

Form 6

**Further submission on
Private Plan Change 84 - Mangawhai Hills
Limited
proposed to the Operative Kaipara District
Plan**

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

This is a **further** submission in support of or in opposition to a submission already received by Kaipara District Council on Private Plan Change 84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited.

No new submission can be made.

Private plan change number: PPC84

Private plan change name: Mangawhai Hills Limited

Overview of the Private Plan Change Proposal

The purpose of this private plan change is to:

- Rezone 218.3 hectares of land between Tara Road, Cove Road, Moir Road, and Old Waipu Road in Mangawhai.
- The creation of a Mangawhai Development Area with core provisions, that to protect ecological features, promote high-quality urban design, provide open space and connectivity; and
- Any necessary consequential amendments to the Kaipara District Plan Maps.

You can read the Private Plan Change application documentation on the [Kaipara District Council website](#).

- **PRIVACY ACT NOTE:** Please note that all information provided in your submission is considered public information under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987. This information may be published to progress the process for the private plan change.

- I understand that information provided in my submission may be published. *

1A

Yes

- **NOTE: you can make a further submission on more than one original submission and/or submission points using this form.**

2A

Further submitter details

Please provide your details

Your first and last names

Sheryl Gow

Street number and name

12 Kuaka crescent

Town

mangawhai

Contact phone

02755231783

- Please select your preferred method of contact *

2B

- Email
- Postal

- Do you have an agent who is acting on your behalf? *

2C

- Yes
- No

- NOTE: If your submission has more than 4000 characters, there is an option at the bottom of this page to upload your submission as a document.

- I am - tick box whether you are: *

3A

- a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest
- a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest that the general public has
- the local authority for the relevant area

- **For the following two questions, you will need the submitter names and their submission point numbers from the Summary of Submissions. Here is the link to open that information: [PPC84 Summary of Submissions](#)**

- Original submitter *

3B

Please select from the following

- 1. A. Skerten
- 2. A. van Niekerk
- 3. B. & S. Pulham
- 4. Berggren Trustee Co Ltd
- 5. C. & R. Owen
- 6. C. Boonham
- 7. C. Marshall
- 8. C. Webster
- 9. D. Bell
- 10. D. Bolton
- 11. D. Parker
- 12. E. Jenner
- 13. F. Lienert
- 14. G. Arnerich
- 15. G. Hosking
- 16. G. Mitchell
- 17. G. van Dalsum
- 18. G. van Niekerk
- 19. G. Wilson
- 20. Horizon Surveying and Land Development
- 21. J. Archer
- 22. J. Bloggs
- 23. J. Mentzer
- 24. J. Sax
- 25. J. Walters
- 26. J. Warden
- 27. J. Young
- 28. K. & S. Gow
- 29. K. Francis
- 30. K. Innes

- 31. K.J. & H Canton
- 32. K. Marment
- 33. K. Moynihan
- 34. K. Reid
- 35. L. Kendall
- 36. D. Hayward
- 37. R. Moffat
- 38. M. Bell
- 39. M. Hewitt (withdrawn 4 Dec 2023)
- 40. M. Loheni
- 41. M. Tschirky
- 42. L. Lewis
- 43. Mangawhai Church Trust
- 44. Mangawhai Matters Society Inc.
- 45. Moana Views Committee
- 46. N. & D. Wilson
- 47. N. Campbell
- 48. N. Gestro
- 49. Northland Regional Council
- 50. P. Harris
- 51. P. Muller
- 52. P. Renner
- 53. R. & J. Panhuis
- 54. R. Burgess
- 55. R. Henry
- 56. R. Woolnough
- 57. Rachel McQuerry
- 58. Ryan McQuerry
- 59. S. & J. McInteer
- 60. S. Brabant
- 61. S. Bray
- 62. S. Hartley
- 63. S. Manwaring
- 64. S. Reid
- 65. T. & J. Wilson
- 66. T. de Baugh
- 67. T. Hanna
- 68. T. Harris
- 69. T.Simpkin
- 70. W. & F. Maclennan
- 71. W. & J. Neal
- 72. W. Martin
- 73. Y. Reid
- 74. C. Best
- 75. D. Patel
- 76. L. Leslie

