

Planning 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 |
| 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 |
| Martina Tschirky | 7 | 7.2 | Rezoning | New proposed district plan | Oppose | Delete | The submitter considers that the PDP does not accommodate any more development in relation to the proposed plan change and therefore asks KDC to disallow the plan change. | | |
| John Seward | 8 | 8.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 as notified | The submitter considers that the area is much needed for growth in Mangawhai. The submitter notes that the land is predominantly flat which is ideal for housing. | N | Y |
| 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 | Y | Y |

Planning 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>bordered by the sea on one side, and does not have the space, amenities or the infrastructure to cope</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. | | |
| 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"> Incompatible urban intensification – the submitter considers that the proposed plan change contradicts existing planning frameworks, including the spatial plan and the proposed district plan which designate the area as rural/residential. Infrastructure – the submitter considers the development should not proceed until all essential infrastructure, inclusive of roads, footpaths, cycleways, stormwater and wastewater systems are fully built and operational. Wastewater uncertainty – the submitter considers there is no credible plan for managing wastewater for the proposed development. Threat to coastal wildlife and natural landscape – the submitter notes their concern regarding the impacts of the plan change on wildlife and the natural landscape. The submitter notes the School overload – the submitter notes that the primary school is nearing its capacity limits. With no long-term solution proposed, the submitter is concerned that additional residents from the proposed development will place pressure on education resources. Traffic – submitter is concerned that potential increase in vehicle movements could be 7,000 – 8,000 per day and there is no planned intersection upgrade or traffic mitigation measures planned. Commercial hub – submitter notes that there are already three other commercial zones in existence and considers the plan change lacks justification for further commercial infrastructure. Housing demand – the submitter is concerned that the housing demand projections rely heavily on data from the past five years, which has a period of high growth. The submitter queries whether the additional proposed supply of housing is necessary or sustainable. | N | N |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.1 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that PC85 is inconsistent with the Mangawhai Growth Strategy (spatial plan). | Y | Y |
| 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 |

Planning 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 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|----------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Julie Riley | 18 | 18.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 as notified | Submitter considers there is a demand for coastal living opportunities on the eastern side of the estuary. The submitter also considered the proposed development will improve access to the harbour from the eastern side of the village. | N | Y |
| Heath Riley | 19 | 19.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 as notified | Submitter considers there is a demand for coastal living opportunities on the eastern side of the estuary. The submitter also considered the proposed development will improve access to the harbour from the eastern side of the village. | N | N |
| Peter Nicholas | 20 | 20.1 | Rezoning | 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. • 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. | Y | Y |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.2 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that PC85 is inconsistent with the Mangawhai Growth Strategy (spatial plan). | Y | Y |
| Hamish Hoyle | 21 | 21.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain PPC85 as notified | Submitter considers the plan change supports the growth of Mangawhai. | N | Y |
| Jes Magill | 23 | 23.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety | The submitter considers the plan change goes against KDC’s previous assessment of the area – that it should not be built on. The submitter considers the area is ecologically sensitive and that no further development should be allowed. | N | N |

Planning 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 |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|----------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Richard Poole | 24 | 24.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety | <p>The submitter notes the other large developments such as Mangawhai Central, Cove Road and Cullen Road and is concerned that the plan change will place additional pressure on infrastructure and roading.</p> <p>The submitter notes the inconsistency with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan and is concerned that allowing this plan change will set a precedent that KDC will allow unlimited development within the boundaries.</p> <p>The submitter is also concerned on the potential effects on the estuary and birdlife.</p> | N | N |
| Angela Bridson | 25 | 25.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety | <p>The submitter is concerned that the plan change will increase pressure on the harbour with the increased number of dwellings, and that pollution in the harbour will increase from sedimentation and plant removal.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned that existing infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic and waste from the additional housing. The submitter also notes their concern that the sand dunes will lose more sand and therefore the land could be more susceptible to flooding</p> | N | N |
| Kirsti Burns | 26 | 26.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety | The submitter considers PPC85 does not align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan and the proposed district plan. The submitter makes reference to other large developments such as The Hills, The Rise, Mangawhai Central, Jessie Developments and other private approved sections. The submitter considers that there are enough small residential developments already available, and that the area should remain rural in nature. | Y | N |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.3 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that PC85 is inconsistent with the Mangawhai Growth Strategy (spatial plan). | Y | Y |
| 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"> • The plan change is not consistent with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan. • The proposed area of development is close to the beach, sand dunes and estuary and the plan change increases risk to flora and fauna. • The proposed development area is within the tsunami zone and considers it is likely to be affected by sea level rise, resulting in potential insurance problems. • The plan change is inconsistent with the proposed district plan, which does not identify the land as suitable for urban development. The submitter references policy 7 of the NZ Coastal Policy, which requires councils to protect from inappropriate subdivision. • The plan change will create traffic congestion around the entrance to Blackswamp Road. | Y | Y |

