

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
Angela Cook	1	1.1	Rezoning	PPC85 it its entirety	Oppose	Delete all PPC85 in its entirety	Submitter considers that the proposed area should not be developed further, and notes concerns for ecosystems and wildlife. Submitter also considers that further commercial, retail and industrial provisions are not necessary given the three hubs already in existence.	N	N
Brownyn Fashawe	2	2.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose	Delete proposed rezoning of land	Submitter considers that rezoning the land will put additional burden on existing infrastructure given that council requires every house to have tank water. Submitter notes that the demand on wastewater, electricity, rubbish collection, school size and available jobs need to be considered further.	N	Y
Dave and Ann Hurley	3	3.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose	Delete proposed rezoning of land	Submitter considers that the rezoning takes away from rural character. Submitter also notes concern regarding infrastructure.	N	Y
David Medland-Slater	4	4.1	Freshwater	PPC85 it its entirety	Oppose	Amend	Submitter considers that the reports provided do not address freshwater, and the submitter would like to see how dwellings will be provided with freshwater.	N	Y
		4.1	Wastewater	PPC85 it its entirety	Oppose	Amend	Submitter considers that the reports do not provide sufficient detail on how wastewater will be discharged.	N	N
Elizabeth Nichols-Gill	5	5.1	Rural environment	Zoning	Oppose	Delete all PPC85 in its entirety	The submitter considers that this plan change, and other large, planned subdivisions will impact and increase pressure of infrastructure. Additionally, the submitter considers the plan change will further impact on traffic congestion. The submitter is also concerned with the potential for increase in rates.	N	Y
		5.2	Natural environment	PPC85 it its entirety	Oppose	Delete all PPC85 in its entirety	Submitter is concerned the plan change will negatively impact on wildlife through an increase in domestic cats.		
Karen Staples	6	6.1	PPC85 it its entirety	PPC85 it its entirety	Oppose	Delete all PPC85 in its entirety	<p>The submitter details a number of concerns which are as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strain on health services – submitter is concerned that the plan change would increase population without plans to expand on existing healthcare services 2. Roding and traffic impacts – submitter considers that the existing roads are not sufficient to support the plan change, and the consequential increase in roading demand. 3. Schooling capacity – submitter is concerned that the existing schools would not be able to accommodate the additional demand 4. Limited employment opportunities – submitter is concerned that the limited number of jobs available will result in a significant portion of residents being required to commute for work. 5. Environmental Impact and Beach Overcrowding – submitter is concerned that the additional residential development will place further strain on beaches and natural environments, and result in overcrowding. 6. Strain on utilities and power supply – the submitter notes that Mangawhai intermittent power cuts and is concerned that the plan change will place additional pressure on the electrical infrastructure. 	N	Y

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/ Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
Martina Tschirky	7	7.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose	Delete all PPC85 in its entirety	<p>Submitter is concerned that existing infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional development and considers there are too many properties for sale as it is.</p> <p>The submitter also notes their concern regarding the location of the land to be rezoned, which is low-lying with some parts in the Tsunami zone. The submitter notes that the land also has a high-water table and does not consider it suitable for intense development.</p>	Y	Y
				New proposed district plan	Oppose	Delete	The submitter considers that the PDP does not accommodate any more development in relation to the proposed plan change and therefore asks KDC to disallow the plan change.		
John Seward	8	8.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Support	Retain PPC85 as notified	The submitter considers that the area is much needed for growth in Mangawhai. The submitter notes that the land is predominantly flat which is ideal for housing.	N	Y
Juan Miguel Hamber	9	9.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose	Delete all PPC85 in its entirety	<p>Submitter considers that Mangawhai does not have sufficient infrastructure to accommodate the level of additional development that the plan change will bring.</p> <p>The submitter also notes that the current roading infrastructure is not adequate to support the plan change. Additionally, the submitter considers that there is sufficient provision for growth and development through other developments (The Hills).</p>	N	Y
Clive Boonham	10	10.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose	Not specified	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasoning as to why they do not support the plan change, as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amenity and ecology of the Mangawhai Estuary – submitter agrees with comments from submitter Joel Cayford (refer submission point xx) Flood Risk – submitter is concerned that the approving the plan change will increase flood risk to future properties. Additional pressure on amenities and infrastructure of recent plan changes – Wastewater infrastructure - 	Y	Y
Paul Wilkes	11	11.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose	Amend	<p>The submitter notes a number of concerns with the proposed plan change as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incompatible urban intensification – the submitter considers that the proposed plan change contradicts existing planning frameworks, including the spatial plan and the proposed district plan which designate the area as rural/residential. Infrastructure – the submitter considers the development should not proceed until all essential infrastructure, inclusive of roads, footpaths, cycleways, stormwater and wastewater systems are fully built and operational. Wastewater uncertainty – the submitter considers there is no credible plan for managing wastewater for the proposed development. Threat to coastal wildlife and natural landscape – the submitter notes their concern regarding the impacts of the 	N	N