- Submission point *

3C

Please enter the submission point you are addressing

Submission point

- Do you support or oppose the original submission of the submitter? *

3D

- I support this original submission point of the submitter named above
- I oppose this original submission point of the submitter named above

- State in **summary** the nature of your submission, giving clear reasons for your support or opposition. *
3E

If you would prefer to attach a separate document you can do this in the next question but you will need to type "Refer To Attachment" in the box below and then move on to question 2F:

FS3.1

2.1 Zoning - Support in part: Submitter is concerned that the proposed development does not align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan and that this aspect has not been sufficiently addressed in the s32 (evaluation of options) report.

Submitter seeks for council to either reject rezoning from Rural to Residential or amend the rezoning to Rural-Residential zone 1.

FS3.2

2.5 Urban Design - Lighting - Support in part: Submitter views that the unpolluted night sky should be protected. Any external lighting required within the boundaries of the proposed development should respect this 'public asset' of the neighbourhood.

Submitter seeks for council to request a low impact lighting assessment of the residential housing development proposed.

The reasons for my support/opposition are:

- Do you have any attachments that relate directly to your Further Submission that you would like to upload? *
3F

- Yes
- No

- Please upload your attachment/s that directly relate to your Further Submission here:

3G

- [PPC84 Form 6 Further Submission Form.pdf](#)

- I wish to be heard in support of my Further Submission at the Hearing: *

3H

- Yes
- No

- If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing *

3I

- Yes
- No

• Points to remember as a further submitter

- It is your responsibility to send a copy of your further submission to the original submitter within 5 days of completing this Further Submission.
- Download Submitter Contact Details here: [PPC84 Submitter Contact Details](#)
- A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.

- Do you have another further submission to make? *

3J

- Yes

No

- NOTE: If your submission has more than 4000 characters, there is an option at the bottom of this page to upload your submission as a document.
- **For the following two questions, you will need the submitter names and their submission point numbers from the Summary of Submissions. Here is the link to open that information: [PPC84 Summary of Submissions](#)**

- Original submitter *
4A

Please select from the following

- 1. A. Skerten
- 2. A. van Niekerk
- 3. B. & S. Pulham
- 4. Berggren Trustee Co Ltd
- 5. C. & R. Owen
- 6. C. Boonham
- 7. C. Marshall
- 8. C. Webster
- 9. D. Bell
- 10. D. Bolton
- 11. D. Parker
- 12. E. Jenner
- 13. F. Lienert
- 14. G. Arnerich
- 15. G. Hosking
- 16. G. Mitchell
- 17. G. van Dalsum
- 18. G. van Niekerk
- 19. G. Wilson
- 20. Horizon Surveying and Land Development
- 21. J. Archer
- 22. J. Bloggs
- 23. J. Mentzer
- 24. J. Sax
- 25. J. Walters
- 26. J. Warden
- 27. J. Young
- 28. K. & S. Gow
- 29. K. Francis
- 30. K. Innes
- 31. K.J. & H Canton
- 32. K. Marment
- 33. K. Moynihan
- 34. K. Reid
- 35. L. Kendall
- 36. D. Hayward
- 37. R. Moffat
- 38. M. Bell
- 39. M. Hewitt (withdrawn 4 Dec 2023)
- 40. M. Loheni
- 41. M. Tschirky
- 42. L. Lewis
- 43. Mangawhai Church Trust
- 44. Mangawhai Matters Society Inc.

