

# Ecology Submissions

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	General	PPC85 in 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
Elizabeth Nichols-Gill	5	5.2	Ecology	PPC85 in 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	General	PPC85 in 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"> <li>1. Strain on health services – submitter is concerned that the plan change would increase population without plans to expand on existing healthcare services</li> <li>2. Roading and traffic impacts – submitter considers that the existing roads are not sufficient to support the plan change, and the consequential increase in roading demand.</li> <li>3. Schooling capacity – submitter is concerned that the existing schools would not be able to accommodate the additional demand</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ol>	N	Y
Clive Boonham	10	10.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	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"> <li>• Amenity and ecology of the Mangawhai Estuary – submitter agrees with comments from submitter Joel Cayford</li> <li>• Flood Risk – submitter is concerned that the approving the plan change will increase flood risk to future properties.</li> <li>• Additional pressure on amenities and infrastructure of recent plan changes – the submitter is concerned that the development is uncontrolled and is destroying the appeal of Mangawhai. The submitter notes the number of previous plan changes that have been granted and considers that the full impact of the increase in population will not be noticeable for several years.</li> <li>• Wastewater infrastructure – the submitter is concerned that the current capacity of the scheme is not sufficient. The submitter notes that they appealed PC78 with respect to wastewater capacity, and that the Environment Court held that wastewater capacity must be either physically available or the required capacity must be planned and funded in the long-term plan. The submitter notes that neither of these requirements have been met.</li> </ul>	Y	Y

# Ecology Submissions

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"> <li>Section 32 Strategic Direction for the Proposed District Plan -the submitter references sections of the s32 report which highlight that further development within the Mangawhai-Hakauru Growth area should be limited given the number of plan changes that have recently been approved in the area.</li> <li>NPSUD – the submitter considers that Tier 3 obligations under the NPSUD cannot apply to townships such as Mangawhai given it is bordered by the sea on one side, and does not have the space, amenities or the infrastructure to cope</li> <li>Commercial hubs – the submitter considers that an additional commercial hub is not necessary given that Mangawhai already has one larger and two smaller existing hubs.</li> </ul>		
Paul Wilkes	11	11.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Amend	<p>The submitter notes a number of concerns with the proposed plan change as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Wastewater uncertainty – the submitter considers there is no credible plan for managing wastewater for the proposed development.</li> <li>Threat to coastal wildlife and natural landscape – the submitter notes their concern regarding the impacts of the plan change on wildlife and the natural landscape. The submitter notes the</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	N	N
Margaret Brookes	13	13.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete all PPC85 in its entirety	Submitter is concerned with the lack of services and estuary wide pollution	N	Y

## Ecology Submissions

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
Sue Fitzgerald	14	14.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	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
Kristina Kahn	16	16.2	Ecology	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose		Submitter agrees with reasons as stated in the Mangawhai Focus August 11 p3 'Mangawhai East plan stirs opposition'  Submitter considers the proposed development is high risk in terms of ecological values.		
Peter Kemp	17	17.2	Ecology	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety	Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will result in further ecological risk for estuary, health, birdlife and risk of wastewater pollution.		
Peter Nicholas	20	20.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	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"> <li>Consistency with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan – the submitter is concerned that the plan change does not align with the direction of the Spatial Plan.</li> <li>Consistency with the proposed District Plan – the submitter notes that the proposed district plan does not identify the proposed plan change area as an area for urban development or recommend that the area be rezoned. The submitter considers that the requirements of the NPSUD have already been met through previous developments that have been approved.</li> <li>Ecology values – the submitter is concerned that the proposed plan change will result in an increase in recreational activities along the estuary which puts endangered birds at risk.</li> <li>Sea defences – the submitter notes that Mangawhai Matters Society Inc has recently completed a series of studies which include investigations and modelling of inundation risks within Mangawhai and adjacent to the estuary posed by stormwater flooding. The submitter notes that one of the options is the construction of seawalls or bunds or another method of raising natural ground levels.</li> <li>Unplanned infrastructure – the submitter is concerned that the proposed plan change will result in the need for the extension to of infrastructure, including wastewater, roading, stormwater, and sea defences.</li> <li>Demand on facilities such as the boat ramp, Mangawhai Heads carpark and road access to the village.</li> </ul>	Y	Y
Hayden Poole	22	22.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose in part	The submitter seeks the following requested relief: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce the scale and density of the proposed zoning.</li> <li>Require infrastructure and sewage upgrades before any large-scale subdivision or building consents are granted.</li> </ul>	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"> <li>Infrastructure and services – the submitter notes that Mangawhai's existing infrastructure, inclusive of roads, water supply and stormwater systems</li> <li>Sewerage and wastewater – the submitter considers that Mangawhai's wastewater treatment plant has limited capacity</li> </ul>	N	N

# Ecology Submissions

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"> <li>Strengthen protections for the Mangawhai estuary and surrounding ecology, including greater setbacks from waterways and coastal hazard zones.</li> <li>Limit development in areas identified as high risk for coastal hazards and flooding.</li> </ul>	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>		
Kirsti Burns	26	26.3	General	Wastewater	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety	The submitter queries what wastewater system is being proposed, noting that the only septic system on this side of the estuary is the campground's private system, which is almost at capacity and is not built to handle the 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.		
Irene Dawn Sanson and Gavan Riley	27	27.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	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"> <li>The plan change is not consistent with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan.</li> <li>The proposed area of development is close to the beach, sand dunes and estuary and the plan change increases risk to flora and fauna.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>The plan change will create traffic congestion around the entrance to Blackswamp Road.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	Y	Y
Vicky and Timothy Andrew	30	30.2	Esplanade	DEV XSUB S3 2	Oppose	Amend the pest and weed control timeframe from 6 monthly to 5 years by the developer and then in perpetuity by the council.	-		
Jason McQuarrie	33	33.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 as notified, or with amendments within scope.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	Y	Y

# Ecology Submissions

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>conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also supports the inclusion of the structure plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai’s growth. They particularly support the 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.</li> <li>Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and 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.</li> </ul>		
Paul Brown	FS6	FS6.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge.	<p>The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.</p> <p>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area.</p>	Y	Y
Krystal Hebden	34	34.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 as notified, or with amendments within scope.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 supports the inclusion of the structure plan.</li> <li>Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai’s growth. They particularly support the 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.</li> <li>Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets</li> </ul>	Y	Y