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/ Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
							<p>plan change on wildlife and the natural landscape. The submitter notes the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> School overload – the submitter notes that the primary school is nearing its capacity limits. With no long-term solution proposed, the submitter is concerned that additional residents from the proposed development will place pressure on education resources. Traffic – submitter is concerned that potential increase in vehicle movements could be 7,000 – 8,000 per day and there is no planned intersection upgrade or traffic mitigation measures planned. Commercial hub – submitter notes that there are already three other commercial zones in existence and considers the plan change lacks justification for further commercial infrastructure. Housing demand – the submitter is concerned that the housing demand projections rely heavily on data from the past five years, which has a period of high growth. The submitter queries whether the additional proposed supply of housing is necessary or sustainable. 		
Lena Nelson	12	12.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose	Delete all PPC85 in its entirety	The submitter notes their concerns are around the current infrastructure which is struggling. They are also concerned with schooling capacity, medical facilities and traffic congestion.	N	Y
Margaret Brookes	13	13.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose	Delete all PPC85 in its entirety	Submitter is concerned with the lack of services and estuary wide pollution	N	Y
Sue Fitzgerald	14	14.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose	Delete all PPC85 in its entirety	Submitter considers that the plan change does not align with the District Plan or the spatial plan. Additionally, the submitter is concerned with that the ecology of the estuary will be negatively affected through an increase in sediment and overgrowth of mangroves damaging the estuary.	N	N
Grant Douglas	15	15.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose	Put PPC85 on hold until the impact of the current three rezoned residential developments are fully, or at least partially implemented.	<p>The submitter is concerned that another larger development will increase financial risk further when there are already three other large residential developments still to be implemented.</p> <p>The submitter is also concerned that costs will be passed down to ratepayers.</p>	N	N
Kristina Kahn	16	16.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose	Delete all PPC85 in its entirety	The submitter is concerned that the proposed development will result in a large increase in traffic volume and therefore will increase traffic safety issues, with particular regard to school drop off and pickup.	N	Y
		16.2	Rezoning	Ecological	Oppose	Delete all PPC85 in its entirety	<p>Submitter agrees with reasons as stated in the Mangawhai Focus August 11 p3 ‘Mangawhai East plan stirs opposition’</p> <p>Submitter considers the proposed development is high risk in terms of ecological values.</p>		

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
Peter Kemp	17	17.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety	The submitter is concerned that the proposed development will result in additional pressure on the roads which already face high traffic volumes.	N	N
		17.2	Rezoning	Ecological	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety	Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will result in further ecological risk for birdlife and wastewater systems.	N	N
Julie Riley	18	18.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Support	Retain PPC85 as notified	Submitter considers there is a demand for coastal living opportunities on the eastern side of the estuary. The submitter also considered the proposed development will improve access to the harbour from the eastern side of the village.	N	Y
Heath Riley	19	19.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Support	Retain PPC85 as notified	Submitter considers there is a demand for coastal living opportunities on the eastern side of the estuary. The submitter also considered the proposed development will improve access to the harbour from the eastern side of the village.	N	N
Peter Nicholas	20	20.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety	The submitter notes a number of reasons as to why they do not support the proposed development; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistency with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan – the submitter is concerned that the plan change does not align with the direction of the Spatial Plan. 	Y	Y
Hamish Hoyle	21	21.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Support	Retain PPC85 as notified	Submitter considers the plan change supports the growth of Mangawhai.	N	Y
Hayden Poole	22	22.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose in part	The submitter seeks the following requested relief: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce the scale and density of the proposed zoning Require infrastructure and sewage upgrades before any large-scale subdivision or building consents are granted Strengthen protections for the Mangawhai estuary and surrounding ecology, including greater setbacks from waterways and coastal hazard zones Limit development in areas identified as high risk for coastal hazards and flooding. 	The submitter opposes the plan change as currently drafted due to a number of reasons and concerns, as below; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure and services – the submitter notes that Mangawhai’s existing infrastructure, inclusive of roads, water supply and stormwater systems Sewerage and wastewater – the submitter considers that Mangawhai’s wastewater treatment plant has limited capacity and that additional development will put pressure on the existing network. The submitter considers that the development should not proceed until there is a proven plan to upgrade sewerage infrastructure that safeguards public health and the environment. Estuary and coastal protection – the submitter notes that the proposed development area sits within an ecologically sensitive environment and notes their concern around an increase in urban runoff, sedimentation and pollution. The submitter considers that given the climate change and sea level risk, intensive development should not expand into these areas. Ecological sensitivity – the submitter notes that while the plan change includes ecological feature maps, the rezoning rural land for more intensive use will place further pressure on these areas. The submitter considers that further 		
Jes Magill	23	23.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety	The submitter considers the plan change goes against KDC’s previous assessment of the area – that it should not be built on. The submitter considers the area is ecologically sensitive and that no further development should be allowed.	N	N