- 45. Moana Views Committee
- 46. N. & D. Wilson
- 47. N. Campbell
- 48. N. Gestro
- 49. Northland Regional Council
- 50. P. Harris
- 51. P. Muller
- 52. P. Renner
- 53. R. & J. Panhuis
- 54. R. Burgess
- 55. R. Henry
- 56. R. Woolnough
- 57. Rachel McQuerry
- 58. Ryan McQuerry
- 59. S. & J. McInteer
- 60. S. Brabant
- 61. S. Bray
- 62. S. Hartley
- 63. S. Manwaring
- 64. S. Reid
- 65. T. & J. Wilson
- 66. T. de Baugh
- 67. T. Hanna
- 68. T. Harris
- 69. T.Simpkin
- 70. W. & F. Maclennan
- 71. W. & J. Neal
- 72. W. Martin
- 73. Y. Reid
- 74. C. Best
- 75. D. Patel
- 76. L. Leslie

- Submission point *

4B

Please enter the submission point you are addressing

Submission point

- Do you support or oppose the original submission of the submitter? *

4C

- I support this original submission point of the submitter named above
- I oppose this original submission point of the submitter named above

- State in summary the nature of your submission, giving clear reasons for your support or opposition: *

4D

FS3.3

7.1 Zoning - support in part:

Submitter seeks for the current paper road above/adjacent to Kahu Drive and Daphne Place that is included in the zone change to be retained as green space.

The submitter seeks the requested relief given there is an abundance of native planting in the area which a lot of birds use as nesting, as well as a flight connection path to the estuary and other habitats. This strip of land is also well utilised for exercise and dog walking.

The reasons for my support/opposition are:

• Points to remember as a further submitter

- It is your responsibility to send a copy of your further submission to the original submitter within 5 days of completing this Further Submission.
 - Download Submitter Contact Details here: [PPC84 Submitter Contact Details](#)
 - A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.
- Do you have another further submission to make? *
- 4E
- Yes
 - No
- NOTE: If your submission has more than 4000 characters, there is an option at the bottom of this page to upload your submission as a document.
- For the following two questions, you will need the submitter names and their submission point numbers from the Summary of Submissions. Here is the link to open that information: [PPC84 Summary of Submissions](#)
- Original submitter *
- 5A
- Please select from the following
- 1. A. Skerten
 - 2. A. van Niekerk
 - 3. B. & S. Pulham
 - 4. Berggren Trustee Co Ltd
 - 5. C. & R. Owen
 - 6. C. Boonham
 - 7. C. Marshall
 - 8. C. Webster
 - 9. D. Bell
 - 10. D. Bolton
 - 11. D. Parker

- 12. E. Jenner
- 13. F. Lienert
- 14. G. Arnerich
- 15. G. Hosking
- 16. G. Mitchell
- 17. G. van Dalsum
- 18. G. van Niekerk
- 19. G. Wilson
- 20. Horizon Surveying and Land Development
- 21. J. Archer
- 22. J. Bloggs
- 23. J. Mentzer
- 24. J. Sax
- 25. J. Walters
- 26. J. Warden
- 27. J. Young
- 28. K. & S. Gow
- 29. K. Francis
- 30. K. Innes
- 31. K.J. & H Canton
- 32. K. Marment
- 33. K. Moynihan
- 34. K. Reid
- 35. L. Kendall
- 36. D. Hayward
- 37. R. Moffat
- 38. M. Bell
- 39. M. Hewitt (withdrawn 4 Dec 2023)
- 40. M. Loheni
- 41. M. Tschirky
- 42. L. Lewis
- 43. Mangawhai Church Trust
- 44. Mangawhai Matters Society Inc.
- 45. Moana Views Committee
- 46. N. & D. Wilson
- 47. N. Campbell
- 48. N. Gestro
- 49. Northland Regional Council
- 50. P. Harris
- 51. P. Muller
- 52. P. Renner
- 53. R. & J. Panhuis
- 54. R. Burgess
- 55. R. Henry
- 56. R. Woolnough
- 57. Rachel McQuerry
- 58. Ryan McQuerry
- 59. S. & J. McInteer
- 60. S. Brabant
- 61. S. Bray
- 62. S. Hartley
- 63. S. Manwaring
- 64. S. Reid
- 65. T. & J. Wilson
- 66. T. de Baugh