# Ecology Submissions

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
							the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan.		
Paul Brown	FS6	FS6.2	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge.	<p>The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.</p> <p>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area.</p>	Y	Y
Derek Smyth	35	35.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change and provides a number of reasons as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intensive urbanisation –the proposed plan change does not align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan and District Plan.</li> <li>Staging of the development – the submitter considers all infrastructure needs to be constructed and operational prior to the first dwellings being built to avoid risk to ratepayers.</li> <li>Wastewater – submitter considers that the proposed plan change does not adequately address wastewater management.</li> <li>Coastal bird taonga and outstanding natural landscape – submitter considers that these matters are not satisfactorily addressed.</li> <li>Traffic – submitter is concerned that the increase in will require intersection upgrades, however notes none have been proposed.</li> <li>Mixed use/commercial hub – queries whether another commercial hub is needed given there are three commercial areas already.</li> <li>Housing demand in Mangawhai – the submitter queries whether the current level of growth will continue, necessitating additional lots.</li> </ul>	N	N
Hugh Benn	37	37.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 as notified, or with amendments within scope.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 supports the inclusion of the structure plan.</li> <li>Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai’s growth. They particularly support the 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.</li> <li>Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on</li> </ul>	Y	Y

# Ecology Submissions

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
							Urban Development and 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.		
Paul Brown	FS6	FS6.3	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge.	The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.  They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area.	Y	Y
Kathleen McInerney	38	38.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety	The submitter opposes the proposed Plan Change due to concern related to the pressure on existing infrastructure such as wastewater and schools. Additionally, the submitter notes concern with ecological values being compromised.	N	N
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 sets out a number of reasons for their opposition of the Plan Change: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stormwater - The submitter is concerned that a high level of impermeable surfaces will result in stormwater runoff into the estuary</li> <li>Wastewater management – the submitter is concerned that the existing wastewater system is not fit for purpose and is already over capacity.</li> <li>Ecology – the submitter considers that ecological values are at risk and have not been properly considered, in particular bird species such as the New Zealand Fairy Tern.</li> </ul>	Y	N
Derek Westwood	FS2	FS2.2	Stormwater	Stormwater	Support	That mitigation measures ensure runoff is managed and hydrological neutrality enforced	The further submitter supports the submission point that highlights concerns about increased impervious coverage and runoff risk to estuary.	Y	Y
Rosemarie Dunning	44	44.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose		The submitter details the following reasons for not supporting the plan change: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant alteration to current zoning – the submitter notes that the proposed district plan identifies the area to be rural lifestyle and is concerned that the plan change is seeking to change the zone before the PDP has been implemented.</li> <li>Housing – the submitter considers that PPC83 and PPC84 are sufficient in terms of aligning with outcomes sought by the NPSUD.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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 for Tara iti.</li> </ul>	Y	N

# Ecology Submissions

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"> <li>Mixed use and commercial hub – the submitter considers that Mangawhai does not need a ‘fourth’ hub.</li> </ul>		
Timothy Scott	45	45.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 as notified.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 supports the inclusion of the structure plan.</li> <li>Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai’s growth. They particularly support the 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.</li> <li>Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and 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.</li> </ul>	Y	Y
Paul Brown	FS6	FS6.4	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge.	<p>The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.</p> <p>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area.</p>	Y	Y
Tern Point Recreation and Conservation Society Inc	46	46.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons for their opposition of PPC85, as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>NPS HPL – the submitter considers that rezoning the proposed development area under PPC85 is contrary to the intended limitations of the Spatial Plan, noting that the land is identified as LUC-3 in the Spatial Plan.</li> <li>Proposed district plan –</li> </ul>	Y	N

Ecology Submissions

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"> <li>- the submitter notes that the Proposed District Plan does not identify the proposed development area under PPC85 for urban development and does not recommend rezoning the land.</li> <li>- the submitter considers that allowing PPC85 would be contrary to KDC's approach in terms of strategic planning. Additionally the submitter considers that the PPC85 would not be consistent with objectives and policies within the NZCPS.</li> <li>• Environmental and guardianship issues – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The submitter notes that the current and proposed rules limiting development in this area provide greater protection of fauna</li> <li>- the submitter is concerned that the proposed plan change will result in environmental issues.</li> <li>- The submitter is concerned that the proposed development will result in an influx of domestic cats, which could threaten the Fairy Tern habitat.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Infrastructure issues – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The submitter notes that the RMA is defines 'effect' and that where there is uncertainty and potential for serious or adverse harm, a precautionary approach is the default. The submitter considers that the campground being connected to the septic system is not justification for new residential development.</li> <li>- the submitter also notes their concern as to who costs will fall to with respect to infrastructure.</li> <li>- the submitter is concerned that the existing infrastructure, inclusive of roading and schools, cannot cope with the proposed level of development.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
Derek Westwood	FS2	FS2.7	General	Flooding	Oppose	That ecological safeguards be adopted as conditions, not reasons to reject PPC85	The further submitter opposes the submissions opposition to PC85 on ecological/infrastructure grounds. Overlaps with flood concerns but takes rejection stance.	Y	Y
AJ and MJ Eaves Family Trust	47	47.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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 supports the inclusion of the structure plan.</li> <li>• Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth. They particularly support the 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.</li> </ul>	N	Y

# Ecology Submissions

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"> <li>Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and 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.</li> </ul>		
Paul Brown	FS6	FS6.5	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge.	<p>The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.</p> <p>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area.</p>	Y	Y
Darren and Kim Hughes	49	49.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 supports the inclusion of the structure plan.</li> <li>Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai’s growth. They particularly support the 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.</li> <li>Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and 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.</li> </ul>	Y	Y
Paul Brown	FS7	FS7.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge.	<p>The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.</p> <p>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area.</p>	Y	Y
Gavin Brannigan	50	50.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	Y	Y

# Ecology Submissions

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>conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also supports the inclusion of the structure plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai’s growth. They particularly support the 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.</li> <li>Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and 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.</li> </ul>		
Paul Brown	FS7	FS7.2	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge.	<p>The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.</p> <p>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area.</p>	Y	Y
Jennifer Anne Readman and Mark Elliot Readman	51	51.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 supports the inclusion of the structure plan.</li> <li>Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai’s growth. They particularly support the 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.</li> <li>Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Northland Regional Policy Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets</li> </ul>	Y	Y

# Ecology Submissions

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
							the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan.		
Paul Brown	FS7	FS7.3	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge.	<p>The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.</p> <p>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area.</p>	Y	Y
Joshua Membrey and Dorothy Nacewa o	52	52.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 supports the inclusion of the structure plan.</li> <li>Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai’s growth. They particularly support the 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.</li> <li>Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and 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.</li> </ul>	Y	Y
Paul Brown	FS7	FS7.4	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge.	<p>The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.</p> <p>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area.</p>	Y	Y
Lance Vale	53	53.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 supports the inclusion of the structure plan.</li> <li>Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential</li> </ul>	Y	Y