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/ Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
Richard Poole	24	24.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety	<p>The submitter notes the other large developments such as Mangawhai Central, Cove Road and Cullen Road and is concerned that the plan change will place additional pressure on infrastructure and roading. The submitter is concerned that allowing this plan change will set a precedent that KDC will allow unlimited development within the boundaries.</p> <p>The submitter is also concerned on the potential effects on the estuary and birdlife.</p>	N	N
Angela Bridson	25	25.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety	<p>The submitter is concerned that the plan change will increase pressure on the harbour with the increased number of dwellings, and that pollution in the harbour will increase from sedimentation and plant removal.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned that existing infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic and waste from the additional housing. The submitter also notes their concern that the sand dunes will lose more sand and therefore the land could be more susceptible to flooding</p>	N	N
Kirsti Burns	26	26.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety	The submitter considers PPC85 does not align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan and the proposed district plan. The submitter makes reference to other large developments such as The Hills, The Rise, Mangawhai Central, Jessie Developments and other private approved sections. The submitter considers that there are enough small residential developments already available, and that the area should remain rural in nature.	Y	N
		26.2	Rezoning	Staging of the development	Oppose	Not specified	The submitter is concerned that infrastructure will not be built until sections have been sold. The submitters considers that infrastructure, such as roads and stormwater drains should be established prior to any buildings.		
		26.3	Rezoning	Wastewater	Oppose	Not specified	<p>The submitter queries what wastewater system is being proposed, noting that the only septic system on this side of the estuary is the campgrounds private system, which is almost at capacity and is not built to handle to required volume of waste. The submitter queries whether this would result in running waste across the harbour and consider this would increase risks through contaminating the estuary.</p> <p>The submitter considers the plan change should be denied to ensure the health of the Mangawhai Estuary.</p>		

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/ Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
Irene Dawn Sanson and Gavan Riley	27	27.1	Rezoning	Plan Change PPC85	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety	<p>The submitter is opposed to the plan change for a number of reasons, as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter considers the plan change is not consistent with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan. The submitter considers that the proposed area of development is close to the beach, sand dunes and estuary and the plan change increases risk to flora and fauna. The submitter also notes that the proposed development area is within the tsunami zone and considers it is likely to be affected by sea level rise, resulting in potential insurance problems. The submitter considers that the plan change is inconsistent with the proposed district plan, which does not identify the land as suitable for urban development. The submitter references policy 7 of the NZ Coastal Policy, which requires councils to protect from inappropriate subdivision. The submitter is concerned that the plan change will result in adverse noise effects from the construction phase of the development, but also potential increase in noise from additional powered boats and jet skis. 	Y	Y
Craig and Deidre Payne	28	28.1	Rezoning	Plan Change PPC85	Support	Retain as notified, or with amendments within scope as necessary to ensure a quality environmental outcome as sought through the plan change application.	<p>The submitter considers the plan change will provide Mangawhai with a quality urban environment and considers the plan change is an opportunity to significantly improve public amenity and access.</p> <p>The submitter notes that development and growth in Mangawhai must be offset by well thought out and quality development to ensure ecological protection and to enhance public amenity.</p>	N	Y
Vicky and Timothy Andrew	29	29.1	Rezoning	DEV XP3-2 – transportation and connectivity	Oppose	Amend	Submitter considers that a right hand turn bay will be insufficient with the new development and the number of people during holiday and weekend periods.	Y	N
		29.2	Zoning	Business neighbourhood and mixed use centre zone, objectives and policies and rules	Oppose	Delete	Submitter considers there is sufficient urban commercial sprawl throughout Mangawhai and therefore will result in adverse amenity effects.		
		29.3	Density	DEV XLU R6 - Comprehensively designed residential development	Oppose	Delete rule and its associated objectives and policies	Submitter seeks to delete the rule and associated objectives as they consider that a site size of 350m ² is too small for Mangawhai. The submitter considers that the level of proposed intensification is inappropriate.		
		29.4	Setbacks	DEV XLU S4 3A Setbacks from internal boundaries	Oppose	Delete rule	The submitter notes that the rule enables townhouse development which they consider to be appropriate for the area.		
Vicky and Timothy Andrew	30	30.1	Zoning	DEV XSUB S1-1	Oppose	Amend	Submitter considers that the medium density residential zone should be changed to a low residential zone.		

