential to support the future growth of Mangawhai. However, the submitter does not support a number of proposed rule changes	N	Y
		37.2	Plan provisions	13.10.12	Support in part	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 (...)	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.		
		37.3	Plan provisions	13.10.13	Support in part	Amend rule 13.10.13 as follows: (...)	Refer to submission point 37.3		

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
						(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 (...)			
		37.4	Plan provisions	13.13X	Support in part	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 400m² 600m² except where the proposed allotment is located within the Northern Area as shown on Precinct Map 1; or (...)	Submitter does not support proposed lot sizes of 400m ² as they view this will negatively impact visual amenity.		
		37.5	Plan provisions	Planning provisions	New provision	Submitter seeks the addition of a provision in which no subdivision consents are granted for further development within the PPC83 area (including but not limited to The Rise)	Submitter views no subdivision consents should be granted until a detailed assessment report and stormwater management plan can adequately demonstrate to Council an appropriate level of onsite stormwater attenuation, treatment and discharge on each development, to ensure further development within the PPC area does not increase overland flow and flooding effects to other properties within the PPC area, as well as the wider catchment.		
		37.6	Plan provisions	13.11.1-3; 13.12.1; 12.12.1;	Support in part	Submitter seeks the following residential rules be reinstated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13.11.1-3; • 13.12.1; • 12.12.1; 	Does not specify reasoning for requested relief.		
		37.7	Plan provisions		Support in part	Submitter seeks for the word "mitigate" to be removed and the word "avoid" be reinstated	Submitter views that the applicant for PPC83 has provided limited mitigation provisions in relation to PPC83.		
		37.8	Plan provisions	Rule 13.13X.2(x)	Oppose	Remove 13.13X.2 (x) 'The protection of land within the proposed allotments to allow access and linkages to adjacent allotments for future infrastructure.	Submitter views that the rule will have a domino effect across PPC83 as development occurs from existing road connections inwards which may disadvantage property owners in the middle of the Precinct. Submitter is concerned this rule may have adverse impacts and restrictions on their property.		
		37.9	Transport and roading	Polices PRECX P1-3	Support in part	Amend policies (PRECX-P1:3) to stipulate safe and accessible connections with existing transport network (being Mangawhai Heads Road and Cove Road) for cyclists and pedestrians. And wording that stipulates any connections to existing road network (walking, cycling) designed so as not to restrict or preclude Council roading improvements north of Jack Boyd Drive	Submitter is concerned with the lack of transport and roading provisions which seek to maintain safety of the roads, with particular regard for the lack of bus shelters whereby school children are waiting for buses in parked cars along the road. The submitter is concerned that the increase to medium density housing will exacerbate traffic safety issues. Submitter also notes there are currently no external connections for walking/cycling infrastructure.		
		37.10	Planning provisions	Concept Plan	Support in part	Submitter seeks for Council to request applicant removes 'Concept Plan' from PPC-83 application, instead providing geographical map of area proposed to be rezoned. Urban design principles, including connectivity via internal	Submitter views that the proposed Concept Plan, which shows the location of proposed/future transport infrastructure, parks and pathways, may result in blight effects to private land. Submitter is concerned this may devalue properties.		

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
		37.11	Environment	Rule 13.13X	Support in part	<p>transport infrastructure, can be adequately conveyed within the suite of provisions, without the need of a Concept Plan showing indicative locations.</p> <p>Submitter seeks that rule 13.13X be amended to read:</p> <p>Any subdivision application within the Cove Road North Precinct where the site either contains an ecological feature including indigenous terrestrial or aquatic habitats, or borders an ecological feature including indigenous terrestrial or aquatic habitats, requires a detailed Ecological Assessment prepared by a suitable qualified ecologist identifying and delineating all natural features contained within the site boundaries and assesses the effects of the proposed site development on these features, and provide recommendations how these may be avoided, remedied or mitigated; and b. An Ecological Enhancement and Management Plan designed to ensure that all ecological features are appropriately enhanced as part of site development works.</p>	Submitter requests the proposed addition into rule 13.13X to provide further assurance that the natural inland wetland is protected from adverse effects related to site development on any adjacent site.		
K. May	38	38.1	General	Entirety of PPC83	Oppose	Does not specify.	<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. 	N	Y
L. and N. Adams	39	39.1	Zoning	Concept Plans	Support in part	Does not specify.	<p>Submitters support in part to have the proposed development area re-zoned as residential, however note the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a landowner of the proposed development area, the submitters are concerned they were not consulted with prior to notification of PPC83. • The submitter is concerned with the which proposes a road run through their existing dwelling. • The submitter is concerned with the proposed provisions for stormwater given flooding has been an issue previously. 	N	Y