# Ecology Submissions

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>environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth. They particularly support the 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"> <li>Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and 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.</li> </ul>		
Paul Brown	FS7	FS7.5	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge.	<p>The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.</p> <p>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area.</p>	Y	Y
Mark and Jacqui Scheib	54	54.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 supports the inclusion of the structure plan.</li> <li>Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth. They particularly support the 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.</li> <li>Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and 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.</li> </ul>	Y	Y
Paul Brown	FS8	FS8.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge.	The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.	Y	Y

# Ecology Submissions

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
							They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area.		
Heather Rogan and Dianne Piesse on behalf of the New Zealand Fairy Tern Trust	58	58.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety.	<p>The submitter is opposed to the plan change for a number of reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spatial plan - The proposed plan change is not consistent with the Spatial Plan, as it does not anticipate residential development to the east of the estuary.</li> <li>Proposed district plan – the proposed plan change is not consistent with the proposed district plan.</li> <li>That PPC85 will enable development activities that could potentially threaten the ecology of the Estuary and potentially degrade the water quality of the estuary.</li> <li>That PPC85 will result in additional infrastructure being required, including wastewater, roading, stormwater and sea defences.</li> <li>Ecology values –the plan change will result in disturbing flora and fauna through increased development resulting in negative effects on water quality, and bird species such as the Fairy Tern. The proposed development will result in adverse effects from construction noise and vibration which could disturb breeding, nesting and feeding areas.</li> </ul>	Y	Y
Mangawhai Matters Incorporated	FS1	FS1.19	Ecology	PC85 in its entirety	Support	Allow the submission relief	The further submitter supports the submission point highlighting that PC85 will adversely affect the habitats of native birds – particularly the Fairy Tern.		
Derek Westwood	FS2	FS2.9	General	Flooding	Oppose	That biodiversity safeguards be combined with stormwater neutrality conditions to allow balanced development.	The further submitter opposes the submissions focus on the Fairy Tern habitat risks. While a valid concern it does not address downstream flooding.	Y	Y
Wild Property Group	59	59.1	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 for their support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 supports the inclusion of the structure plan.</li> <li>Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai’s growth. They particularly support the 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.</li> <li>Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on</li> </ul>	Y	Y

# Ecology Submissions

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
							Urban Development and 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.		
Paul Brown	FS8	FS8.2	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge.	The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.  They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area.	Y	Y
Samuel Wilson	61	61.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.	The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 supports the inclusion of the structure plan.</li> <li>Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai’s growth. They particularly support the 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.</li> <li>Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and 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.</li> </ul>	Y	Y
Paul Brown	FS8	FS8.3	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge.	The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.  They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area.	Y	Y
Pamala and Allen Collenge	62	62.2	Ecology	DEV XPA4 - Biodiversity and Ecological Values Section E	Oppose	Amend the policy to enable existing landowners to have cats in perpetuity.	The submitter considers that property owners do not agree with the restriction on having cats when property owners already have cats.		
Pamala and Allen Collenge	62	62.14	Esplanade and reserves	DEV XSAUB S3 2 and DEV XSAUB S3 1 a & d  Esplanade and Other Reserve Enhancement	Oppose	Amend.	The submitter seeks to change the pest and weed control timeframe from 6 months to 5 years by the developer and then in perpetuity by the council.		

## Ecology Submissions

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
							The submitter opposes the proposed footpath between their boundary and the estuary. They consider it will adversely affect ecological values and their privacy and security. They also do not consider it necessary for a path to be on both sides of the watercourse.		
Paul Brown	FS4	FS4.1	Esplanades and reserves	DEV XSAUB S3 2 and DEV XSAUB S3 1 a & d Esplanade and Other Reserve Enhancement	Support	Allow the submission relief	The further submitter supports the submission point to not locate a footpath between their boundary and the estuary.	Y	Y
Eve Nicola Susan	63	63.2	Ecology	DEV XP4 - Biodiversity and Ecological Values Section E	Oppose	Amend the policy to enable existing landowners to have cats in perpetuity.	The submitter considers that property owners do not agree with the restriction on having cats when property owners already have cats.		
Eve Nicola Susan	63	63.14	Esplanade and reserves	DEV XSAUB S3 2 Esplanade and Other Reserve Enhancement	Oppose	Amend.	The submitter seeks to change the pest and weed control timeframe from 6 months to 5 years by the developer and then in perpetuity by the council.		
John Michael Bornhauser	64	64.2	Ecology	DEV XP4 - Biodiversity and Ecological Values Section E	Oppose	Amend the policy to enable existing landowners to have cats in perpetuity.	The submitter considers that property owners do not agree with the restriction on having cats when property owners already have cats.		
John Michael Bornhauser	64	64.14	Esplanade and reserves	DEV XSAUB S3 2 Esplanade and Other Reserve Enhancement	Oppose	Amend.	The submitter seeks to change the pest and weed control timeframe from 6 months to 5 years by the developer and then in perpetuity by the council.		
Heather and Colin Young	66	66.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Decline PPC85 until the outlined issues are properly resolved.	<p>The reasons the submitter does not support the plan change are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schooling and infrastructure – concerns that existing schools are already operating at or near capacity, and there is no local public high school. Lack of clear plan to expand education facilities.</li> <li>Sewerage water quality in Estuary – the submitter notes that the school is not on the Mangawhai sewerage scheme. Concerns with the water quality of the estuary from sewage runoff.</li> <li>Sewerage and wastewater management – questions whether the existing system can cope given historic challenges with wastewater management.</li> <li>Fairy Tern habitat – the plan change will disturb the Fairy Tern habitat through increased noise, humans and domestic animals</li> <li>Public transport deficiency – the lack of reliable public transport options and that the increase in population from the plan change will result in greater reliance on private vehicles.</li> <li>Road Infrastructure and quality – the roads are not equipped to handle the increase in traffic volumes from the plan change and that many of the existing roads are narrow, poorly maintained and lack pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.</li> </ul>	N	Y
Managawhai Matters Incorporated	FS1	FS1.20	Ecology	PC85 in its entirety	Support	Allow the submission relief	The further submitter supports the submission point highlighting that PC85 will adversely affect the habitats of native birds – particularly the Fairy Tern.	Y	Y

# Ecology Submissions

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
Alan Rogers	67	67.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 supports the inclusion of the structure plan.</li> <li>Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai’s growth. They particularly support the 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.</li> <li>Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and 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.</li> </ul>	Y	Y
Paul Brown	FS8	FS8.4	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge.	<p>The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.</p> <p>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area.</p>	Y	Y
David and Glenys Mather	68	68.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety.	<p>The submitter details a number of reasons why they oppose the plan change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The inconsistency with the spatial plan that favours retaining low level development in the area of the Plan Change.</li> <li>The inconsistency with the proposed district plan, given that the PDP does not identify the proposed development area for future residential and commercial development.</li> <li>The upper Mangawhai estuary is a sensitive ecological area and is the breeding ground for endangered birds such as the Fairy Tern. The submitter is concerned that the proposed plan change will result in adverse effects on ecological values, due to intensive recreational use of the upper estuary.</li> <li>The proposed plan change does not provide for sufficient infrastructure that would be required to support a development of this size.</li> </ul>	N	-