Planning 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 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. | | |
| Craig and Deidre Payne | 28 | 28.1 | Rezoning | PPC85 in its entirety | Support | Retain as notified, or with amendments within scope as necessary to ensure a quality environmental outcome as sought through the plan change application. | <p>The submitter considers the plan change will provide Mangawhai with a quality urban environment and considers the plan change is an opportunity to significantly improve public amenity and access and is to be undertaken by a reputable locally owned company.</p> <p>The submitter notes that development and growth in Mangawhai must be offset by well thought out and quality development to ensure ecological protection and to enhance public amenity.</p> | N | Y |
| Vicky and Timothy Andrew | 29 | 29.2 | Zoning | Business neighbourhood and mixed use centre zone, objectives and policies and rules | Oppose | Delete | Submitter considers there is sufficient urban commercial sprawl throughout Mangawhai and therefore the commercial element and associated effects in PC85 is unnecessary. | | |
| Vicky and Timothy Andrew | 29 | 29.3 | Density | DEV XLU R6 - Comprehensively designed residential development | Oppose | Delete rule and its associated objectives and policies | Submitter seeks to delete the rule and associated objectives as they consider that a site size of 350m ² is too small for Mangawhai. The submitter considers that the level of proposed intensification is inappropriate. | | |
| Vicky and Timothy Andrew | 29 | 29.4 | Setbacks | DEV XLU S4 3A Setbacks from internal boundaries | Oppose | Delete rule | The submitter notes that the rule enables townhouse development which they consider to be appropriate for the area. | | |
| Vicky and Timothy Andrew | 30 | 30.1 | Zoning | DEV XSUB S1-1 | Oppose | The medium density residential zone should be changed to a low residential zone. | - | Y | Y |
| Vicky and Timothy Andrew | 30 | 30.4 | Subdivision | DEV X REQ 2 | Support | None-specified | The submitter supports the walkway to the village | | |
| Vicky and Timothy Andrew | 31 | 31.1 | Visitor accommodation | DEV X LU R3 Visitor accommodation | Oppose | Delete rule. | The submitter considers this is not in character with the area of Mangawhai and is not necessary. | Y | Y |
| Vicky and Timothy Andrew | 31 | 31.2 | Commercial activities | DEV X LU R4 | Oppose | Delete rule. | The submitter considers this is not in character with the area of Mangawhai and is not necessary. | | |
| Vicky and Timothy Andrew | 31 | 31.3 | Commercial activities | DEV X LU R6 | Oppose | Delete rule. | The submitter considers this is not in character with the area of Mangawhai and is not necessary. | | |
| Riverside Holiday Park 2007 Limited | 32 | 32.2 | 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 | <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 | | |

Planning 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>lifestyle zones that adjoin 41 Black Swamp Road (Riverside Holiday Park).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>submitter is concerned that the practicality and costs have not been fully considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. | | |
| 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"> • 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. • 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. • 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. | Y | Y |
| Paul Brown | FS6 | FS6.1 | 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 |

Planning 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. | | |
| 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"> 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. 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. 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. | Y | Y |
| 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"> Intensive urbanisation –the proposed plan change does not align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan and District Plan. 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. Wastewater – submitter considers that the proposed plan change does not adequately address wastewater management. Coastal bird taonga and outstanding natural landscape – submitter considers that these matters are not satisfactorily addressed. Traffic – submitter is concerned that the increase in will require intersection upgrades, however notes none have been proposed. | N | N |

Planning 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"> Mixed use/commercial hub – queries whether another commercial hub is needed given there are three commercial areas already. Housing demand in Mangawhai – the submitter queries whether the current level of growth will continue, necessitating additional lots. | | |
| Ed Smyth | 36 | 36.1 | Rezoning | Zoning | Oppose | <p>The submitter seeks the following requested relief;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the PPC85 zoning maps to apply Low Density Residential Zone (LDRZ) to Lot 1 DP 545009, 45 Windsor Way, Mangawhai. Provide consequential relief to the PPC85 provisions as needed to give effect to this submission and to achieve sustainable management. Ensure consistency in the application of zoning principles across PPC85 so that sites with equivalent physical suitability are zoned similarly. Amend provisions to integrate the provision of services and access, including subdivision and development, to enable the efficient and effective extension of infrastructure to all parts of the PPC85 area. Provide alternative relief with similar effect, to ensure the property can achieve the intended residential outcomes consistent with PPC85’s objectives. | <p>The submitter provides a number of reasons supporting their requested relief, as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The flood hazards on their property have been resolved. Zoning their property as LDRZ would be consistent with the approach as set out in the s32 report for PPC85. The Mangawhai Spatial Plan recommends that the proposed development area be zoned as RLZ. That additional provisions are required to ensure sufficient services and access is provided to the area. The submitter considers that the proposed plan change will impose additional restrictions on their property if their relief is not provided. The submitter considers that the proposed plan change will reduce their property’s flexibility and use and PPC85 would not benefit the property. | Y | Y |
| 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"> 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. 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. 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. | Y | Y |