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
		30.2	Esplanade	DEV XSUB S3 2	Oppose	Amend standard from 6 monthly to 5 years by the developer and then in perpetuity by the council.	-		
		30.3	Infrastructure	DEV XSUB S8	Oppose	The submitter requests that the stormwater management plan be prepared with direct consultation from directly adjoining neighbours.	-		
		30.4	Subdivision	DEV X REQ 2	Support	None-specified	The submitter supports the walkway to the village		
Vicky and Timothy Andrew	31	31.1	Visitor accommodation	DEV X LU R3 Visitor accommodation	Oppose	Delete rule.	The submitter considers this is not in character with the area of Mangawhai and is not necessary.		
		31.2.	Commercial activities	DEV X LU R4	Oppose	Delete rule.	The submitter considers this is not in character with the area of Mangawhai and is not necessary.		
		31.3	Commercial activities	DEV X LU R6	Oppose	Delete rule.	The submitter considers this is not in character with the area of Mangawhai and is not necessary.		
Riverside Holiday Park 2007 Limited	32	32.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose	Retain the existing Rural zoning and that the low-Density Residential Zone set out in Appendix 2 is not adopted, with respect to 41 Black Swamp Road.	The submitter seeks the requested relief as they are concerned with the increase in rates that would occur given the site would be rezoned to an urban zone. The submitter notes they do not have any intention of discontinuing the holiday park or selling the site to a developer. The submitter considers that the	Y	Y
		32.2		Structure plan/development area provisions	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks the following requested relief;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision for no-complaints covenants within the relevant zone standards that apply to the residential and rural lifestyle zones that adjoin 41 Black Swamp Road (Riverside Holiday Park). Deletion of the 'Coastal fringe enhancement and public walkway' from the Structure Plan in Appendix 4. The implementation of pedestrian and cyclist connectivity along Black Swamp Road. The need for implementation of traffic control measures (preferably a roundabout) at the intersection of Black Swamp Road, Tomarata Road, and Insley Street, which <p>should be linked to development thresholds within the Rules and Standards within the Development Area Provisions in Appendix 3.</p>	<p>The submitter notes a number of concerns with the structure plan and development area provisions as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter is concerned that the proposed Coastal fringe enhancement and public walkway will not have the actual levels of public benefit. Additionally, the submitter is concerned that the practicality and costs have not been fully considered. Submitter queries whether the proposed alignment of the indicative road will provide the most efficient and appropriate mechanism given there appears to be little consideration in respect to upgrades and improvements to Black Swamp Road. Submitter notes there may be a need for traffic improvements, such as a roundabout, at the intersection of Black Swamp Road, Tomarata Road, and Insley Street. Submitter considers that required upgrades should be included in the development rules and triggered once certain development thresholds are met (e.g., number of dwellings or floor area). Submitter considers that the proposed cycleway across the Insley Street bridge requires further detail given the current pedestrian safety risks present. 		

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need for pedestrian and cycling improvements across the Insley Street Bridge, which should be linked to development thresholds within the Rules and Standards within the Development Area Provisions in Appendix 3. 			
Jason McQuarrie	33	33.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 as notified, or with amendments within scope.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons as to why they are in support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also considers that the inclusion of the structure plan is supported as this Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports supporting the plan change are comprehensive and address all potential environmental effects and demonstrating a clear need for additional land to support Mangawhai’s growth over the short, medium, and long term. They show that the area can be developed into a high-quality urban environment while effectively managing adverse effects. The plan includes strong ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure. Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are considered acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. 	Y	N
Krystal Hebden	34	34.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 as notified, or with amendments within scope.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons as to why they are in support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also considers that the inclusion of the structure plan is supported as this Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports supporting the plan change are comprehensive and address all potential environmental 	N	Y

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/ Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
							<p>effects and demonstrating a clear need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth over the short, medium, and long term. They show that the area can be developed into a high-quality urban environment while effectively managing adverse effects. The plan includes strong ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure.</p> <p>Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are considered acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan.</p>		
Derek Smyth	35	35.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety	<p>The submitter considers that the plan change is not viable and provides a number of reasons for this as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intensive urbanisation – the submitter considers that the proposed plan change does not align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan and District Plan which identifies the land as a rural/residential area. Staging of the development – the submitter considers that it should be a requirement for all infrastructure to be fully constructed and operational prior to the first dwellings being built to avoid risk to current and future ratepayers and occupiers and considers that this is not the case with the current proposal. Wastewater – submitter considers that no clear plan has been offered as to how raw sewage from the proposed development will be managed. The submitter considers an independent risk analysis should be completed before any decision is made to ensure protection of the estuary. Coastal bird taonga and outstanding natural landscape – submitter considers there is minimal acknowledgement in the proposal which setting out that the area to be developed is in close proximity to the nesting area of endangered bird species. Traffic – submitter is concerned that the increase in traffic from the additional vehicle movements would require intersection upgrades, however notes none have been proposed. Mixed use/commercial hub – queries whether another commercial hub is needed given there are three commercial areas already. Housing demand in Mangawhai – the submitter queries whether Mangawhai will continue to see the level of growth as seen in the last five years, and whether the demand for additional lots are needed. 	N	N