# Ecology Submissions

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
Managawhai Matters Incorporated	FS1	FS1.21	Ecology	PC85 in its entirety	Support	Allow the submission relief	The further submitter supports the submission point highlighting that PC85 will adversely affect the habitats of native birds – particularly the Fairy Tern.	Y	Y
Isabelle McDell	69	69.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety.	<p>The submitter details a number of reasons why they oppose the proposed plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change of zoning – the submitter considers that the area as currently zoned is appropriate and does not see why it should be changed now.</li> <li>• Housing – the submitter notes the requirement for Urban Development has already been met by the two previous approved plan changes.</li> <li>• Funding of infrastructure – the submitter is concerned that there is no mechanism for the developer to fund the infrastructure required to support the development. The submitter is concerned that costs will then fall to the ratepayer.</li> <li>• Ecology values – the submitter considers that the rural zone provides a buffer between intensive urban areas on the west of the estuary and the DOC wildlife refuge. The submitter is concerned that the projected increase in residential development will increase predators.</li> </ul>	Y	N
Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert	70	70.2	Ecology	DEV XP4 - Biodiversity and Ecological Values Section E	Oppose	Amend the policy to enable existing landowners to have cats in perpetuity.	The submitter considers that property owners do not agree with the restriction on having cats when property owners already have cats.		
Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert	70	70.14	Esplanade and reserves	DEV XSAUB S3 2 Esplanade and Other Reserve Enhancement	Oppose	Amend.	Submitter seeks to change the pest and weed control timeframe from 6 months to 5 years by the developer and then in perpetuity by the council.		
Abigail and Francis Meagher	71	71.2	Ecology	DEV XP4 - Biodiversity and Ecological Values Section E	Oppose	Amend the policy to enable existing landowners to have cats in perpetuity.	The submitter considers that property owners do not agree with the restriction on having cats when property owners already have cats.		
Abigail and Francis Meagher	71	71.14	Esplanade and reserves	DEV XSAUB S3 2 Esplanade and Other Reserve Enhancement	Oppose	Amend.	The submitter seeks to change the pest and weed control timeframe from 6 months to 5 years by the developer and then in perpetuity by the council.		
Alex Flavell-Johnson	72	72.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons for opposing the proposed plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the plan change will threaten the ecology of Mangawhai, including at risk and threatened species.</li> <li>• That the plan change will put pressure on infrastructure, including roads, wastewater and access to recreational spaces.</li> <li>• That the proposed plan change will result in adverse effects on amenity and natural character of Mangawhai and the estuary.</li> <li>• That the proposed plan change is not consistent with the Spatial Plan or the proposed district plan.</li> <li>• That the development activities close to the boundary of the estuary enabled by the plan change will affect its ability to absorb present and future inundation</li> </ul>	N	Y

# Ecology Submissions

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"> <li>That the plan change will enable development activities that will restrict natural processes and coastal retreat under the predicted sea level rise.</li> <li>That a fourth town centre is not necessary.</li> <li>That the proposed plan change will result in congestion at the main gateway in and out of Mangawhai (Black Swamp Rd, Tomarata Rd, Insley St).</li> <li>That sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand has already been achieved through previous plan changes.</li> </ul>		
Kerry Desmond	73	73.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose in part	<p>The submitter seeks the following requested relief;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce the proportion of low-density residential zoning in favour of a higher ratio of large lot residential to minimize urban encroachment into sensitive habitats.</li> <li>Exclude medium-density residential zoning from the plan entirely, as higher density housing increases human and pet activity near vulnerable sites.</li> <li>Mandate native planting requirements for all new subdivisions, drawing on previous council precedents such as the 4000 m<sup>2</sup> per site with 50% native bush preservation (Council Subdivision Policy, 2016).</li> </ul>	The submitter is concerned that the proposed rezoning of rural land poses a threat to native bird habitats, including the NZ Fairy Tern.	N	Y
		FS1.22	Ecology	PC85 in its entirety	Support	Allow the submission relief	The further submitter supports the submission point highlighting that PC85 will adversely affect the habitats of native birds – particularly the Fairy Tern.	Y	Y
Kerry Desmond	73	73.2	Earthworks	General	Oppose in part	<p>The submitter seeks the requested relief;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement regulations that strictly prohibit raising the land surface above existing levels, in order to prevent exacerbating local flood risk.</li> <li>Require comprehensive sediment control measures to prevent silt and pollutants from entering the estuary during earthworks, such as silt fences and retention ponds, in accordance with best practice guidelines from the NIWA Estuarine Management Manual.</li> </ul>	The submitter notes that the geotechnical reports indicate that 1.2 metres of soil needs to be removed and replaced with hardfill for housing and road construction. The submitter is concerned the large-scale earthworks will increase flood risk to neighbouring properties and result in sediment runoff into the estuary.		
Mangawhai Matters Incorporated	FS1	FS1.12	Earthworks	General	Support	Allow the submission relief	The further submitter supports the submission point highlighting the risk of sediment runoff into the estuary during large-scale earthworks.	Y	Y
Kerry Desmond	73	73.3	Ecology	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks the requested relief;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enact a ban on domestic cats within the development zone, or alternatively, require cat containment policies similar to those implemented in other ecologically sensitive subdivisions.</li> </ul>	The submitter is concerned that domestic cats will threaten endangered native birds, such as the NZ Fairy Tern.		
Janet Hooper	74	74.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose in part	The submitter seeks the following requested relief;	The submitter is concerned that the proposed rezoning of rural land poses a threat to native bird habitats, including the NZ Fairy Tern.	N	Y

