

Hazard 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
Martina Tschirky	7	7.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete all PPC85 in its entirety	<p>Submitter is concerned that existing infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional development and considers there are already too many properties for sale.</p> <p>The submitter also notes their concern regarding the location of the land to be rezoned, which is low-lying with some parts in the Tsunami zone. The submitter notes that the land also has a high-water table and does not consider it suitable for intense development.</p> <p>Additional industrial zones are unnecessary.</p>	Y	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"> • Amenity and ecology of the Mangawhai Estuary – submitter agrees with comments from submitter Joel Cayford • Flood Risk – submitter is concerned that the approving the plan change will increase flood risk to future properties. • Additional pressure on amenities and infrastructure of recent plan changes – 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. • 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. • 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. • 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 • 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. 	Y	Y
Peter Nicholas	20	20.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety	<p>The submitter notes a number of reasons as to why they do not support the proposed development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan – the submitter is concerned that the plan change does not align with the direction of the Spatial Plan. 	Y	Y

Hazard 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"> 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. 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. 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. 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. Demand on facilities such as the boat ramp, Mangawhai Heads carpark and road access to the village. 		
Riverside Holiday Park 2007 Limited	32	32.2	General	Structure plan/development area provisions	Support in part	<p>For the balance of the plan change site excluding 41 Blackswamp Road, the submitter seeks the following requested relief:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision for no-complaints covenants within the relevant zone standards that apply to the residential and rural lifestyle zones that adjoin 41 Black Swamp Road (Riverside Holiday Park). Deletion of the ‘Coastal fringe enhancement and public walkway’ from the Structure Plan in Appendix 4. The implementation of pedestrian and cyclist connectivity along Black Swamp Road. The need for implementation of traffic control measures (preferably a roundabout) at the intersection of Black Swamp Road, Tomarata Road, and Insley Street, which should be linked to development thresholds within the Rules and Standards within the Development Area Provisions in Appendix 3. The need for pedestrian and cycling improvements across the Insley Street Bridge, which should be linked to development thresholds within the Rules and Standards within the Development Area Provisions in Appendix 3. 	<p>The submitter identifies a number of concerns with the structure plan and development area provisions as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed Coastal fringe enhancement and public walkway will not have the actual levels of public benefit. Additionally, the submitter is concerned that the practicality and costs have not been fully considered. Submitter queries whether the proposed alignment of the indicative road will provide the most efficient and appropriate mechanism given there appears to be little consideration in respect to upgrades and improvements to Black Swamp Road. Submitter notes there may be a need for traffic improvements, such as a roundabout, at the intersection of Black Swamp Road, Tomarata Road, and Insley Street. Submitter considers that required upgrades should be included in the development rules and triggered once certain development thresholds are met (e.g., number of dwellings or floor area). Submitter considers that the proposed cycleway across the Insley Street bridge requires further detail given the current pedestrian safety risks present. 		

Hazard 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
Derek Westwood	FS2	FS2.5	General	Stormwater	Oppose	That limited weight be given to this submission where it conflicts with flood management requirements	The further submitter opposes the submissions focus on traffic/density while disregarding flooding impacts	Y	Y
Gayle Forster	42	42.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose		<p>The submitter considers that land identified as “O” and “P” (from the Mangawhai Spatial Plan) are close to the estuary and is concerned that the proposed rezoning of these areas and the consequent construction would permanently affect the areas that attract people to Mangawhai.</p> <p>The submitter has traffic concerns.</p> <p>With consideration of area “Q”, the submitter is concerned that the area is highly restrained due the risk of sea level rise, and building on this land would result in an increase in flooding and permanent damage.</p> <p>The submitter considers the Plan Change to be premature.</p>	N	N
Northland Regional Council	43	43.1	Coastal flood hazard	Flood maps		That the land identified as hazard prone in the NRC flood maps to the north-east and coastal estuarine areas of the proposed plan change area is not rezoned for intensive residential development.	The submitter considers that some areas are potentially affected by coastal inundation and subject to flooding during a 1-in-100-year storm event, taking into account projected sea level rise over the next 100 years and that there may be some residual risk. The submitter considers that risk must be avoided through avoiding inappropriate development in 10- and 100-year flood hazard areas and coastal hazard areas.	Y	Y
Black Swamp Limited	48	48.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose in part	<p>The submitter seeks the following amendments;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the PPC85 zoning maps to apply the Low Density Residential Zone to BSL’s land at Black Swamp Road, Mangawhai (Lot 8 DP 565865). Amend the PC85 zoning maps to apply the Mixed Use or Neighbourhood Centre Zone to the land that is subject to the existing KDC land use consent for the brewery (RM210463). Alternatively, a Commercial Zone (COMZ) should be considered for this area, similar to what has been proposed under the Proposed Kaipara District Plan. Consequential relief to the PPC85 provisions as needed to give effect to this submission and to achieve sustainable management. Amend the provisions to integrate the provision of services and access, including subdivision and development to provide for the efficient and effective extension of services and access to all parts of the PPC85 area. Ensure consistency in the application of zoning principles across PPC85 so that sites with equivalent physical suitability are zoned similarly; or Alternative relief with similar effect. 	<p>The submitter requests that their land be rezoned from Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ) to Low Density Residential Zone (LDRZ) because the original flood hazard constraint—used to justify the RLZ—has been addressed through an approved resource consent (AUT.046759) that mitigates the hazard. The submitter considers that rezoning to LDRZ would align with PPC85’s objective to support Mangawhai’s high growth by increasing residential capacity.</p> <p>The submitter also requests the land containing their consented brewery be rezoned to a Mixed Use Zone (MUZ), Neighbourhood Centre Zone (NCZ), or Commercial Zone (COMZ) to reflect its existing lawful use and avoid future compliance issues. They consider that retaining RLZ would reduce development efficiency, underutilise infrastructure, lower housing supply, and ignore site-specific mitigation work already done. Rezoning would enable more housing and better recognise existing land uses.</p>	Y	-
Derek Westwood	FS2	FS2.8	General	Flooding	Oppose	That rezoning not proceed until a catchment-wide stormwater upgrade is secured.	The further submitter opposes the submission to seek rezoning intensification without addressing downstream stormwater. The further submitter considers this risks worsening flooding on Windsor Way.	Y	Y