Planning 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 |
|-------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 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 |
| Patrick Fontein | 39 | 39.1 | Rezoning | Zoning | Support | Amend | The submitter supports the overall proposed plan change as it will provide opportunities for the overall growth of Mangawhai and will allow for diversity of property types. The submitter expresses concern at the spread of town centre activities and would prefer a consolidation of town centre activities within Mangawhai Village as opposed to Black Swamp Road. | N | N |
| Arthur and Jocelyn Rutherford | 40 | 40.1 | Rezoning | Zoning map | Support in part | The submitter seeks to remove business zoning. | The submitter supports rezoning the site at 4 and 4A Black Swamp Road to Large Lot residential and Low Density residential. The submitter does not support business zoning along Black Swamp Road | Y | Y |
| Arthur and Jocelyn Rutherford | 40 | 40.2 | Building standards | DEVX-LU-R3 Minor Residential Unit | Oppose | Reduce the maximum GFA of the minor residential unit to 65m². | The submitter considers that a GFA of 90m² is a small dwelling, not a minor residential unit. The submitter considers that a GFA of 65m² would be more appropriate. | | |
| Arthur and Jocelyn Rutherford | 40 | 40.3 | Building standards | DEVX-LU-S4 Setback from internal boundaries | Support in part | Amend as follows: 2(b) Where a building or structure is located directly adjacent to Lot 2 DP 392239, or subsequent legal description, then a no build landscaped setback shall be 8m minimum and the exceptions below do not apply. This area shall include a bund to redirect stormwater runoff from development to the road. | The submitter considers that this standard shall apply to buildings and/or structures that are directly adjacent to Lot 2 DP 392239 and that the landscaped area should not contain services to avoid disturbance in the future. | | |
| Arthur and Jocelyn Rutherford | 40 | 40.4 | Building standards | DEVX-LU-S1 Site Coverage | Oppose | Submitter seeks to amend the standard as follows (if it is retained); <u>Low Density Residential</u> <u>Building coverage – 25%</u> <u>Impervious surface – 40%</u> <u>Large Lot Residential</u> <u>Building coverage – 25%</u> <u>Impervious surface – 35%</u> | The submitter considers that site coverage between different residential zones needs to be clearly outlined. The submitter notes that as currently drafted, 45% building coverage is permitted and considers that the site coverage should be lower to better reflect the intended character of the zone. | | |
| Arthur and Jocelyn Rutherford | 40 | 40.7 | Density | DEVX-SUB-S1 Density / Minimum Site Size | Oppose | Amend the standard as follows: (...) <div> <div>Large lot residential zone</div> <div> <div>Large Lot Residential zone</div> <div>a. 1,000m² when connected to a</div> </div> </div> | The submitter considers that LLR zone should have a minimum site area of 2000m² and considers 1000m² is not appropriate for this zone. | | |

Planning 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 |
|-------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|----------|---|--------------------------------|---|---|--|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | | | | reticulated wastewater Network. 2,000m ² where a connection to the Reticulated Wastewater network is not available | | | | |
| | | | | | | (...) | | | | | |
| Arthur and Jocelyn Rutherford | 40 | 40.8 | Density | DEVX-SUB-S1 Density / Minimum Site Size Low Density Residential zone 750m ² | Support | Retain as notified. | | | The submitter supports the proposed density for the Low Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Arthur and Jocelyn Rutherford | 40 | 40.9 | Density | DEVX-SUB-S1 Density / Minimum Site Size Medium Density Residential zone 350m ² | Oppose | Remove reference to 350m ² and comprehensive developments. | | | The submitter considers that the proposed density for the Medium Density Residential zone is not appropriate. | | |
| 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 |
| Rosemarie Dunning | 44 | 44.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | | | | <p>The submitter details the following reasons for not supporting the plan change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant alteration to current zoning – the submitter notes that the proposed district plan identifies the area to be rural lifestyle and is concerned that the plan change is seeking to change the zone before the PDP has been implemented. Housing – the submitter considers that PPC83 and PPC84 are sufficient in terms of aligning with outcomes sought by the NPSUD. Infrastructure – the submitter is concerned that the 900 proposed sections will not be able to be accommodated by the existing infrastructure, including wastewater, stormwater and roading. | Y | N |

Planning 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"> 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. Mixed use and commercial hub – the submitter considers that Mangawhai does not need a ‘fourth’ hub. | | |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.4 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that PC85 is inconsistent with the Mangawhai Growth Strategy (spatial plan). | Y | Y |
| Derek Westwood | FS2 | FS2.6 | General | Infrastructure | Oppose | That infrastructure based solutions are prioritised rather than outright rejection. | The further submitter opposes the submissions claims that there is no demand for housing and that is an unsuitable location. | Y | Y |
| 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"> 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. 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. 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. | 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"> 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. | Y | N |

Planning 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"> Spatial Plan – the submitter notes that the spatial plan discourages rezoning the proposed development area for further intensified development and noted a number of reasons as to why the proposed plan change does not align with the Spatial Plan. NPS HPL – 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. Proposed district plan – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. Environmental and guardianship issues – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter notes that the current and proposed rules limiting development in this area provide greater protection of fauna the submitter is concerned that the proposed plan change will result in environmental issues. The submitter is concerned that the proposed development will result in an influx of domestic cats, which could threaten the Fairy Tern habitat. Infrastructure issues – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. the submitter also notes their concern as to who costs will fall to with respect to infrastructure. the submitter is concerned that the existing infrastructure, inclusive of roading and schools, cannot cope with the proposed level of development. | | |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.5 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that PC85 is inconsistent with the Mangawhai Growth Strategy (spatial plan). | Y | Y |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.8 | General | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that PC85 is inconsistent with the Proposed District Plan. | | |
| 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"> 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 | N | Y |

Planning 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"> 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. 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. | | |
| 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 |
| 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 | - |

Planning 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 | FS2.8 | 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 |
| Neil & Raewyn Cullen | FS3 | FS3.1 | Rezoning | Zoning | Oppose | Disallow the submission relief sought | The further submitter opposes the submission to seek rezoning their land from RLZ to LDRZ due to the increase in use of Windsor Way and the effect this will have on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing local residents Wildlife The country feel of the area | N | Y |
| Neil & Raewyn Cullen | FS3 | FS3.2 | Rezoning | Zoning | Oppose | Disallow the submission relief sought | The further submitter opposes the submission to seek rezoning some land to MUZ, NCZ or COMZ due to the effect on traffic and noise. | N | 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. | The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also supports the inclusion of the structure plan. 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. 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. | Y | Y |
| Paul Brown | FS7 | FS7.1 | 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. They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area. | Y | Y |
| Gavin Brannigan | 50 | 50.1 | General | 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; | Y | Y |