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
Ed Smyth	36	36.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks the following requested relief;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the PPC85 zoning maps to apply Low Density Residential Zone (LDRZ) to Lot 1 DP 545009, 45 Windsor Way, Mangawhai. Provide consequential relief to the PPC85 provisions as needed to give effect to this submission and to achieve sustainable management. Ensure consistency in the application of zoning principles across PPC85 so that sites with equivalent physical suitability are zoned similarly. Amend provisions to integrate the provision of services and access, including subdivision and development, to enable the efficient and effective extension of infrastructure to all parts of the PPC85 area. Provide alternative relief with similar effect, to ensure the property can achieve the intended residential outcomes consistent with PPC85's objectives. 		Y	Y
Hugh Benn	37	37.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 as notified, or with amendments within scope.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons as to why they are in support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also considers that the inclusion of the structure plan is supported as this Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports supporting the plan change are comprehensive and address all potential environmental effects and demonstrating a clear need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth over the short, medium, and long term. They show that the area can be developed into a high-quality urban environment while effectively managing adverse effects. The plan includes strong ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure. 	N	Y

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/ Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are considered acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. 		
Kathleen McInerney	38	38.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety	The submitter notes concerns around pressure on existing infrastructure such as wastewater and schools. Additionally, the submitter notes concern with ecological values being compromised.	N	N
Patrick Fontein	39	39.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Support	Amend	The submitter supports the overall proposed plan change, noting that it will provide opportunities for the overall growth of Mangawhai and will allow for diversity of property types. The submitter also notes their concern at the spread of town centre activities and would prefer a consolidation of town centre activities within Mangawhai Village as opposed to Black Swamp Road.	N	N
Arthur and Jocelyn Rutherford	40	40.1	Rezoning	Zoning map	Support in part	The submitter seeks to remove business zoning.	The submitter is in support of rezoning the site at 4 and 4A Black Swamp Road to Large Lot residential and Low Density residential. The submitter does not support business zoning along Black Swamp Road		
		40.2	Building standards	DEVX-LU-R3 Minor Residential Unit	Oppose	Reduce the maximum GFA of the minor residential unit to 65m2.	The submitter considers that a GFA of 90m2 is essentially a small dwelling, as opposed to a minor residential unit. The submitter considers that a GFA of 65m2 would be more appropriate.	Y	Y
		40.3	Building standards	DEVX-LU-S4 Setback from internal boundaries	Support in part	Amend as follows: 2(b) Where a building or structure <u>is located directly adjacent</u> to Lot 2 DP 392239, or subsequent legal description, then <u>a no build landscaped</u> setback shall be 8m minimum and the exceptions below do not apply. <u>This area shall include a bund to redirect stormwater runoff from development to the road.</u>	The submitter considers that this standard shall apply to buildings and/or structures that are directly adjacent to Lot 2 DP 392239 to avoid disturbance in the future.		
		40.4	Building standards	DEVX-LU-S1 Site Coverage	Oppose	Submitter seeks to amend the standard as follows (if it is retained); Low Density Residential Building coverage – 25% Impervious surface – 40% Large Lot Residential Building coverage – 25% Impervious surface – 35%	The submitter considers that site coverage between different residential zones needs to be clearly outlined. The submitter notes that as currently drafted, 45% building coverage is permitted and considers that the site coverage should be lower to better reflect the intended character of the zone.		