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter is concerned that a 60% impermeable surface standard is too high. 		
M. Knox	40	40.1	Wastewater		Oppose	Submitter seeks for the inclusion of a provision which is directive in requiring a communal wastewater system be installed prior to building consent being issued. Submitter also seeks for the onsite septic system; the minimum dripper field be specified on the title.	No reasoning specified.	N	Y
Mangawhai Matters Society Incorporated	41	41.1	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Oppose	PPC83 should not be adopted in its present form	Reasoning is specified in the submission points below from 41.2 – 41.5.	Y	Y
		41.2	Plan provisions	Rule 13.13X	Support in part	Increase minimum allotment size to a minimum of 600m ²	Submitter is concerned that lots sizes of 400m ² will have adverse effects on stormwater runoff.		
		41.3	Plan Provision	New precinct	Support in part	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 	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.		
		41.4	Transport and roading		Support in part	Submitter seeks for revision of the Integrated Transport Plan	Submitter views that on-site roads should be finalised through PPC93 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.		
		41.5	Subdivision		Support in part	Submitter seeks for the inclusion of rules which do not allow subdivision to take place before necessary infrastructure is confirmed and the funding is in place (through the Long Term Plan).	Submitter is concerned that the urban design assessment does not reference water reticulation.		
M. van Werkum	42	42.1	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Oppose	Does not specify.	Submitter is concerned there is insufficient sewerage allocation and stormwater systems to allow for the proposed development. Submitter views 400m ² and 600m ² lot sizes are too small for stormwater soakage. Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will lower property values.	N	Y

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
M. Davies	43	43.1	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Oppose	Does not specify.	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.	N	N
M. and A. Geary	44	44.1	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Oppose	Halt approval of PPC83 in its entirety.	Submitter is concerned the developer has not sufficiently consulted with the applicable property owners within the scope of PPC83. Submitter is concerned that PPC83 will disrupt	N	Y
		44.2	Concept Plan	Concept plan - Mangawhai North	Oppose	Submitter requests that trigger points and conceptual roadways to be removed.	Submitter notes they have not consented to the proposed Mangawhai North and views that the plan is misleading to potential purchasers. Submitter is concerned that the proposed rezoning of land will have long term impacts and consequences.		
		44.3	Roading and transport	Concept Plan – ROW access	Oppose	Remove the proposed street through the submitters ROW access as shown on the proposed concept plan.	Submitter is opposed to the proposed street across their ROW given it is how they access their property. The submitter views the proposed street will have adverse effect on their property's character and functionality.		
		44.4	Housing density	No specific provision	Oppose	Submitter seeks for the land under PPC83 to be used for larger lifestyle residences.	Submitter is concerned the 400m ² lot sizes are too small. Submitter is also concerned that the increase to density will result in loss to the rural character and amenity of the area and to their property.		
		44.5	Roading and transport	Integrated Transport Assessment	Oppose	Submitter seeks for an updated transport assessment be undertaken.	Submitter is concerned that the transport assessment undertaken is not sufficient.		
N. Nathan	45	45.1	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC83 in its entirety.	Submitter is concerned with the management of wastewater and potential increased odour from wastewater if the development proceeds. The submitter is concerned with loss of amenity and character of the area. The submitter is also concerned with potential flooding issues the development may create. The submitter is concerned with the lack of regard for Māori on the Concept Plans, noting a paa site has not been identified on the Concept Plan.	Y	Y
M. Silvester	46	46.1	Environment		Support in part	Submitter seeks for the inclusion of provisions which prohibits cats and other pest species. Submitter also seeks for the inclusion of provisions which control dogs.	Submitter seeks the requested relief to achieve consistency with the Cultural Effects Assessment which advocates the complete ban of cats, pest species and the control of pet dogs. Submitter notes this will also achieve consistency with existing covenants.	-	-
N. Smith	47	47.1	Zoning	Concept Plans	Oppose	Keep zoning of the proposed development the site the same.	The submitter opposes the proposed zone change for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of amenity and character values of the area, noting that lifestyle blocks add to the richness of the area. The submitter is concerned that the development may contribute to potential flooding in the area. The submitter is concerned the proposed development will create further strain on wastewater facilities. 		