Planning 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"> 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. 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. 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. | | |
| 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"> 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. 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. 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 | Y | Y |

Planning 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 |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets 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"> 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. 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. 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. | 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"> 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. | Y | Y |

Planning 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"> 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. 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. | | |
| 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"> 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. 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. 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. | Y | Y |

Planning 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 |
|---|------------------|--------------------|----------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 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. They support the provision of public amenities elsewhere in the PC area. | Y | Y |
| 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. | The submitter is opposed to the plan change for a number of reasons; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Proposed district plan – the proposed plan change is not consistent with the proposed district plan. That PPC85 will enable development activities that could potentially threaten the ecology of the Estuary and potentially degrade the water quality of the estuary. That PPC85 will result in additional infrastructure being required, including wastewater, roading, stormwater and sea defences. 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. | Y | Y |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.9 | General | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that PC85 is inconsistent with the Proposed District Plan. | 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. | The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development area provisions – the submitter considers that the development area provisions, including objectives and policies will ensure that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with urban development as it occurs. The submitter also supports the inclusion of the structure plan. 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. 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 | Y | Y |

Planning 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 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | | | | 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 |
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.4 | Buildings | DEV X-LU-R1 Buildings, accessory buildings and structures | Support in part | Amend as follows: DEV X-LU-R1 Buildings, accessory buildings and structures 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: The construction, alteration, addition to, or demolition of any building, accessory building, or structure that complies with: ... <u>m. DEVX-SUB-S7 Water Supply</u> or to similar effect | The submitter considers that the requested relief would give better effect to Objective DEV X – O10 and DEV X -P6 which applies to all developments. | | |
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.5 | Buildings | DEV X-LU-R2 Residential unit | Support | Retain as notified | The submitter supports DEV X-LU-R2 to the extent that it requires residential units to comply with: • xiv. DEVX-G-S3 Vehicle Crossings • xvi. DEVX-SUB-S6 Roads, accessways, pedestrian walkways and cycleways • xvii. DEVX-SUB-S7 Water Supply | | |
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.6 | Buildings | DEV X-LU-R1 Buildings and accessory buildings | Support in part | Amend as follows: DEV X-LU-R1 Buildings and accessory buildings 1. Activity Status: Restricted discretionary Where: The construction of any building, accessory building, or structure that complies with DEV XLU-R1: <u>a. DEVX-SUB-S7 Water Supply</u> | The submitter seeks that new buildings within the Business Neighbourhood Centre and Business Mixed Use Zone are assessed as a restricted discretionary activity if compliance can be achieved with DEVX—SUB-S7 so that buildings can be adequately provided with a firefighting water supply. | | |
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.7 | Visitor accommodation | DEV X -LU-R3 Visitor Accommodation | Support | Retain as notified | Submitter supports that the rule includes a matter of discretion which relates to firefighting water supply. | | |
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.8 | Commercial | DEV X-LU-R4 Commercial Activities, Educational Facilities, | Support | Retain as notified | Submitter supports that the rule includes a matter of discretion which relates to firefighting water supply. | | |

Planning 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 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | Care Centres and Community Facilities | | | | | |
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.9 | Fencing and landscaping | DEV X-LU-S6 Fencing and Landscaping | Support in part | Clarify what “soft” landscaping is in relation to this standard. | Submitter notes that it is important for water tanks, which may be used for firefighting purposes, should not be screened with ‘soft’ landscaping that may inhibit access to tank couplings in a fire emergency. | | |
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.10 | Service connections | DEV X-LU-S12 Service Connections | Oppose | Clarify the application and relevance of this standard as it relates to firefighting water supply provision. Define ‘occupied buildings’. | The submitter notes that the standard does not appear to have been applied to any rules in PPC85 and seeks clarification as to its application. Additionally, the submitter notes that the table 1.2 is unclear as to whether the volumes stated account for firefighting water supply, and notes that there is no specification that firefighting capacity must be maintained at all times. The submitter also notes that the term “occupied buildings” is not defined in the ODP and considers that a definition would provide further clarity. | | |
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand | 60 | 60.17 | | Table DEV X Table 1.2 Required Tank Volumes for Onsite Residential Water Supply | Oppose | Clarify intent and application of this table. | The submitter considers it is unclear whether these volumes account for firefighting water supply capacity, and notes that if it does it needs to specify how much water storage must be maintained at all times for firefighting water use. | | |
| 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"> 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. 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. 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. | 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. | Y | Y |