# Ecology Submissions

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"> <li>Reduce the proportion of low-density residential zoning in favour of a higher ratio of large lot residential to minimize urban encroachment into sensitive habitats.</li> <li>Exclude medium-density residential zoning from the plan entirely, as higher density housing increases human and pet activity near vulnerable sites.</li> <li>Mandate native planting requirements for all new subdivisions, drawing on previous council precedents such as the 4000 m² per site with 50% native bush preservation (Council Subdivision Policy, 2016).</li> </ul>			
Janet Hooper	74	74.2	Earthworks	General	Oppose in part	<p>The submitter seeks the requested relief;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement regulations that strictly prohibit raising the land surface above existing levels, in order to prevent exacerbating local flood risk.</li> <li>Require comprehensive sediment control measures to prevent silt and pollutants from entering the estuary during earthworks, such as silt fences and retention ponds, in accordance with best practice guidelines from the NIWA Estuarine Management Manual.</li> </ul>	The submitter notes that the geotechnical reports indicate that 1.2 metres of soil needs to be removed and replaced with hardfill for housing and road construction. The submitter is concerned the large-scale earthworks will increase flood risk to neighbouring properties and result in sediment runoff into the estuary.		
Mangawhai Matters Incorporated	FS1	FS1.13	Earthworks	General	Support	Allow the submission relief	The further submitter supports the submission point highlighting the risk of sediment runoff into the estuary during large-scale earthworks.	Y	Y
Janet Hooper	74	74.3	Ecology	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks the requested relief;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enact a ban on domestic cats within the development zone, or alternatively, require cat containment policies similar to those implemented in other ecologically sensitive subdivisions.</li> </ul>	The submitter is concerned that domestic cats will threaten endangered native birds, such as the NZ Fairy Tern.		
Bryce Taylor	75	75.2	Ecology	DEV XP4 - Biodiversity and Ecological Values Section E	Oppose	Amend the policy to enable existing landowners to have cats in perpetuity.	The submitter considers that property owners do not agree with the restriction on having cats when property owners already have cats.		
Bryce Taylor	75	75.14	Esplanade and reserves	DEV XSAUB S3 2 Esplanade and Other Reserve Enhancement	Oppose	Amend.	Submitter seeks to change the pest and weed control timeframe from 6 months to 5 years by the developer and then in perpetuity by the council.		
Bryce Taylor	75	75.19	Ecology	Ecological Features Map	Oppose	Amend.	The submitter references two areas on the map identified on their property as wetland. The submitter notes that this has not been identified on any other map and seeks it be removed.		
Gareth and Sue Jones	76	76.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety	<p>The submitter details a number of reasons why they oppose the proposed plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure – that there is not sufficient infrastructure to support the development, and that Mangawhai sewerage system is already at capacity. Additionally, the submitter is concerned that roading is not sufficient and roads are already congested.</li> </ul>	N	Y

# Ecology Submissions

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"> <li>Environmental impact – that the increased development will lead to further decline in the health of the estuary from increased stormwater runoff.</li> <li>That there is no need for a fourth commercial hub and that an additional hub could lead to commercial closures and empty buildings.</li> <li>That Black Swamp Road is prone to waterlogging and flooding, and questions who will compensate home and business owners should the land flood?</li> <li>The submitter considers the area should remain rural with horticultural and agricultural activities only.</li> <li>The submitter considers that the increase in residential density will increase pressure on infrastructure.</li> </ul>		
Mangawhai Matters Incorporated	FS1	FS1.14	General	PC85 in its entirety	Support	Allow the submission relief	The further submitter supports the submission point highlighting the environmental impact to the estuary from increased stormwater runoff.	Y	Y
Gareth Jones	77	77.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety	<p>The submitter details a number of reasons why they oppose the proposed plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure – that there is not sufficient infrastructure to support the development, and that Mangawhai sewerage system is already at capacity. Additionally, the submitter is concerned that roading is not sufficient and roads are already congested.</li> <li>Environmental impact – that the increased development will lead to further decline in the health of the estuary from increased stormwater runoff.</li> <li>That there is no need for a fourth commercial hub and that an additional hub could lead to commercial closures and empty buildings.</li> <li>That Black Swamp Road is prone to waterlogging and flooding, and questions who will compensate home and business owners should the land flood?</li> <li>The submitter considers the area should remain rural with horticultural and agricultural activities only.</li> <li>The submitter considers that the increase in residential density will increase pressure on infrastructure.</li> </ul>	N	N
Mangawhai Matters Incorporated	FS1	FS1.15	General	PC85 in its entirety	Support	Allow the submission relief	The further submitter supports the submission point highlighting the environmental impact to the estuary from increased stormwater runoff.	Y	Y
Paul Humphries	78	78.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Retain existing zoning	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons why they oppose the plan change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That the plan change will result in fractionization of the development and future growth of Mangawhai and Mangawhai Heads.</li> <li>That the additional development will result in negative effects on the health of Mangawhai estuary, spit and sand dunes.</li> </ul>	N	N

## Ecology Submissions

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"> <li>That the proposed area for development is not consistent with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan.</li> <li>That there is already enough residential development approved with previous plan changes to meet the medium and long term needs of the district.</li> <li>The submitter considers the proposed plan change does not bring any benefits to the community of Mangawhai.</li> </ul>		
Charlotte Boonen	79	79.2	Ecology	DEV XP4 - Biodiversity and Ecological Values Section E	Oppose	Amend the policy to enable existing landowners to have cats in perpetuity.	The submitter considers that property owners do not agree with the restriction on having cats when property owners already have cats.		
Charlotte Boonen	79	79.14	Esplanade and reserves	DEV XSAUB S3 2 Esplanade and Other Reserve Enhancement	Oppose	Amend.	The Submitter seeks to change the pest and weed control timeframe from 6 months to 5 years by the developer and then in perpetuity by the council.		
Sue McKay	80	80.8	Esplanade and reserves	DEV XSAUB S3 2 Esplanade and Other Reserve Enhancement	Oppose	Amend.	Submitter seeks to change the pest and weed control timeframe from 6 months to 5 years by the developer and then in perpetuity by the council.		
Department of Conservation	81	81.1	Ecology	Mangawhai East Plan Change Planning Report: July 2025 (Planning report)	Oppose in part	<p>The submitter seeks the following requested relief;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Undertake additional ecological impact assessment to address the gaps identified in this submission point.</li> <li>Use this information to revise proposed provisions as necessary to give effect to the NZCPS, NPSIB and Northland RPS. This is likely to involve methods to avoid or minimise additional human (and pet) presence along the coast of Mangawhai Estuary and Harbour, in order to minimise disturbance of fauna, particularly birds. Methods of this kind are outlined in the submission points below, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amending the zoning pattern shown in the proposed structure plan, so that land near the coast either remains rural-zoned or is rezoned to rural lifestyle rather than low density residential</li> <li>Provision of public open space away from the coast, to give alternative options for recreation</li> <li>A ban on the keeping of dogs as pets within the plan change area, unless an alternative approach is put forward that can avoid adverse effects on threatened and at-risk wildlife in the Mangawhai Estuary and Harbour, and is supported by an ecological impact assessment</li> <li>Establishment of the walkway alongside the Insley Causeway prior to development of the plan change area, provided that appropriate measures are taken to manage additional access from Mangawhai</li> <li>Revision of proposals to create new/enhanced walking tracks through SNAs and along the coast and estuary</li> <li>Removal of proposals to create new boating access to the harbour and a new route across the harbour</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The submitter considers that neither of the two ecological impact assessments adequately assess the implications of the rezoning and associated development beyond the boundaries of the plan change area.</p> <p>Additionally, the submitter considers that there is insufficient field work to detect lizards or bats, and insufficient work to define the location and use of threatened birds.</p>	Y	Y