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter is concerned that rates will increase as a result of the proposed development. 		
Northland Regional Council	48	48.1	Water supply	Rule 13.10.3a	Support in part	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.	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.	Y	Y
		48.2	Wastewater	Rule 13.14.6	Support in part	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 document is not adopted.	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		
		48.3	Wastewater	Subdivision rules	Support in part	Submitter seeks the addition of provisions which require a minimum lot size of 2000m ² be required where no wastewater connection is available to ensure future development can provide 1500m ² of land per household for wastewater disposal within the net site area of the allotment.	Refer to submission point 48.2.		
		48.4	Flooding	Concept Plans	Support in part	Submitter seeks the following requested relief: The proposed precinct plan delineates the areas subject to a 1:100 year coastal or river flood hazard on the Northland Regional Council hazard maps and identifies that these areas are unsuitable for residential development.	Submitter notes that portions of the plan change area have been identified in the Northland Regional Council hazard maps, and development should not occur within these areas to avoid damage from flooding. The submitter also notes the development may have potential to exacerbate flood risk. The submitter gives reference to Section 7 of the Regional Policy Statement, to which the development should give effect to.		
P. and R. Boocock	49	49.1	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Oppose	PPC83 be deleted in its entirety, or changes are made to the proposal.	Submitter is concerned PPC83 will result in adverse effects to amenity and character of the area.	Y	Y
		49.2	Plan Provisions	Rule 13.10.3a	Support in part	Submitter seeks that the activity status for more than one dwelling on a site should be increased from Restricted Discretionary to Discretionary.	Does not specify.		
		49.3	Zoning	Concept Plans	Support in part	Submitter seeks for an amended Precinct Plan map existing indigenous vegetation.	Additional mapping of indigenous vegetation will assist in clarifying proposed rule 13.10.15.		
		49.4	Plan provisions	Rule 13.10.7	Support in part	Amend rule 13.10.7 to increase setback of 3 metres.	Submitter opposes 3m setback and views setback should be increased to ensure appropriate transition between rural and urban zones. An increased setback will seek to retain rural character and amenity.		
		49.5	Plan provisions	Rule 13.10.11	Support in part	Increase yard setback to at least 10 metres.	Refer to submission point 49.3		
		49.6	Plan provisions	Rule 13.10.12 Rule 13.10.13	Support in part	Does not specify.	Submitter is opposed to the 45% building coverage standard and 60% impermeable area standard for Larger Lot sub precinct.		
		49.7	Plan provisions	Rule 13.10.14	Support in part	Amend rule 13.10.14 to amend activity status from restricted discretionary to discretionary.	Submitter notes that retirement villages require considerations towards urban design and infrastructure. Submitter requests the		