Hazard 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
Derek Westwood, Thalia Ormerod, David & Fiona Collins, Tomasz Kus, Susan Hoskin, Lynette Nicholson. Kim and Shane Growden	56	56.1	Infrastructure	Stormwater Management Plan	Oppose in part	<p>The submitters seek the following requested relief;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide a site specific hydraulic and hydrologic assessment for the Windsor Way sub catchment, including climate change and blockage scenarios. 2. Demonstrate swale, overland flow and outlet capacity for design AEP events in accordance with GD01 and GD04. 3. Prohibit reliance on infiltration based disposal unless supported by local infiltration testing and mounding analysis or drainage infrastructure. 4. Ensure any ground filling, if proposed is integrated with a coordinated drainage design to prevent ponding or backflow effects on adjoining land. 5. Alternative relief with similar effect. <p>In relation to DEV X-P7, DEV X-LU-S1, DEV X-SUB-S8, DEV X-REQ1</p>	<p>The submitter raises the following concerns with the Stormwater Management Plan;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That there is no site-specific hydraulic analysis • That the proposed development area has high flood and ponding susceptibility presenting a high likelihood of inundation. • That hydraulic neutrality via infiltration is not supported by local geotechnical or hydrogeological testing • That minor filling could obstruct drainage, alter overland flow paths and induce long term peat settlement. <p>The submitter also notes that the council must manage the effects of land use to avoid or mitigate natural hazards.</p>	Y	-
Peter and Barbara Lambert	57	57.1	Rezoning	Zoning	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety.	<p>The submitter is opposed to the rezoning for the following reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land adjoining Black Swamp Road is low lying and therefore unsuitable for housing • The current infrastructure does not support the proposed development area and does not deal with effects from flooding. • That a further town centre is not necessary. 	N	Y
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	60	60.3	Subdivision	Policy DEV X-P7 Subdivision	Support	Retain as notified	The submitter considers that the design and delivery of subdivisions where sites are connected to roads is essential for Fire and Emergency to response efficiently in an emergency.		
Pamala and Allen Collenge	62	62.10	Earthworks	DEV XG R1 1 (f) Excavation and Fill	Oppose	Amend.	The submitter considers that this part of the rule is unclear that earthworks consents can be applied for in the Coastal Hazard Overlay within the Low-Density Residential zone. The submitter considers that earthworks should be allowed/consent required and considers that the NRC rules should be translated into the PPC for this area.		
Eve Nicola Susan	63	63.10	Earthworks	DEV XG R1 1 (f) Excavation and Fill	Oppose	Amend.	The submitter considers that this part of the rule is unclear that earthworks consents can be applied for in the Coastal Hazard Overlay within the Low-Density Residential zone. The submitter considers that earthworks should be allowed/consent required and considers that the NRC rules should be translated into the PPC for this area.		
John Michael Bornhauser	64	64.10	Earthworks	DEV XG R1 1 (f) Excavation and Fill	Oppose	Amend.	The submitter considers that this part of the rule is unclear that earthworks consents can be applied for in the Coastal Hazard Overlay within the Low-Density Residential zone. The submitter considers that earthworks should be allowed/consent required and considers that the NRC rules should be translated into the PPC for this area.		
Marc Kaemper	65	65.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete	The reasons the submitter does not support the plan change are as follows:	Y	Y