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
		40.5	Transport	New standard	Support	<div><div>Add a new standard as follows:</div><div><div>1. The intersection at Insley Street and Black Swamp Road shall be a roundabout intersection prior to s.224c approval for any development within the Development Area.</div><div>2. The roundabout intersection shall be designed to Austroad standards.</div><div>3. The intersection shall include landscaping and design features to achieve a quality entrance to the Development Area</div><div>4. A pedestrian footpath and cycleway, connecting the Development Area with Mangawhai township, along the estuary edge of Black Swamp Road shall be constructed to the engineering standards in conjunction with the any development in the Development Area.</div></div></div>	The submitter seeks to include the requirement for an intersection to be established at Insley Street and Black Swamp Road to be a roundabout intersection.		
		40.6	Transport	DEVX-G-S4 Traffic Intensity	Oppose	<div><div>Amend standard as follows:</div><div><div><u>Accordingly, up to 18 daily one way vehicle movements per site, excluding construction traffic only, should be permitted.</u></div></div></div>	The submitter notes that the standard traffic generation from a residential site can be up to 9 one-way vehicle movements, and that a minor residential dwelling could allow for an additional 6 vehicle movements		
		40.7	Infrastructure	DEVX-SUB-S1 Density / Minimum Site Size	Oppose	<div><div>Amend the standard as follows:</div><div>(...)</div><div><div>Large lot residential zone</div><div><div>Large Lot Residential zone</div><div>a. 1,000m² when connected to a reticulated wastewater Network.</div><div>2,000m² where a connection to the Reticulated Wastewater network is not available</div></div></div></div>	The submitter considers that LLR zone should only have a minimum site size of 2000m and considers that 1000m2 is not appropriate at all for this zone.		

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/ Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
						(...)			
		40.8	Infrastructure	DEVX-SUB-S1 Density / Minimum Site Size	Support	Retain as notified.	The submitter supports the proposed density for the Low Density Residential Zone.		
		40.9		DEVX-SUB-S1 Density / Minimum Site Size Medium Density Residential zone 350m²	Oppose	Remove reference to 350m² and comprehensive developments.	The submitter considers that the proposed density for the Medium Density Residential zone is not appropriate for the area.		
		40.10		Information Requirements DEVX-REQ2 Subdivision or Development that will enable 50 or more residential units or residential unit equivalents in the Development Area	Oppose	The Development Area anticipates development /intensification and therefore the Developer should undertake an upgrade to the intersection of Insley Street and Tomarata Road and provide a roundabout intersection. <u>Information Requirements DEVX-REQ2 Subdivision or Development in the Development Area</u>	The intersection of Insley Street and Tomarata Road/Black Swamp Road is a key entry point into Mangawhai. With future development, the submitter considers it should be upgraded to a roundabout to improve traffic flow and ensure pedestrian and cyclist safety. The submitter considers that, due to nearby property access and expected traffic growth, a roundabout is necessary sooner as a safety measure.		
Melanie Scott	41	41.1	Rezoning	Zoning maps	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety	The submitter considers that the proposed development area is unsuitable for commercial and high-density residential development given that it is low lying and flood prone. The submitter details a number of reasons as to why they do not support the plan change <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stormwater - The submitter is concerned that a high level of impermeable surfaces will result in stormwater runoff into the estuary Wastewater management – the submitter is concerned that the existing wastewater system is not fit for purpose and is already over capacity. Ecology – the submitter considers that ecological values are at risk, in particular bird species such as the New Zealand Fairy Tern. The submitter is concerned that ecology values have not been properly considered with respect to the proposed plan change. 	Y	N
Gayle Forster	42	42.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose		The submitter considers that land identified as “O” and “P” are close to the estuary and is concerned that the proposed rezoning of these areas and the consequent construction would permanently affect the areas that attract people to Mangawhai.	N	N

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
							With consideration of area “Q”, the submitter is concerned that the area is highly restrained due the risk of sea level rise, and building on this land would result in an increase in flooding and permanent damage.		
Northland Regional Council	43	43.1	Coastal flood hazard	Flood maps		That the land identified as hazard prone in the NRC flood maps to the north-east and coastal estuarine areas of the proposed plan change area is not rezoned for intensive residential development.	The submitter considers that some areas are potentially affected by coastal inundation and subject to flooding during a 1-in-100-year storm event, taking into account projected sea level rise over the next 100 years and that there may be some residual risk. The submitter considers that risk must be avoided through avoiding inappropriate development in 10- and 100-year flood hazard areas and coastal hazard areas.	Y	Y
		43.2	Water Supply	Appendix 3: Development Area Provisions		Add a provision to Appendix 3: Development Area Provisions requiring 50,000 litres of on-site water storage for domestic use through rainwater collection for each residential unit.	<p>The submitter is concerned that rezoning from rural to residential will provide smaller lot sizes, and that it may be difficult to accommodate residential dwellings and the required water tank sizes. The submitter considers that the required water tank sizes should be made clear at the time of development to ensure that development can be planned to accommodate the tanks.</p> <p>The submitter considers that this would provide better consistency with Policy 5.1.1 (d) and (h) and Policy 5.1.2 (d) of the RPS.</p>		
Rosemarie Dunning	44	44.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose		<p>The submitter details the following reasoning as to why they do not support the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant alteration to current zoning – the submitter notes that the proposed district plan identifies the to be rural lifestyle and is concerned that the plan change is seeking to change the zone before the PDP has been implemented Housing – the submitter considers that PPC83 and PPC84 are sufficient in terms of aligning with outcomes sought by the NPSUD Infrastructure – the submitter is concerned that the 900 proposed sections will not be able to be accommodated by the existing infrastructure, including wastewater, stormwater and roading. Ecology values – the submitter is concerned that the proposed plan change will result in negative effects on the estuary, which is a popular feeding ground of Tari iti. Mixed use and commercial hub – the submitter considers that Mangawhai does not need a ‘fourth’ hub. 	Y	N
Timothy Scott	45	45.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 as notified.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons as to why they are in support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also considers that the inclusion of the structure plan is supported as this 	Y	Y