Submission No.49 - Withdrawn by Submitter on 19 Oct 2023

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
							activity status be increased given that a retirement village would be too far removed from the main urban amenities and services.		
		49.9	Plan Provisions	Rule 13.13X	Support in part	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 400m ² 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 5000m² 4000m² ; and c. Proposed allotments have an average size of at least 600m ² . d. Proposed allotments in the Northern Precinct have an average size of least 8000m². (...)	Submitter views that the northern precinct lot sizes should be increased to be achieve consistency of the site sizes for the adjoining Bream Tail Farm development.		
		49.10	Plan Provisions	Rule 13.13.X Clause 2. a	Oppose	Does not specify.	Submitter views that the 400m ² lot sizes are inappropriate.		
P. and A Maroulis	50	50.1	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Oppose	Submitter seeks for improved infrastructure in place before the development proceeds.	Submitter views existing infrastructure is not sufficient to sustain the proposed development. Submitter is concerned that 850m ² is too small for a site to sustain its own wastewater systems given the area required for dripper fields can be at least 300m ² . Submitter is concerned that the traffic assessment undertaken does not reflect the anticipated traffic of the proposed development.	N	Y
		50.2	Plan Provisions	13.13X	Support in part	Amend rule 13.13X as follows: Increase minimum allotment size to 500-600m ² .	Submitter views 400m ² is too small for a site to collect and dispose of water, given up to 60% of the site is permitted to be impermeable.		
		50.3	Infrastructure	-	Support in part	Submitter seeks for the cost related to improvements to infrastructure to fall to the developer.	Submitter is concerned that costs related to upgrading the infrastructure will fall to the ratepayer.		
		50.4	Environment	-	Support in part	Submitter seeks the addition of new provisions which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> prohibits cats require predator control control of dogs 	Submitter notes the proximity of PPC83 sites to covenanted land to the North which are home to Kiwi and other wildlife.		
P. Fontein	51	51.1	Zoning	Concept Plan	Support	Retain the proposed zone change as notified	Submitter is in support of the zone change as it provides extra and diverse housing types for Mangawhai.	N	N
		51.2	Infrastructure	-	Support in part	Submitter seeks for an infrastructure and precinct staging plan.	Submitter views that a robust infrastructure and staging plan will ensure intended urban design and infrastructure outcomes are achieved.		
P. Humphries	52	52.1	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC83 in its entirety unless changes as requested below are made.	See submission points below from 52.2 – 52.6.	-	Y
		52.2	Plan provisions	13.13X	Support in part	Amend rule 13.13X as follows: Subdivision Design Rules:	Submitter seeks requested relief to better align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan. Submitter views that the proposed density standard		

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
						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 1000m ² ; and c. Proposed allotments have an average size of at least 600m² 750m² .	will have an adverse impact on amenity values and an adverse effect on the character of the area.		
		52.3	Plan provisions	13.10.12	Support in part	Amend rule 13.10.12 to be consistent with the operative district plan standard of 45% impermeable surfaces be applied.	Submitter is concerned that a permitted impermeable standard of 60% is too high and has potential to exacerbate flooding from stormwater overflow.		
		52.4	Wastewater		Support in part	Submitter seeks for a comprehensive wastewater management plan be implemented for the PPC83 area.	Submitter is concerned with wastewater management being up to the individual property owner.		
		52.5	Plan provisions	Rule 13.10.12	Oppose	Delete rule 13.10.12 and replace with the operative district plan standard for permeable surfaces.	Submitter is concerned that a 60% impermeable surface standard is too high, with respect to historical flooding.		
		52.6	Concept Plan	Proposed street	Oppose	Delete the proposed street as shown on the Concept Plans those traverses over the submitters land.	Submitter opposes the proposed street as they view it would have adverse effect on their environment, lifestyle, quiet enjoyment and property values.		
P. and K. Barbour	53	53.1	Environmental	-	Oppose	Submitter seeks for the inclusion of provisions in which cats and dogs to be banned. Submitter seeks for the inclusion of a provision which requires predator control.	Submitter notes that land to the north contains covenants which should be protected and enhanced to promote the use of wildlife corridors.	N	N
		53.2	Housing density	13.13X	Oppose	Does not specify.	Submitter is opposed to the 400m ² minimum allotment size as they view this is too small. Submitter is also concerned that allotments with a size of 850m ² will be allowed to have their own wastewater treatment given that dripper fields are typically 300m ² or larger.		
		53.3	Stormwater	-	Oppose	Does not specify	Submitter is concerned with the management of stormwater given the area is already prone to flooding.		
		53.4	Wastewater	-	Oppose	Costs of upgrades to the wastewater treatment facility should not fall to the ratepayers.	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.		
		53.5	Roading and transport	Concept Plans		Establish a new roundabout on the corner of Mangawhai Heads Road and Cove Road.	Submitter notes that a roundabout will be required to accommodate the increased demand in traffic.		
		53.6	Roading and transport	Concept Plans	Support	Retain proposed walking paths as notified	Submitter is in support of the proposed walking paths as outlined on the Concept Plans.		
		53.7	General	Concept Plans	Oppose		Submitter is opposed to Ad hoc developments without first development an overall subdivision plan.		
P. Muller	54	54.1	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC83 in its entirety.	Submitter is concerned with the number of residential developments already in existence. Submitter is concerned that services and infrastructure will not be able to sustain the proposed development. Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will result in loss of rural character and amenity.	N	N