Hazard 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"> The proposed plan change is an unnecessary intense development as there are a number of other current developments available. There is no clear solution for wastewater in a flood prone area. The proposed development area was a swamp, and the ground would need to be raised substantially, which could endanger adjoining properties. The increase in traffic could result in an increased risk on traffic safety. 		
Derek Westwood	FS2	FS2.3	Stormwater	Stormwater	Support	That PPC85 conditions require upgrades to wastewater and stormwater networks	The further submitter supports the submission point that highlights flooding and wastewater issues.	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"> Change of zoning – the submitter considers that the area as currently zoned is appropriate and does not see why it should be changed now. Housing – the submitter notes the requirement for Urban Development has already been met by the two previous approved plan changes. 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. 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. 	Y	N
Derek Westwood	FS2	FS2.10	General	Flooding	Oppose	That enforceable conditions, not opposition, address Windsor Way's concerns.	The further submitter opposes the submission as it expresses distrust of developers and is not infrastructure-specific. The submission fails to engage with technical flooding issues.	Y	Y
Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert	70	70.10	Earthworks	DEV XG R1 1 (f) Excavation and Fill	Oppose	Amend.	The submitter considers that this part of the rule is not clear that earthworks consents can be applied for in the Coastal Hazard Overlay within the Low-Density Residential zone. The submitter considers that earthworks should be allowed/consent required and considers that the NRC rules should be translated into the PPC for this area.		
Abigail and Francis Meagher	71	71.10	Earthworks	DEV XG R1 1 (f) Excavation and Fill	Oppose	Amend.	The submitter considers that this part of the rule is not clear that earthworks consents can be applied for in the Coastal Hazard Overlay within the Low-Density Residential zone. The submitter considers that earthworks should be allowed/consent required and considers that the NRC rules should be translated into the PPC for this area.		
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"> That the plan change will threaten the ecology of Mangawhai, including at risk and threatened species. 	N	Y

Hazard 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"> That the plan change will put pressure on infrastructure, including roads, wastewater and access to recreational spaces. That the proposed plan change will result in adverse effects on amenity and natural character of Mangawhai and the estuary. That the proposed plan change is not consistent with the Spatial Plan or the proposed district plan. 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 That the plan change will enable development activities that will restrict natural processes and coastal retreat under the predicted sea level rise. That a fourth town centre is not necessary. 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). That sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand has already been achieved through previous plan changes. 		
Kerry Desmond	73	73.2	Earthworks	General	Oppose in part	<p>The submitter seeks the requested relief;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement regulations that strictly prohibit raising the land surface above existing levels, in order to prevent exacerbating local flood risk. 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. 	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.		
Janet Hooper	74	74.2	Earthworks	General	Oppose in part	<p>The submitter seeks the requested relief;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement regulations that strictly prohibit raising the land surface above existing levels, in order to prevent exacerbating local flood risk. 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. 	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.		
Bryce Taylor	75	75.10	Earthworks	DEV XG R1 1 (f) Excavation and Fill	Oppose	Amend.	The submitter considers that this part of the rule is not clear that earthworks consents can be applied for in the Coastal Hazard Overlay within the Low-Density Residential zone. The submitter considers that earthworks should be allowed/consent required and considers that the NRC rules should be translated into the PPC for this area.		
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"> Infrastructure – that there is not sufficient infrastructure to support the development, and that Mangawhai sewerage 	N	Y

Hazard 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>system is already at capacity. Additionally, the submitter is concerned that roading is not sufficient and roads are already congested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental impact – that the increased development will lead to further decline in the health of the estuary from increased stormwater runoff. That there is no need for a fourth commercial hub and that an additional hub could lead to commercial closures and empty buildings. That Black Swamp Road is prone to waterlogging and flooding, and questions who will compensate home and business owners should the land flood? The submitter considers the area should remain rural with horticultural and agricultural activities only. The submitter considers that the increase in residential density will increase pressure on infrastructure. 		
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"> 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. Environmental impact – that the increased development will lead to further decline in the health of the estuary from increased stormwater runoff. That there is no need for a fourth commercial hub and that an additional hub could lead to commercial closures and empty buildings. That Black Swamp Road is prone to waterlogging and flooding, and questions who will compensate home and business owners should the land flood? The submitter considers the area should remain rural with horticultural and agricultural activities only. The submitter considers that the increase in residential density will increase pressure on infrastructure. 	N	N
Charlotte Boonen	79	79.10	Earthworks	DEV XG R1 1 (f) Excavation and Fill	Oppose	Amend.	<p>The submitter considers that this part of the rule is not clear that earthworks consents can be applied for in the Coastal Hazard Overlay within the Low-Density Residential zone. The submitter considers that earthworks should be allowed/consent required and considers that the NRC rules should be translated into the PPC for this area.</p>		
Department of Conservation	81	81.17	Coastal hazards	DEV X-LU-R7 – Buildings for vulnerable activities in the Coastal Hazard overlay	Support in part	Amend provisions as necessary so that the overlay is referred to consistently as either the “Coastal Hazard overlay” or “Coastal inundation overlay”.	<p>Submitter seeks the amendment to the terminology used for consistency.</p>		