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports supporting the plan change are comprehensive and address all potential environmental effects and demonstrating a clear need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth over the short, medium, and long term. They show that the area can be developed into a high-quality urban environment while effectively managing adverse effects. The plan includes strong ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure. Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are considered acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. 		
Tern Point Recreation and Conservation Society Inc	46	46.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose		<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons as to why they do not support PPC85, as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPS-UD – the submitter notes that whilst encouraged, tier 3 councils are not required to implement Medium Density Residential standards and therefore there is no need for PPC85 with respect to the NPSUD. The submitter considers there is more than sufficient provision for long term growth. Spatial Plan – the submitter notes that the spatial plan discourages rezoning the proposed development area for further intensified development and noted a number of reasons as to why the proposed plan change does not align with the Spatial Plan. NPS HPL Environmental and guardianship issues Infrastructure 		
AJ and MJ Eaves Family Trust	47	47.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons as to why they are in support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also considers that the inclusion of the structure plan is supported as this 	Not stated	Y

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports supporting the plan change are comprehensive and address all potential environmental effects and demonstrating a clear need for additional land to support Mangawhai’s growth over the short, medium, and long term. They show that the area can be developed into a high-quality urban environment while effectively managing adverse effects. The plan includes strong ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure. Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are considered acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. 		
Black Swamp Limited	48	48.1	Rezoning	Zoning Map	Oppose in part	<p>The submitter seeks the following amendments;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the PPC85 zoning maps to apply the Low Density Residential Zone to BSL’s land at Black Swamp Road, Mangawhai (Lot 8 DP 565865). Amend the PC85 zoning maps to apply the Mixed Use or Neighbourhood Centre Zone to the land that is subject to the existing KDC land use consent for the brewery (RM210463). Alternatively, a Commercial Zone (COMZ) should be considered for this area, similar to what has been proposed under the Proposed Kaipara District Plan. Consequential relief to the PPC85 provisions as needed to give effect to this submission and to achieve sustainable management. Amend the provisions to integrate the provision of services and access, including subdivision and development to provide for the efficient and effective extension of 	<p>The submitter requests that their land be rezoned from Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ) to Low Density Residential Zone (LDRZ) because the original flood hazard constraint—used to justify the RLZ—has been addressed through an approved resource consent (AUT.046759) that mitigates the hazard. The submitter considers that rezoning to LDRZ would align with PPC85’s objective to support Mangawhai’s high growth by increasing residential capacity.</p> <p>The submitter also requests the land containing their consented brewery be rezoned to a Mixed Use Zone (MUZ), Neighbourhood Centre Zone (NCZ), or Commercial Zone (COMZ) to reflect its existing lawful use and avoid future compliance issues. They consider that retaining RLZ would reduce development efficiency, underutilise infrastructure, lower housing supply, and ignore site-specific mitigation work already done. Rezoning would enable more housing and better recognise existing land uses.</p>	Y	-

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
						<p>services and access to all parts of the PPC85 area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure consistency in the application of zoning principles across PPC85 so that sites with equivalent physical suitability are zoned similarly; or • Alternative relief with similar effect. 			
Darren and Kim Hughes	49	49.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons as to why they are in support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also considers that the inclusion of the structure plan is supported as this • Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports supporting the plan change are comprehensive and address all potential environmental effects and demonstrating a clear need for additional land to support Mangawhai’s growth over the short, medium, and long term. They show that the area can be developed into a high-quality urban environment while effectively managing adverse effects. The plan includes strong ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure. • Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are considered acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. 	Y	Y
Gavin Brannigan	51	51.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons as to why they are in support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it 	Y	Y

