

## 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**  
**Street number and name**  
**Town**  
**Contact phone**

Kyoko Reid

11 De Boer lane

Mangawhai

0212321217

- 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:

Refer to attachment

**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  
Please attach the required Documents

- 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

- 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.

•  
[PublicVoice](#)

**FS7.1 Private Plan Change 84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited – Further submission from K Reid**

Since making my previous submission we have been contacted by the developer and asked to withdraw our opposition which I am reluctant to do as it will have a negative effect for us and our home.

My primary concern is road safety. Traffic volume has increased substantially in the last four years and road speeds have increased greatly as well. Adding cars from 600 more houses will make Cove Road difficult and more dangerous. The intersection of De Boer Lane onto Cove Road is already dangerous for cars exiting from De Boer Lane which has a 30 Kph onto Cove Road where vehicles are commonly travelling in excess of 100 Kph. I am scared to drive on this part of Cove Road and we are now forced to construct a new vehicle crossing which will have better visibility for us. There is a dangerous corner on Cove Road adjacent to our property which has been the cause of several accidents in the 15 years that we have lived here.

I have complained to the Council about the absence of proper speed signs in this location but nothing has been done. There needs to be 80 Kph signs so drivers know the proper limit. In my opinion 50-60 Kph would be a safe speed for this part of the road. I have never seen any policing here.

We have talked to the developers on site about this so they are aware of the danger that exists here. They have proposed selling an area of land to the Council so that the offending corner can be removed and made less dangerous. Council Engineers have inspected the site and given approval. We support the idea but what guarantee do we have that it will happen and when will it happen.

On the plans there is a road exit from the development site onto Cove Road in front of our property. We already suffer from a lot of noise from trucks, motorcycles and cars. Our neighbours have similar experience. My suggestion is that this road exit be relocated to a more suitable location that affects fewer residents if the development is permitted. Furthermore there should be a limit on the number of houses that can be built. I suggest it should be a limit of 50 houses to protect the rural nature of this part of Mangawhai

My secondary concern is water flooding onto our property which has a negative impact on our land and buildings as well as De Boer Lane and neighbouring properties. I have read the Chester storm water management plan and I cannot agree with their views. In the 15 years that we have lived here we have experienced frequent flooding of storm water from Fredlictons farm. The water runs from the farm into the roadside gutter where it is piped under the road and exits at our boundary. Every time it rains we are flooded with the neighbours storm water. The Council was responsible for putting this culvert in place originally and then replacing it with a larger pipe four years ago. This has to be illegal. The water runs over our property causing a lot of damage and then onto De Boer Lane where it washes away the road metal and causes damage to neighbouring properties. Fifteen

years ago we planted all our boundaries with native trees most of which have now been destroyed with flooding. Of the 110 olive trees that were planted, we had to remove 40 this year for the same reason. The Council staff inspected the damage and did nothing to fix the problem. We have been asking the Council to remove this illegal culvert for nearly 15 years. Lots of letters have been written and photos taken of damaged trees and lawns under water. Very sad for us and costly. We have had numerous meetings with Council staff on property who are sympathetic and make promises that something will be done but nothing has ever been done to fix the problem. We can see elevated problems with storm water disposal that will affect us and our neighbours badly if this consent is approved without having a proper plan in place and the work completed. It is time that the Council fixed this problem and give the service that we deserve. This application should definitely be declined until this problem is remedied.