## Ecology Submissions

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
						- Setback of buildings, structures, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance from the coast.			
Cabra Mangawhai Limited and Pro Land Matters Company	FS11	FS11.1	Ecology	Mangawhai East Plan Change Planning Report: July 2025 (Planning report)	Oppose	Do not require further ecological assessments.	The further submitter opposes the submission point to require further ecological assessments.	Y	
Department of Conservation	81	81.2	Ecology	Structure plan - Reference to 'potential future harbour access', and depiction of crossing route from this harbour access to Moir Street, Mangawhai	Oppose	Amend the Structure Plan to remove: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the reference to and depiction of 'potential future harbour access', and</li> <li>the depiction of crossing route from this new access to Moir Street, Mangawhai</li> </ul>	The submitter is concerned that the proposed harbour access from Raymond Bull Road, and the crossing route will result in disturbance to wildlife, inclusive of shorebirds and therefore the proposed access and crossing are not supported.		
Department of Conservation	81	81.3	Ecology	Structure plan – zoning of land adjacent to the coast	Oppose in part	Amend the zoning pattern in the Structure Plan so that land adjacent to the coast either remains rural-zoned or is rezoned to rural lifestyle rather than low density residential. The zoning pattern should be informed by the additional ecological impact assessment requested in the submission point above.	The submitter considers that the proposed areas to be rezoned low density residential should remain in the rural zone, or be rezoned rural lifestyle as they are concerned the low density residential could impact on shorebirds and the harbour environment.		
Cabra Mangawhai Limited and Pro Land Matters Company	FS11	FS11.2	Ecology	Zoning	Oppose	Retain the proposed zoning.	The further submitter opposes the submission point relating to the proposed zoning and sets out that the proposed provisions require an assessment to deliver ecological protection identified in the Mangawhai East Structure Plan.	Y	
Department of Conservation	81	81.4	Ecology	Structure plan - Proposed location of public walkways along the coast and the banks of the estuary	Oppose in part	Amend the Structure Plan as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify the relative location of the walkways and the planted buffers</li> <li>Remove proposed walkway traversing the saltmarsh, "natural inland wetland D"</li> <li>Any new walkways should be separated from ecological features by a planted buffer</li> </ul>	The submitter notes it is currently unclear how the proposed walkways will interact with the proposed plant buffers around ecological features. The submitter supports the plant buffers but notes that the structure plan shows the walkway intersecting with the buffer areas. Additionally, the submitter notes that the walkways appear to be proposed across the saltmarsh in the northwest of the site and considers that a walkway in this area could result in potential adverse effects on avifauna.		
Paul Brown	FS4	FS4.3	Ecology	Public walkway	Support	Allow the submission relief	The further submitter supports the submission point related to the proposed walkway noting the sensitive nature of the estuarine environment and the potential for adverse ecological effects.	Y	Y
Department of Conservation	81	81.5	Ecology	Structure plan - Absence of proposed reserves or public open space areas, except for the coastal and estuary reserves	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend the Structure Plan to indicate the location of proposed reserves/public open space areas away from the coast.</li> </ul>	<p>The submitter considers that adequate proposed public open space has not been shown on the structure plan map.</p> <p>The submitter considers it vital that appropriate public open space is provided for residents, as it brings the public into closer contact with wildlife, including tara iti.</p>		

# Ecology Submissions

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
Department of Conservation	81	81.6	Ecology	Structure plan - Proposed walkway alongside the Insley Causeway	Support	The proposed walkway alongside the Insley Causeway is established prior to subdivision and development of the plan change area, provided that appropriate measures are taken to manage additional access from Mangawhai.	The submitter notes that whilst the walkway is outside of the proposed plan change area, it should be established prior to development, to reduce disturbance of harbour wildlife.		
Department of Conservation	81	81.7	Ecology	Planning maps - Proposed "Northern SNA area" and "Southern SNA area" shown on the final planning map in Appendix 2 to the Planning report	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>retain proposed Northern and Southern SNAs</li> <li>amend the Structure Plan to include the SNAs</li> <li>amend the development area provisions to directly refer to SNAs</li> </ul>	The submitter notes the planning maps provided with the application show two SNA areas, however they are not directly referred to in the Development Area provisions and are not labelled on the structure plan.		
Department of Conservation	81	81.8	Ecology	DEVX-04 Indigenous Biodiversity and Ecological Values	Support in part	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Protect and enhance the ecological and habitat values of the Development Area</p> <p><del>including and of</del> adjacent land <del>and</del> estuarine environments <del>in</del> the coastal marine area <b><u>so that there is at least no net loss and preferably a net gain in indigenous biodiversity values.</u></b></p>	The submitter supports the objective and considers the requested relief will provide better clarity, and give better effect to the NPSIB, NZCPS and the Northland RPS 2016.		
Cabra Mangawhai Limited and Pro Land Matters Company	FS11	FS11.4	Ecology	DEVX-04 Indigenous Biodiversity and Ecological Values	Support	Allow the submission relief.	The further submitter supports the submission point and changes to the Development Area provisions that give effect to the NPS-IB.	Y	
Department of Conservation	81	81.9	Ecology	DEV X-05 Freshwater Management	Support in part	<p>Amend as follows;</p> <p><del>Ensure</del> <b><u>Protect and enhance</u></b> freshwater resources in the Development Area <del>are protected and enhanced</del> <b><u>so that there at least no net loss and preferably a net gain in freshwater values</u></b></p>	The submitter supports the objective with minor amendments for clarity.		
Department of Conservation	81	81.10	Ecology	DEV X-06 Coastal and Erosion Hazards Management	Support	Retain as notified.	The submitter supports the objective, and they consider it gives effect to the RMA and RPS.		
Department of Conservation	81	81.11	Ecology	DEV X-07 Landscape Character and Amenity	Support in part	<p>Either amend this objective and associated Policy DEV X-P5, or add a new objective and policy, to give effect to NZCPS Policies 13 and 14 and RPS Policy 4.6.1, including by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requiring that significant adverse effects on the natural character values of the High Natural Character Areas adjacent to and within the site are avoided, and other adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</li> <li>Providing for restoration or rehabilitation of natural character.</li> </ul>	The submitter notes they are in support of the intent of the objective. However, they seek amendments to give better effects to NZCPS policy 13, as well as RPS policy 4.6.1 and NZCPS policy 14.		