- 67. T. Hanna
- 68. T. Harris
- 69. T.Simpkin
- 70. W. & F. MacLennan
- 71. W. & J. Neal
- 72. W. Martin
- 73. Y. Reid
- 74. C. Best
- 75. D. Patel
- 76. L. Leslie

- Submission point *
5B

Please enter the submission point you are addressing

Submission point

- Do you support or oppose the original submission of the submitter? *
5C

- I support this original submission point of the submitter named above
- I oppose this original submission point of the submitter named above

- State in summary the nature of your submission, giving clear reasons for your support or opposition: *
5D

FS3.4	<p>44.1 Stormwater Management Plan - Support in part: The submitter is concerned the proposed Stormwater Management Plan is not sufficient in detail and is concerned that the proposed stormwater plan as is will lead to ad hoc stormwater servicing risking system failure. The submitter views that an overall stormwater plan will assist in providing further certainty as to how stormwater will be managed within the PPC84 scope.</p> <p>Submitter seeks for either the Kaipara District Council or the developer to provide "whole of site" primary and secondary stormwater system installation as part of this application.</p>
FS3.5	<p>44.2 Ridgeline development - Support: The submitter is concerned that landscape protection provisions within PPC84 (such as proposed standard DEV2 - S2 - relating to height of a building) will be incrementally ignored, which has the potential to lead to a fully developed ridgeline.</p> <p>Submitter seeks for Kaipara District Council to consider taking into ownership an equivalent of an esplanade reserve along the top of the ridge part of the subject land. The submitter also seeks that setbacks from the reserve are implemented rather than from the edge of the ridge.</p>
FS3.6	<p>44.3 Infrastructure - support: The submitter seeks for provisions to be included in the assessment of all subdivision applications consequential to PPC84 which clarifies how the cost of infrastructure is to be funded, in particular what level of the Development Contributions component from each lot is set as the lot owner's financial contribution to the public cost of public infrastructure to service the development. This is to include: roading, wastewater, freshwater and stormwater infrastructure.</p> <p>The submitter views that the requested relief will provide certainty as to how infrastructure upgrades will be paid for. The submitter is concerned that costs to upgrade infrastructure will fall to the ratepayers. The submitter references transport, treatment and disposal of wastewater and notes that the roading network requires further upgrades to service PPC84. The submitter notes there is no information included in the application as to how the cost of the required roads will be met.</p>

The reasons for my support/opposition are:

• **Points to remember as a further submitter**

- It is your responsibility to send a copy of your further submission to the original submitter within 5 days of completing this Further Submission.
- Download Submitter Contact Details here: [PPC84 Submitter Contact Details](#)
- A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.

- Do you have another further submission to make? *
5E

- Yes
- No

• NOTE: If your submission has more than 4000 characters, there is an option at the bottom of this page to upload your submission as a document.

• **For the following two questions, you will need the submitter names and their submission point numbers from the Summary of Submissions. Here is the link to open that information: [PPC84 Summary of Submissions](#)**

• Original submitter *
6A

Please select from the following

- 1. A. Skerten
- 2. A. van Niekerk
- 3. B. & S. Pulham
- 4. Berggren Trustee Co Ltd
- 5. C. & R. Owen
- 6. C. Boonham
- 7. C. Marshall
- 8. C. Webster
- 9. D. Bell
- 10. D. Bolton
- 11. D. Parker
- 12. E. Jenner
- 13. F. Lienert
- 14. G. Arnerich
- 15. G. Hosking
- 16. G. Mitchell
- 17. G. van Dalsum
- 18. G. van Niekerk
- 19. G. Wilson
- 20. Horizon Surveying and Land Development
- 21. J. Archer
- 22. J. Bloggs
- 23. J. Mentzer
- 24. J. Sax
- 25. J. Walters
- 26. J. Warden
- 27. J. Young
- 28. K. & S. Gow
- 29. K. Francis
- 30. K. Innes
- 31. K.J. & H Canton
- 32. K. Marment
- 33. K. Moynihan
- 34. K. Reid
- 35. L. Kendall
- 36. D. Hayward
- 37. R. Moffat
- 38. M. Bell
- 39. M. Hewitt (withdrawn 4 Dec 2023)
- 40. M. Loheni
- 41. M. Tschirky
- 42. L. Lewis
- 43. Mangawhai Church Trust