Planning 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. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.3 | Zoning | Business Neighbourhood and Mixed Use Centre Zone, Objectives and Policies and Rules | Oppose | Delete | The submitter notes that Mangawhai has a number of commercial and business areas already which has created urban sprawl throughout Mangawhai and Mangawhai Heads. The submitter considers that another commercial area will potentially emphasise the ad hoc commercial sprawl through the area and it will result in adverse amenity effects. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.4 | Home businesses | DEV-XLU R4 - Home Business | Oppose | Amend the rule to allow existing businesses by the existing landowners that currently operate from home to continue; and To allow existing landowners to undertake home businesses at their discretion with having to comply with this rule | The submitter notes that they run a home business that would not comply with the rule. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.5 | Residential development | DEV - XLU - R6 - Comprehensively designed residential development | Oppose | Delete rule and associated objectives and policies. | The submitter considers that 350m ² is too small for Mangawhai, and that the level of proposed intensification is not appropriate and not consistent with the character or amenity values of the township. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.6 | General rules | DEV- XLU- R8 - Any Activity Not Otherwise Provided for | Oppose | Delete or amend this rule. | The submitter is concerned that resource consent will be required to undertake agricultural activities in the Low-Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.7 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and Policies | Oppose | Add in an objective and policy related to reverse sensitivity. | The submitter notes that at present the sites are zoned as rural and land use is rural in nature. The submitter is concerned that neighbouring sites will complain about the rural uses on the site. Therefore, the submitter seeks to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity to avoid complaints from neighbours about adjacent farming. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.8 | Visitor accommodation | DEV-XLU-R3 1(a) Visitor Accommodation | Oppose | Delete rule. | The submitter considers the rule will result in adverse effects from traffic and noise and have adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the area. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.9 | Building standards | DEV XLU s4 3(a) Setbacks from Internal Boundaries | Oppose | Delete standard. | The submitter notes that the standard enables townhouse type development which is not appropriate for the area and will result in adverse effects on character and amenity values. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.11 | Noise | DEV XGR 31(b) Noise | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter is concerned that existing farming activities could trigger this rule and consent could be required. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.12 | Hazardous substances | DEV XGR 5 Hazardous Substances | Oppose. | Amend. | The submitter considers that this rule needs to be amended to ensure existing sites can continue to use and store fertilisers and farm sprays for existing rural uses. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.13 | Building standards | DEV XSUB S1-1 Density / Minimum Site Size and any relevant objectives and policies and other relevant rules | Oppose. | Amend/delete. | The submitter considers that the Medium Density Residential Zone, Low Density Residential Zone, Business Neighbourhood Centre Zone and Business Mixed Use Zone should be Large Lot Residential Zone. | | |

Planning 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 |
|---------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.16 | Subdivision | DEV X REQ 2 Subdivision or Development that will enable 50 or more residential units or residential unit equivalent in the development area | Support in part | None stated. | The submitter supports the walkway to the village. | | |
| Pamala and Allen Collenge | 62 | 62.18 | Visitor accommodation | DEV XLU R5 1 a Home Stay Accommodation | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter considers that home stay accommodation should be enabled in a separate dwelling on site for existing landowners. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.3 | Zoning | Business Neighbourhood and Mixed Use Centre Zone, Objectives and Policies and Rules | Oppose | Delete | The submitter notes that Mangawhai has a number of commercial and business areas already which has created urban sprawl throughout Mangawhai and Mangawhai Heads. The submitter considers that another commercial area will potentially emphasise the ad hoc commercial sprawl through the area and it will result in adverse amenity effects. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.4 | Home businesses | DEV-XLU R4 - Home Business | Oppose | Amend the rule to allow continuation of existing businesses by the existing landowners that currently operate from home to continue; and To allow existing landowners to undertake home businesses at their discretion with having to comply with this rule | The submitter notes that they run a home business, or would like to in the future, that would not comply with the rule. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.5 | Residential development | DEV - XLU - R6 - Comprehensively designed residential development | Oppose | Delete rule and associated objectives and policies. | The submitter considers that 350m ² is too small for Mangawhai, and that the level of proposed intensification is not appropriate and not consistent with the character or amenity values of the township. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.6 | General rules | DEV- XLU- R8 - Any Activity Not Otherwise Provided for | Oppose | Delete or amend this rule. | The submitter is concerned that resource consent will be required to undertake agricultural activities in the Low-Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.7 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and Policies | Oppose | Add in an objective and policy related to reverse sensitivity. | The submitter notes that at present the sites are zoned as rural and land use is rural in nature. The submitter is concerned that neighbouring sites will complain about the rural uses on the site. Therefore, the submitter seeks to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity to avoid complaints from neighbours about adjacent farming. | | |
| Paul Brown | FS4 | FS4.5 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and policies | Support | Allow the submission relief. | The further submitter supports the submission point to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity. | Y | Y |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.8 | Visitor accommodation | DEV-XLU-R3 1(a) Visitor Accommodation | Oppose | Delete rule. | The submitter considers the rule will result in adverse effects from traffic and noise and have adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the area. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.9 | Building standards | DEV XLU s4 3(a) Setbacks from Internal Boundaries | Oppose | Delete standard. | The submitter notes that the standard enables townhouse type development which is not appropriate for the area and will result in adverse effects on character and amenity values. | | |