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
R. Blake	55	55.1	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Oppose	Halt the approval of PPC83 in its entirety until comprehensive assessments and improvements to infrastructure are undertaken.	Submitter seeks the requested relief for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing infrastructure is not sufficient to sustain the proposed development. Further residential growth will create adverse strain on the capacity of existing infrastructure systems. Existing roading network is not able to meet the demands of the proposed development. Proposed development will create further damage to roads given the increase in vehicles. 	N	Y
R. and R. Davies	56	56.1	Zoning	Concept Plans	Support in part	Rezone four properties (legally described as RT 911113, RT 911115, RT 911114 and RT 911116) as either Commercial or Industrial.	Submitter views that the proposed Residential Zone and Cove Road North Precinct do not take into account existing activities. The submitter notes that the properties owners of RT 911113, RT 911115, RT 911114 and RT 911116 wish to undertake further commercial/industrial activities on two of the titles which are currently vacant. The submitter notes that zoning the titles commercial or industrial will take into account the existing and future activities.	Y	-
		56.2	Stormwater	Rule 13.10.12(2)	Support in part	Amend rule 13.10.12(2) to increase the maximum impermeable surface coverage of 60% is only permitted where it is demonstrated that attenuation to 80% of pre-development runoff will be achieved (using a Type 1A nested rainfall hyetograph – TR-55 typology) to ensure that there is no exacerbation of flooding downstream resulting from incumbent network constraints.	Submitter views the requested relief will assist in avoiding potential adverse flood effects on downstream properties.		
		56.3		Rule 13.14.5 (3)	Support in part	Amend rule 13.14.5.(3) to include a requirement to demonstrate that stormwater from the 60% of permitted impermeable coverage can be attenuated to 80% of pre-development runoff (using a Type 1A nested rainfall hyetograph – TR-55 typology) to ensure that there is no exacerbation of flooding downstream resulting from incumbent network constraints.	Refer to submission point 56.2.		
R. Humphries	57	57.1	General	Application letter supporting The Rise Limited Private Plan Change Application	Oppose	Does not specify.	Submitter notes the lack of consultation with private landowners, given they were not consulted with prior to the notification of the plan change.		
		57.2	Plan Provisions	Rule 13.13X	Support in part	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	Does not specify.		

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/ Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
						b. Every proposed allotment within the Northern Area as shown on 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	Plan provisions	13.10.7	Support in part	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. (...)	Submitter seeks for setbacks to be amended to be consistent with the operative district plan setback standards.		
		57.3	Zoning	Concept Plans – new proposed street	Oppose	Remove the proposed street over private land from the Cove Road North Precinct Map 1.	Submitter is not in support of the proposed road that traverses through their property.		
R. and H Hawkes	58	58.1	Zoning	Concept Plans	Oppose	Keep zoning of the proposed development as per the operative district plan zoning.	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 Concerns with stormwater and potential for the development to increase flood risk. Concerns with wastewater management given the system is nearing capacity. Concerns with increased rates if the development proceeds 	Y	Y
R. Kitchener	59	59.1	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete 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. 	N	Y
S. Mackey-Wood	60	60.1	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Oppose	Reject PPC83 in its current form.	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) 	N	N
S. Waring	61	62.1	Plan provisions	Rule 13.13X	Support in part	Amend rule 13.13x to increase minimum allotment size to 800m ² .	Submitter seeks the requested relief as they consider that increasing minimum allotment size from 400m ² to 800m ² will assist	N	N