# Ecology Submissions

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>The policy should be designed for use when assessing applications for resource triggered by proposed rules applying in the plan change area, where there are potential effects on the natural character values of the High Natural Character Areas.</p> <p>This would include but not necessarily be limited to the following rules (as amended by submission points in this submission), where applications affect the HNC Areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DEV X-LU-S7 – Setback from natural features (including requested change at the submission point on this rule below, to add a setback from the coast)</li> <li>DEV X-G-R1 – Earthworks (including requested change at the submission point on this rule below, to add a setback of earthworks from the coast)</li> <li>DEV X-G-R2 – Indigenous vegetation clearance (including requested change at the submission point on this rule below, to add a setback of indigenous vegetation clearance from the coast).</li> <li>DEV X-R1 – Effects of subdivision on natural character values.</li> </ul>			
Department of Conservation	81	81.12	Ecology	DEV X-O10 Infrastructure servicing	Support in part	The submitter seeks that evidence is provided to demonstrate that the proposed housing can be serviced with wastewater infrastructure in a way that will not have adverse effects on the harbour.	The submitter considers that insufficient information has been provided on the route of wastewater piping and the impacts of its establishment and use.		
Department of Conservation	81	81.13	Ecology	DEV X-P4 Biodiversity and Ecological Values	Support in part and oppose in part	<p>Amend proposed Policy DEV X-P4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add references to bans on the keeping of mustelids and dogs as pets, at clause e</li> <li>Delete clause b</li> <li>Add references to additional methods to manage potential impacts on harbour wildlife from disturbance caused by human activity and pets, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provision of public open space away from the coast, to give alternative options for recreation</li> <li>setback of buildings, structures, earthworks and vegetation clearance from natural inland wetlands, water bodies and the coast.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Either amend proposed Policy DEV X-P4 or add a new policy to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>give effect to NZCPS Policy 11 and NPSIB policies 7 and 8, in relation to protecting indigenous biodiversity in the coastal environment and indigenous biodiversity within and outside SNAs – with specific reference to the new SNAs proposed for the area, as shown in the planning maps. The submitter notes that giving effect to these higher order provisions will include making</li> </ul>	<p>The submitter considers that to implement the proposed objective, and relevant higher order provisions, it will be vital to manage potential impacts on harbour wildlife from disturbance.</p> <p>The submitter considers that amendments are required to give better effect to the NZCPS policy 11 and NPSIB policies 7 and 8 in relation to protecting indigenous biodiversity. Additionally, the submitter considers that a link to proposed rules that manage the effects of activities on indigenous biodiversity and provide directions as to how activity that require consent under these rules should be assessed.</p> <p>The submitter also considers that clause e of the policy should be amended to refer to the ban on the keeping of mustelids to align with clause i of rule DEV X -R1 subdivision. Additionally, the submitter seeks to amend the clause to include reference to a ban on dogs unless an alternative approach is initiated to avoid adverse effects on the wildlife.</p> <p>The submitter notes that clause b of the policy, with respect to the formation of a walking/cycling track on the esplanade reserve is opposed to the extent that it would result in a new track across the saltmarsh in the northwest of the site.</p>		

# Ecology Submissions

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>clear that adverse effects on taxa listed as threatened, and their habitats, are to be avoided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>link to proposed rules that manage the effects of activities on indigenous biodiversity and provide direction for how activities that require consent under these rules should be assessed. This would include but not necessarily be limited to the following rules (as amended by submission points in this submission):</li> <li>DEV X-LU-S7 – Setback from natural features</li> <li>DEV X-G-R1 – Earthworks (including requested change at the submission point on this rule below, to define “riparian yards”)</li> <li>DEV X-G-R2 – Indigenous vegetation clearance</li> <li>DEV X-R1 – Effects of subdivision on indigenous biodiversity values.</li> </ul>			
Department of Conservation	81	81.14	Landscape values	DEV X-P5 Landscape Character and Amenity	Support in part	Refer submission point 81.11	Refer submission point 81.11		
Department of Conservation	81	81.16	Subdivision	DEV X-P7 Subdivision	Support	Retain as notified	Submitter supports clause 4 and 5 of this policy as they consider it helps to give effect to higher order provisions in relation to management of risk from hazards and protection of indigenous biodiversity.		
Department of Conservation	81	81.18	Natural features	DEV X-LU-S7 – Setbacks from natural features	Support in part	<p>Amend Rule DEV X-LU-S7 (or add a new rule) to add a setback of buildings and structures from the coast. The length of this setback should be informed by the additional ecological impact assessment, requested in this submission.</p> <p>Amend Rule DEV X-LU-S7.2, with respect to the exemptions to setbacks from wetlands, streams, riparian planting, wetland planting and indigenous vegetation, as necessary to address points made elsewhere in this submission regarding the location of proposed walkways – i.e. that walkways should not traverse SNAs, and that any new walkways should be separated from ecological features by a planted buffer.</p>	<p>The submitter notes they generally support as the required setbacks assist in giving effect to higher order documents in relation to protection of waterbodies, wetlands and indigenous biodiversity.</p> <p>The submitter notes that a setback of buildings and structures from the coast should be added to assist in reducing disturbance to harbour wildlife.</p>		
Cabra Mangawhai Limited and Pro Land Matters Company	FS11	FS11.3	Natural features	DEV X-LU-S7 – Setbacks from natural features	Oppose	Retain the rule as proposed.	The further submitter opposes the submission point and makes a point of clarification that the requirement to provide esplanade reserves will generally ensure a setback from the coast greater than the proximity of existing development will be achieved.	Y	
Department of Conservation	81	81.19	Earthworks	DEV X-G-R1 – Earthworks – Excavation and Fill	Support with amendments	<p>Amend rule as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>clarify that “riparian yards” has the following meaning, in line with Rule DEV X-LU-S7:</li> <li>15m from the edge of natural wetlands, intermittent and permanent streams; unless the stream has an average width of 3m or greater in which case the setback shall be 20m.</li> </ul>	<p>The submitter notes that the intent of the rule is supported but notes that the term ‘riparian yards’ is not defined in the proposed plan change documents or in the operative plan.</p> <p>Additionally, the submitter requests the earthworks setback from the coast.</p>		