Planning 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 |
|-------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|--|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.11 | Noise | DEV XGR 31(b) Noise | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter is concerned that existing farming activities could trigger this rule and consent could be required. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.12 | Hazardous substances | DEV XGR 5 Hazardous Substances | Oppose. | Amend. | The submitter considers this rule needs to be amended to ensure that existing sites can continue to use and store fertilisers and farm sprays for existing rural uses. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.13 | Building standards | DEV XSUB S1-1 Density / Minimum Site Size and any relevant objectives and policies and other relevant rules | Oppose. | Amend/delete. | The submitter considers that the Medium Density Residential Zone should be changed to Low Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.16 | Subdivision | DEV X REQ 2 Subdivision or Development that will enable 50 or more residential units or residential unit equivalent in the development area | Support in part | None stated. | The submitter supports the walkway to the village. | | |
| Eve Nicola Susan | 63 | 63.18 | Visitor accommodation | DEV XLU R5 1 a Home Stay Accommodation | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter considers that home stay accommodation should be enabled in a separate dwelling on site for existing landowners. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.3 | Zoning | Business Neighbourhood and Mixed Use Centre Zone, Objectives and Policies and Rules | Oppose | Delete | The submitter notes that Mangawhai has a number of commercial and business areas already which has created urban sprawl throughout Mangawhai and Mangawhai Heads. The submitter considers that another commercial area will potentially emphasise the adhoc commercial sprawl through the area, and therefore result in adverse amenity effects. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.4 | Home businesses | DEV-XLU R4 - Home Business | Oppose | Amend the rule to allow continuation of existing businesses by the existing landowners that currently operate from home to continue; and To allow existing landowners to undertake home businesses at their discretion with having to comply with this rule | The submitter notes that they run a home business, or would like to in the future, that would not comply with the rule. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.5 | Residential development | DEV - XLU - R6 - Comprehensively designed residential development | Oppose | Delete rule and associated objectives and policies. | The submitter considers that 350m ² is too small for Mangawhai, and that the level of proposed intensification is not appropriate and not consistent with the character or amenity values of the township. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.6 | General rules | DEV- XLU- R8 - Any Activity Not Otherwise Provided for | Oppose | Delete or amend this rule. | The submitter is concerned that resource consent will be required to undertake agricultural activities in the Low-Density Residential Zone. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.7 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and Policies | Oppose | Add in an objective and policy related to reverse sensitivity. | The submitter notes that at present the sites are zoned as rural and land use is rural in nature. The submitter is concerned that neighbouring sites will complain about the rural uses on the site. Therefore, the submitter seeks to include an objective and policy to address reverse | | |

Planning 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 |
|-------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|--|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | | | | sensitivity to avoid complaints from neighbours about adjacent farming. | | |
| Paul Brown | FS5 | FS5.1 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and policies | Support | Allow the submission relief. | The further submitter supports the submission point to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity. | Y | Y |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.8 | Visitor accommodation | DEV-XLU-R3 1(a) Visitor Accommodation | Oppose | Delete rule. | The submitter considers the rule will result in adverse effects from traffic and noise and have adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the area. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.9 | Building standards | DEV XLU s4 3(a) Setbacks from Internal Boundaries | Oppose | Delete standard. | The submitter notes that the standard enables townhouse type development which is not appropriate for the area and will result in adverse effects on character and amenity values. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.11 | Noise | DEV XGR 31(b) Noise | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter is concerned that existing farming activities could trigger this rule and consent could be required. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.12 | Hazardous substances | DEV XGR 5 Hazardous Substances | Oppose. | Amend. | The submitter considers this rule needs to be amended to ensure that existing sites can continue to use and store fertilisers and farm sprays for existing rural uses. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.13 | Building standards | DEV XSUB S1-1 Density / Minimum Site Size and any relevant objectives and policies and other relevant rules | Oppose. | Amend/delete. | The submitter considers that the Medium Density Residential Zone should be changed to Low Density Residential Zone. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.16 | Subdivision | DEV X REQ 2 Subdivision or Development that will enable 50 or more residential units or residential unit equivalent in the development area | Support in part | None specified. | The submitter supports the walkway to the village. | | |
| John Michael Bornhauser | 64 | 64.18 | Visitor accommodation | DEV XLU R5 1 a Home Stay Accommodation | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter considers that home stay accommodation should be enabled in a separate dwelling on site for existing landowners. | | |
| Marc Kaemper | 65 | 65.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete | <p>The reasons the submitter does not support the plan change are as follows:</p> <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. | Y | Y |
| Alan Rogers | 67 | 67.1 | General | 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; | Y | Y |

Planning 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"> 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. 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. 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. | | |
| 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"> The inconsistency with the spatial plan that favours retaining low level development in the area of the Plan Change. The inconsistency with the proposed district plan, given that the PDP does not identify the proposed development area for future residential and commercial development. 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. The proposed plan change does not provide for sufficient infrastructure that would be required to support a development of this size. | N | - |
| 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. | Y | N |

Planning 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"> 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. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.3 | Zoning | Business Neighbourhood and Mixed Use Centre Zone, Objectives and Policies and Rules | Oppose | Delete | The submitter notes that Mangawhai has a number of commercial and business areas already which has created urban sprawl throughout Mangawhai and Mangawhai Heads. The submitter considers that another commercial area will potentially emphasise the ad hoc commercial sprawl through the area, and therefore result in adverse amenity effects. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.4 | Home businesses | DEV-XLU R4 - Home Business | Oppose | Amend the rule to allow continuation of existing businesses by the existing landowners that currently operate from home to continue. To allow existing landowners to undertake home businesses at their discretion with having to comply with this rule | The submitter notes that they run a home business, or would like to in the future, that would not comply with the rule. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.5 | Residential development | DEV - XLU - R6 - Comprehensively designed residential development | Oppose | Delete rule and associated objectives and policies. | The submitter considers that 350m ² is too small for Mangawhai, and that the level of proposed intensification is not appropriate and not consistent with the character or amenity values of the township. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.6 | General rules | DEV- XLU- R8 - Any Activity Not Otherwise Provided for | Oppose | Delete or amend this rule. | The submitter is concerned that resource consent will be required to undertake agricultural activities in the Low-Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.7 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and Policies | Oppose | Add in an objective and policy related to reverse sensitivity. | The submitter notes that at present the sites are zoned as rural and land use is rural in nature. The submitter is concerned that neighbouring sites will complain about the rural uses on the site. Therefore, the submitter seeks to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity to avoid complaints from neighbours about adjacent farming. | | |
| Paul Brown | FS5 | FS5.2 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and policies | Support | Allow the submission relief. | The further submitter supports the submission point to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity. | Y | Y |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.8 | Visitor accommodation | DEV-XLU-R3 1(a) Visitor Accommodation | Oppose | Delete rule. | The submitter considers the rule will result in adverse effects from traffic and noise and have adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the area. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.9 | Building standards | DEV XLU s4 3(a) Setbacks from Internal Boundaries | Oppose | Delete standard. | The submitter notes that the standard enables townhouse type development which is not appropriate for the area and will result in adverse effects on character and amenity values. | | |