- 44. Mangawhai Matters Society Inc.
- 45. Moana Views Committee
- 46. N. & D. Wilson
- 47. N. Campbell
- 48. N. Gestro
- 49. Northland Regional Council
- 50. P. Harris
- 51. P. Muller
- 52. P. Renner
- 53. R. & J. Panhuis
- 54. R. Burgess
- 55. R. Henry
- 56. R. Woolnough
- 57. Rachel McQuerry
- 58. Ryan McQuerry
- 59. S. & J. McInteer
- 60. S. Brabant
- 61. S. Bray
- 62. S. Hartley
- 63. S. Manwaring
- 64. S. Reid
- 65. T. & J. Wilson
- 66. T. de Baugh
- 67. T. Hanna
- 68. T. Harris
- 69. T. Simpkin
- 70. W. & F. Maclennan
- 71. W. & J. Neal
- 72. W. Martin
- 73. Y. Reid
- 74. C. Best
- 75. D. Patel
- 76. L. Leslie

- Submission point *

6B

Please enter the submission point you are addressing

Submission point 4.1,

- Do you support or oppose the original submission of the submitter? *

6C

- I support this original submission point of the submitter named above
- I oppose this original submission point of the submitter named above

- State in summary the nature of your submission, giving clear reasons for your support or opposition: *

6D

FS3.7

4.1 PPC84 in Whole - Oppose:

The submitter views the proposed plan change requires amendment to be more directive and to provide greater clarity.

Submitter seeks to delete PPC84 in its entirety, unless changes to the proposed provisions are made.

FS3.8

4.13 Higher order planning documents - Oppose:

Submitter views the effects of PPC84 create uncertainty on the environment and view that the proposed plan change provisions do not adequately manage the plan change provisions. The submitter views the proposed development does not align with higher order planning documents such as the NPS - UD, with respect to the integration of infrastructure, urban development, and strategic planning over the medium and long term. Submitter also views PPC84 is not consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement.

Submitter seeks for Council to refuse PPC84 or make changes to the proposal to address the matters raised in this submission.

The reasons for my support/opposition are:

4.1 I agree with the submitter that the proposed plan change requires amendment to be more directive and to provide greater clarity. There is a lot of general information and indicative drawings but these are not accurate and do not provide any clarity or certainty in relation to the many and varied elements of the proposed development.

i feel every aspect of the development has to be assessed properly with accurate and detailed plans submitted in full to the KDC for review and consideration by the community before a zoning request can be approved.

It's impossible to make an informed decision regarding the true impact and effects of a development of this size on our community and whether the surrounding areas can actually support a development of this size without detailed information.

4.13 I agree with the submitter that the effects of PPC84 create uncertainty on the environment and view that the proposed plan change provisions do not adequately manage the plan change provisions. I agree with the submitter that the proposed development does not align with higher order planning documents such as the NPS - UD, with respect to the integration of infrastructure, urban development, and strategic planning over the medium and long term. A agree with the submitter the PPC84 is not consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statem

• Points to remember as a further submitter

- It is your responsibility to send a copy of your further submission to the original submitter within 5 days of completing this Further Submission.
- Download Submitter Contact Details here: [PPC84 Submitter Contact Details](#)
- A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.

• Further submissions

If you have any further submissions to make, please submit this form and start a new one.

Thank you.

- Thank you for your further submission.

This is confirmation that your further submission has been received by the Kaipara District Council and it will be forwarded to the District Planning Team for analysis.

IMPORTANT:

A copy of your responses will be emailed to you shortly so that you can save a copy for your file and then also serve a copy of your further submission to the original submitter. If you do not receive an email within a few minutes, please check your spam/junk/updates folders as your server may not accept our email into your Inbox.

The District Planning Team will, in due course, also send a courtesy email to advise they have received your submission.