# Ecology Submissions

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"> <li>- 5m from the edge of riparian planting, wetland planting, and indigenous vegetation.</li> <li>• add a setback of earthworks from the coast. The length of this setback should be informed by the additional ecological impact assessment, requested in this submission.</li> </ul>			
Department of Conservation	81	81.20	Indigenous vegetation clearance	DEV X-G-R2 – Indigenous Vegetation Clearance	Support in part	<p>Amend Rule DEV X-G-R2 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to refer to the new Northern and Southern SNAs proposed in the planning maps</li> <li>• not to permit indigenous vegetation clearance in SNAs where clause b is met; the only exemptions to requirement for consent for indigenous vegetation clearance in SNAs should be the activities listed at clause c</li> <li>• to remove the exemption for consent requirement for indigenous vegetation clearance for the purpose of formation of walking tracks in SNAs</li> <li>• to reduce permitted width of clearance of indigenous vegetation on either side of an existing or new fence, and</li> <li>• to add a required setback of indigenous vegetation clearance from the coast</li> </ul> <p>– the length of this setback should be informed by the additional ecological impact assessment, requested in this submission.</p>	The submitter considers that the requested relief would better give effects to relevant higher order documents, and the rule should be amended to specifically refer to the new Northern and Southern SNAs proposed in the planning maps.		
Department of Conservation	81	81.22	Lighting	DEV X-G-R7 – Lighting	Support in part	<p>Amend clause 2 to add new matters of discretion;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects on natural character values of the Mangawhai High Natural Character Areas</li> <li>• Effects on indigenous biodiversity values, including the values of the Northern and Southern Significant Natural Areas</li> </ul>	The submitter notes that lighting has the potential to cause adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity and natural character. The submitter seeks the requested relief give effect to higher order documents and to the proposed objectives of the plan change.		
Department of Conservation	81	81.25	Esplanade	DEV X-SUB-S3 Esplanade and other reserve enhancement	Support in part	<p>Revise provisions relating to the construction of a pathway to facilitate public walking access on the existing coastal esplanade reserve and the proposed estuary esplanade reserve, in the light of additional ecological impact assessment requested in this submission.</p> <p>Amend clause 2 to remove the reference to a minimum period of 6 months for weed and pest control. Provisions should be drafted to ensure ongoing weed and pest control.</p>	<p>The submitter considers that a walkway area across the saltmarsh in the northwest of the site may result in adverse effects on avifauna via human disturbance.</p> <p>The submitter supports the proposed signage relating to keeping dogs on leads however the submitter is concerned that new or upgraded cycling access along the coast and estuary could lead to increased human and pet activity that could disturb wildlife.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposals for weed and pest control are generally supported, however the submitter considers that the proposed 6-month duration is insufficient, and that weed and pest control is needed in perpetuity.</p>		
Paul Brown	FS4	FS4.4	Esplanade	DEV X-SUB-S3 Esplanade and other reserve enhancement	Oppose	Do not enable a walkway in the estuarine environment	The further submitter opposes the submission point related to the proposed walkway noting the sensitive nature of the estuarine environment and the potential for adverse ecological effects.	Y	Y

# Ecology Submissions

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
Department of Conservation	81	81.26	Subdivision and development	DEVX-REQ2 Subdivision or Development that will enable 50 or more residential units or residential unit equivalents in the Development Area	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retain clauses 1.c, 1.e and 1.f as notified, subject to revisions to DEVX-REQ2 and DEVX-REQ4 as necessary to remove duplication.</li> <li>Revise provisions relating to the construction of a pathway to facilitate public walking access on the existing coastal esplanade reserve and the proposed estuary esplanade reserve, in the light of additional ecological impact assessment requested in the submission point above.</li> </ul>	<p>In relation to the reference to “a defined walkway along the coastal esplanade reserve”, at clause 1.d, refer to submission point 87.25</p> <p>The submitter notes they are in support of the requirements contained in clauses 1.c, 1.e and 1.f a.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the content of clauses c - f do not align well with the earlier reference to a “transport assessment and civil engineering design”. The submitter notes there is also some duplication between REQ2 and REQ4.</p>		
Department of Conservation	81	81.27	Ecology	DEVX-REQ4 Ecological Enhancement – Coastal Esplanade and Riparian areas	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retain clauses 1.l, 1.m and 2, subject to revisions to DEVX-REQ2 and DEVXREQ4 as necessary to remove duplication.</li> <li>Revise provisions relating to the upgrade of the coastal esplanade reserve, including the proposed construction of a pathway to facilitate public walking access on the existing coastal esplanade reserve and the proposed estuary esplanade reserve, in the light of additional ecological impact assessment requested in the submission point above.</li> </ul>	<p>In relation to the reference to “a defined walkway along the coastal esplanade reserve”, at clause 1.d, refer to submission point 87.25</p> <p>The submitter supports the requirements contained in clauses 1.l, 1.m and 2.</p> <p>The submitter notes there is some duplication between REQ2 and REQ4.</p>		
Hamish Wright	82	82.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 supports the inclusion of the structure plan.</li> <li>Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai’s growth. They particularly support the 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.</li> <li>Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and 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.</li> </ul>	Y	Y
Paul Brown	FS8	FS8.5	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge.	The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.	Y	Y

# Ecology Submissions

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
							They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area.		
Nick Smith	83	83.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 supports the inclusion of the structure plan.</li> <li>Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai’s growth. They particularly support the 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.</li> <li>Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and 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.</li> </ul>	Y	Y
Paul Brown	FS9	FS9.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge.	<p>The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.</p> <p>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area.</p>	Y	Y
Mark Morgan Kemp	84	84.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 supports the inclusion of the structure plan.</li> <li>Effects on the environment – The submitter considers that the technical reports comprehensively address all potential environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai’s growth. They particularly support the ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area</li> </ul>	Y	Y

# Ecology Submissions

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>undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are acceptable. The submitter finds that the proposal aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and 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.</li> </ul>		
Paul Brown	FS9	FS9.2	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Not enable a walkway on the coastal edge.	<p>The further submitter opposes the submission point to include a public walkway along the coastal edge.</p> <p>They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area.</p>	Y	Y
Jennifer Budelmann	87	87.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons why they oppose the proposed plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intensive urbanisation –the proposed plan change does not align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan and District Plan.</li> <li>Mixed use/commercial hub – queries whether another commercial hub is needed given there are three commercial areas already.</li> <li>Staging of the development – the submitter considers all infrastructure needs to be constructed and operational prior to the first dwellings being built to avoid risk to ratepayers.</li> <li>Wastewater – submitter considers that the proposed plan change does not adequately address wastewater management.</li> <li>Traffic – the submitter is concerned that the proposal will result in an increase in safety issues.</li> <li>Housing demand in Mangawhai – the submitter queries whether the current level of growth will continue, necessitating additional lots.</li> <li>Mangawhai primary school – the submitter notes that the school is nearly at its capacity and is concerned that the proposed development will place pressure on the school.</li> <li>Coastal bird taonga and outstanding natural landscape – submitter considers that these matters are not satisfactorily addressed.</li> </ul>	N	N