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
							in retaining rural character and amenity values. Submitter is also concerned with the density of 400m ² lots and how stormwater will be managed.		
S. Bray	62	62.1	Environmental		Support in part	Submitter seeks the addition of new provisions which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> prohibits cats and dogs require predator control 	Submitter notes that land to the north contains covenants which should be protected and enhanced to promote the use of wildlife corridors.	N	N
		62.2	Density		Oppose	Does not specify.	Submitter is concerned that 850m ² lots are too small for properties to adequately manage onsite wastewater. Submitter is also concerned that 400m ² lots are too small.		
		62.3	Stormwater		Oppose	Does not specify.	Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will exacerbate flood risk due to increased stormwater runoff, noting the flooding that has occurred this year (2023).		
		62.4	Wastewater		Oppose	Submitter seeks for the cost of upgrades to wastewater infrastructure fall directly on any new sections created.	Submitter is concerned the cost to upgrade wastewater systems will fall to the ratepayer		
		62.5	Roading and transport	Concept Plans	Oppose	Establish a roundabout onto the corner of Mangawhai Heads and Cove Road.	Submitter is concerned that the proposed new roads will create traffic congestion and submits that a new roundabout will seek to alleviate potential traffic congestion.		
		62.6	Subdivision	Concept Plans	Support in part	Develop a scheme plan for the proposed development	Submitter views than an overall scheme plan will avoid ad hoc developments.		
S. and C. Brotherton	63	63.1	General	PPC83 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC83 in its entirety however seeks amendments if approved.	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. 	Y	Y
		63.2	Plan provisions	New rule	Support	Insert a new rule which sets out a 6-10 metre planted buffer of native plants along the common boundary of Bream Tail and PPC83 land.	Refer to submission point 63.1.		
		63.3	Plan provisions	New rule	Support	Insert a new rule which prohibits cats and mustelids on PPC83 land	Refer to submission point 63.1		
		63.4	Environment	New provision	Support	Insert a new standard where people and predator proof fencing are established.	Submitter seeks the requested relief to ensure that no cats, mustelids or people can enter the farming or conservation areas of Bream Tail.		

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
		63.5	General	New provision	Support	Insert no complaints covenants onto titles within the scope of PPC83.	Submitter is concerned with potential complaints from the proposed residential development in relation to noise, rural odour and use of agricultural equipment.		
		63.6	Plan Provisions	Rule 13.10.3a(2)	Support in part	Amend rule 13.10.3a(2) to exclude any minor dwellings or accessory buildings not contained within a single building	Refer to submission point 63.1		
		63.7	Plan provisions	Rule 13.10.7(3)	Support in part	Amend rule 13.10.7(3) to increase setback from submitters land to 20m.	Refer to submission point 63.1		
		63.8	Plan provisions	Rule 13.10.7a(1)	Support in part	Insert a new clause into rule 13.10.7a(1) in which predator and people proof fencing shall be constructed along the common boundary between PPC83, and the submitters land and any land owned or managed by the BTRA.	Refer to submission point 63.1		
		63.9	Plan provisions	Rule 13.10.11(2)	Support in part	Increase the amount of private space to 50% of the gross floor area of the dwelling.	Refer to submission point 63.1		
		63.10	Plan provisions	Rule 13.10.13	Support in part	Reduce building coverage to 35%.	Refer to submission point 63.1		
		63.11	Plan provisions	Rule 13.13X	Support in part	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.	Refer to submission point 63.1		
		63.12	Plan provisions	Rule 13.10.23	Support in part	Insert a new clause into rule 13.10.23 which directs all outside lighting 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 shall have a minimum site area of 8,000m ² .	Refer to submission point 63.1		
		63.13	Plan Provisions	New provision	Support	Insert a new provision into PPC83 which includes flood mitigation measures, including large stormwater retention capability within the property area.	Refer to submission point 63.1		
S. Birkenhead	64	64.1	Environmental			Submitter seeks the addition of new provisions which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> prohibits cats and dogs. require predator control 	Submitter notes that land to the north contains covenants which should be protected and enhanced to promote the use of wildlife corridors.	N	Y
		64.2	Density		Oppose	Delete rule 13.10.3.a	Submitter views 400sqm is too small for a lot size, and 60% impermeable surface will increase risk in terms of flooding from stormwater overflow.		
		64.3	Stormwater		Oppose	Delete PPC83 in its entirety.	The submitter notes that the Sanctuary Driveway has flooded twice in 2023, disrupting traffic. Submitter is concerned that if the plan change goes ahead, this will exacerbate flood risk to neighbouring properties.		
		64.4	Wastewater		Oppose	Delete PPC83 in its entirety	Submitter has raised concerns around the wastewater treatment plant capacity, and the cost of increasing wastewater infrastructure will have to be met by ratepayers.		
		64.5	Roading and Transport		Oppose	Delete PPC83 in its entirety.	Submitter is concerned that PPC83 will result in increased traffic congestion and require increased roading and transport infrastructure.		