Planning 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 |
|---------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.11 | Noise | DEV XGR 31(b) Noise | Oppose | Amend. | Submitter is concerned that existing farming activities could trigger this rule and consent could be required. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.12 | Hazardous substances | DEV XGR 5 Hazardous Substances | Oppose. | Amend. | Submitter considers this rule needs to be amended to ensure that existing sites can continue to use and store fertilisers and farm sprays for existing rural uses. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.13 | Building standards | DEV XSUB S1-1 Density / Minimum Site Size and any relevant objectives and policies and other relevant rules | Oppose. | Amend/delete. | The submitter considers that the Medium Density Residential Zone should be changed to Low Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.16 | Subdivision | DEV X REQ 2 Subdivision or Development that will enable 50 or more residential units or residential unit equivalent in the development area | Support in part | None stated. | The submitter supports the walkway to the village. | | |
| Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert | 70 | 70.18 | Visitor accommodation | DEV XLU R5 1 a Home Stay Accommodation | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter considers that home stay accommodation should be enabled in a separate dwelling on site for existing landowners. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.3 | Zoning | Business Neighbourhood and Mixed Use Centre Zone, Objectives and Policies and Rules | Oppose | Delete | The submitter notes that Mangawhai has a number of commercial and business areas already which has created urban sprawl throughout Mangawhai and Mangawhai Heads. The submitter considers that another commercial area will potentially emphasise the ad hoc commercial sprawl through the area, and therefore result in adverse amenity effects. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.4 | Home businesses | DEV-XLU R4 - Home Business | Oppose | Amend the rule to allow continuation of existing businesses by the existing landowners that currently operate from home to continue. To allow existing landowners to undertake home businesses at their discretion with having to comply with this rule | The submitter notes that they run a home business, or would like to in the future, that would not comply with the rule. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.5 | Residential development | DEV - XLU - R6 - Comprehensively designed residential development | Oppose | Delete rule and associated objectives and policies. | The submitter considers that 350m ² is too small for Mangawhai, and that the level of proposed intensification is not appropriate and not consistent with the character or amenity values of the township. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.6 | General rules | DEV- XLU- R8 - Any Activity Not Otherwise Provided for | Oppose | Delete or amend this rule. | The submitter is concerned that resource consent will be required to undertake agricultural activities in the Low-Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.7 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and Policies | Oppose | Add in an objective and policy related to reverse sensitivity. | The submitter notes that at present the sites are zoned as rural and land use is rural in nature. The submitter is concerned that neighbouring sites will complain about the rural uses on the site. Therefore, the | | |

Planning 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 |
|-----------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | | | | submitter seeks to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity to avoid complaints from neighbours about adjacent farming. | | |
| Paul Brown | FS5 | FS5.3 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and policies | Support | Allow the submission relief. | The further submitter supports the submission point to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity. | Y | Y |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.8 | Visitor accommodation | DEV-XLU-R3 1(a) Visitor Accommodation | Oppose | Delete rule. | The submitter considers the rule will result in adverse effects from traffic and noise and have adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the area. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.9 | Building standards | DEV XLU s4 3(a) Setbacks from Internal Boundaries | Oppose | Delete standard. | The submitter notes that the standard enables townhouse type development which is not appropriate for the area and will result in adverse effects on character and amenity values. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.11 | Noise | DEV XGR 31(b) Noise | Oppose | Amend. | Submitter is concerned that existing farming activities could trigger this rule and consent could be required. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.12 | Hazardous substances | DEV XGR 5 Hazardous Substances | Oppose. | Amend. | Submitter considers this rule needs to be amended to ensure that existing sites can continue to use and store fertilisers and farm sprays for existing rural uses. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.13 | Building standards | DEV XSUB S1-1 Density / Minimum Site Size and any relevant objectives and policies and other relevant rules | Oppose. | Amend/delete. | The submitter considers that the Medium Density Residential Zone should be changed to Low Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.16 | Subdivision | DEV X REQ 2 Subdivision or Development that will enable 50 or more residential units or residential unit equivalent in the development area | Support in part | None stated. | The submitter supports the walkway to the village. | | |
| Abigail and Francis Meagher | 71 | 71.18 | Visitor accommodation | DEV XLU R5 1 a Home Stay Accommodation | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter considers that home stay accommodation should be enabled in a separate dwelling on site for existing landowners. | | |
| 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. 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. | N | Y |