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
							<p>occurs. The submitter also considers that the inclusion of the structure plan is supported as this</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports supporting the plan change are comprehensive and address all potential environmental effects and demonstrating a clear need for additional land to support Mangawhai’s growth over the short, medium, and long term. They show that the area can be developed into a high-quality urban environment while effectively managing adverse effects. The plan includes strong ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure. Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are considered acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. 		
Jennifer Anne Readman and Mark Elliot Readman	51	51.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons as to why they are in support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also considers that the inclusion of the structure plan is supported as this Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports supporting the plan change are comprehensive and address all potential environmental effects and demonstrating a clear need for additional land to support Mangawhai’s growth over the short, medium, and long term. They show that the area can be developed into a high-quality urban environment while effectively managing adverse effects. The plan includes strong ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure. Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are considered acceptable. The 	Y	Y

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/ Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
							submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan.		
Joshua Membrey and Dorothy Nacewa o	52	52.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons as to why they are in support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also considers that the inclusion of the structure plan is supported as this Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports supporting the plan change are comprehensive and address all potential environmental effects and demonstrating a clear need for additional land to support Mangawhai’s growth over the short, medium, and long term. They show that the area can be developed into a high-quality urban environment while effectively managing adverse effects. The plan includes strong ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure. Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are considered acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. 	Y	Y
Lance Vale	53	53.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons as to why they are in support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also considers that the inclusion of the structure plan is supported as this Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports supporting the plan change are comprehensive and address all potential environmental 	Y	Y

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/ Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission	
							<p>effects and demonstrating a clear need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth over the short, medium, and long term. They show that the area can be developed into a high-quality urban environment while effectively managing adverse effects. The plan includes strong ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are considered acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. 			
Lance Vale	53	53.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.		<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons as to why they are in support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it 	Y	Y

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission	
								<p>occurs. The submitter also considers that the inclusion of the structure plan is supported as this</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports supporting the plan change are comprehensive and address all potential environmental effects and demonstrating a clear need for additional land to support Mangawha i's growth over the short, medium, and long term. They show that the area can be developed into a high-		

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/ Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission	
								<p>quality urban environment while effectively managing adverse effects. The plan includes strong ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environme		

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/ Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission	
								nt are considered acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan.		
Mark and Jacqui Scheib	54	54.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.	The submitter provides a number of reasons as to why they are in support of the plan change; <ul style="list-style-type: none">Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also considers that the inclusion of the structure plan is supported as this			

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports supporting the plan change are comprehensive and address all potential environmental effects and demonstrating a clear need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth over the short, medium, and long term. They show that the area can be developed into a high-quality urban environment while effectively managing adverse effects. The plan includes strong ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure. Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are considered acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. 		
New Zealand Steel Limited (NZ Steel)	55	55.1		DEV X-LU-S11(1)(b)	Support in part	Amend DEV X-LU-S11(1)(b) as follows: 1. In the Residential Large Lot zone all building, accessory building or structure exteriors shall: ... b. Include at least 70% of the total painted or galvanised external surface of buildings (excluding windows) with a colour reflectance value of no greater than 35% and with a roof colour with a colour reflectance value no greater than 20%.	The submitter considers that as currently drafted, the standard could be misinterpreted as relating to Total Solar Reflectance TSR) rather than Light Reflectance Values (LRVs, and that a TSR value of no greater than 20% would significantly limit roof colour options.	N	-
Derek Westwood, Thalia	56	56.1				The submitters seek the following requested relief;		Y	

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/ Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
Ormerod, David & Fiona Collins, Tomasz Kus, Susan Hoskin, Lynette Nicholson. Kim and Shane Growden									
Peter and Barbara Lambert	57	57.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety	<p>The submitter is opposed to the rezoning for the following reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land adjoining Black Swamp Road is low lying and therefore unsuitable for housing • The submitter considers that current infrastructure does not support the proposed development area and does not deal with effects from flooding. • The submitter considers that a further town centre is not necessary. 	N	Y
Dianne Piesse	58	58.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose		<p>The submitter is opposed to the plan change for a number of reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spatial plan - The submitter references the Spatial Plan, which notes that the beach, estuary and sand dunes play a role in protecting flora and fauna. Additionally, the submitter notes that the land is fragile due to sea level rise. The submitter considers that the proposed plan change is not consistent with the Spatial Plan, as it does not anticipate residential development to the east of the estuary. • Proposed district plan – the submitter considers that the proposed plan change is not consistent with the proposed district plan as it does not identify the proposed development area as being suitable for urban development or recommend rezoning. The submitter also notes that the proposed district plan considers Policy 7 of the Coastal policy statement which requires councils to provide protection of coastal areas from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. The submitter considers that accepting PPC85 would be inconsistent with this approach. • The submitter considers that PPC85 will enable development activities that could potentially threaten the ecology of the Estuary and potentially degrade the water quality of the estuary. • The submitter is concerned that PPC85 will result in additional infrastructure being required, including wastewater, roading, stormwater and sea defences. • Ecology values – the submitter is concerned that the plan change will result in disturbing flora and fauna through 		

[illegible]