Planning 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 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. | | |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.8 | General | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that PC85 is inconsistent with the Proposed District Plan. | Y | Y |
| 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"> 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. Exclude medium-density residential zoning from the plan entirely, as higher density housing increases human and pet activity near vulnerable sites. 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). | 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 |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.11 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that the level of development proposed in PC85 is not supported by the Proposed District Plan. | Y | Y |
| Janet Hooper | 74 | 74.1 | Rezoning | Zoning | Oppose in part | <p>The submitter seeks the following requested relief;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Exclude medium-density residential zoning from the plan entirely, as higher density housing increases human and pet activity near vulnerable sites. 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). | 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 |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.10 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that the level of development proposed in PC85 is not supported by the Proposed District Plan. | Y | Y |

Planning 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 |
|----------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.3 | Zoning | Business Neighbourhood and Mixed Use Centre Zone, Objectives and Policies and Rules | Oppose | Delete | The submitter notes that Mangawhai has a number of commercial and business areas already which has created urban sprawl throughout Mangawhai and Mangawhai Heads. The submitter considers that another commercial area will potentially emphasise the ad hoc commercial sprawl through the area and therefore result in adverse amenity effects. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.4 | Home businesses | DEV-XLU R4 - Home Business | Oppose | Amend the rule to allow continuation of existing businesses by the existing landowners that currently operate from home to continue. | The submitter notes that they run a home business, or would like to in the future, that would not comply with the rule. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.5 | Residential development | DEV - XLU - R6 - Comprehensively designed residential development | Oppose | Delete rule and associated objectives and policies. | The submitter considers that 350m ² is too small for Mangawhai, and that the level of proposed intensification is not appropriate and not consistent with the character or amenity values of the township. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.6 | General rules | DEV- XLU- R8 - Any Activity Not Otherwise Provided for | Oppose | Delete or amend this rule. | The submitter is concerned that resource consent will be required to undertake agricultural activities in the Low-Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.7 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and Policies | Oppose | Add in an objective and policy related to reverse sensitivity. | The submitter notes that at present the sites are zoned as rural and land use is rural in nature. The submitter is concerned that neighbouring sites will complain about the rural uses on the site. Therefore, the submitter seeks to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity to avoid complaints from neighbours about adjacent farming. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.8 | Visitor accommodation | DEV-XLU-R3 1(a) Visitor Accommodation | Oppose | Delete rule. | The submitter considers the rule will result in adverse effects from traffic and noise and have adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the area. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.9 | Building standards | DEV XLU s4 3(a) Setbacks from Internal Boundaries | Oppose | Delete standard. | The submitter notes that the standard enables townhouse type development which is not appropriate for the area and will result in adverse effects on character and amenity values. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.11 | Noise | DEV XGR 31(b) Noise | Oppose | Amend. | Submitter is concerned that existing farming activities could trigger this rule and consent could be required. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.12 | Hazardous substances | DEV XGR 5 Hazardous Substances | Oppose. | Amend. | Submitter considers this rule needs to be amended to ensure that existing sites can continue to use and store fertilisers and farm sprays for existing rural uses. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.13 | Building standards | DEV XSUB S1-1 Density / Minimum Site Size and any relevant objectives and policies and other relevant rules | Oppose. | Amend/delete. | The submitter considers that the Medium Density Residential Zone should be changed to Low Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.16 | Subdivision | DEV X REQ 2 Subdivision or Development that will enable 50 or more residential units or | Support in part | None stated. | The submitter supports the walkway to the village. | | |

Planning 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 |
|----------------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | residential unit equivalent in the development area | | | | | |
| Bryce Taylor | 75 | 75.18 | Visitor accommodation | DEV XLU R5 1 a Home Stay Accommodation | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter considers that home stay accommodation should be enabled in a separate dwelling on site for existing landowners. | | |
| 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 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 | 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"> 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 |

Planning 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 |
|------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 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"> That the plan change will result in fractionization of the development and future growth of Mangawhai and Mangawhai Heads. That the additional development will result in negative effects on the health of Mangawhai estuary, spit and sand dunes. That the proposed area for development is not consistent with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan. That there is already enough residential development approved with previous plan changes to meet the medium and long term needs of the district. The submitter considers the proposed plan change does not bring any benefits to the community of Mangawhai. | N | N |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.3 | Zoning | Business Neighbourhood and Mixed Use Centre Zone, Objectives and Policies and Rules | Oppose | Delete | The submitter notes that Mangawhai has a number of commercial and business areas already which has created urban sprawl throughout Mangawhai and Mangawhai Heads. The submitter considers that another commercial area will potentially emphasise the ad hoc commercial sprawl through the area, and therefore result in adverse amenity effects. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.4 | Home businesses | DEV-XLU R4 - Home Business | Oppose | <p>Amend the rule to allow continuation of existing businesses by the existing landowners that currently operate from home to continue.</p> <p>To allow existing landowners to undertake home businesses at their discretion with having to comply with this rule.</p> | The submitter notes that they run a home business, or would like to in the future, that would not comply with the rule. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.5 | Residential development | DEV - XLU - R6 - Comprehensively designed residential development | Oppose | Delete rule and associated objectives and policies. | The submitter considers that 350m ² is too small for Mangawhai, and that the level of proposed intensification is not appropriate and not consistent with the character or amenity values of the township. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.6 | General rules | DEV- XLU- R8 - Any Activity Not Otherwise Provided for | Oppose | Delete or amend this rule. | The submitter is concerned that resource consent will be required to undertake agricultural activities in the Low-Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.7 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and Policies | Oppose | Add in an objective and policy related to reverse sensitivity. | The submitter notes that at present the sites are zoned as rural and land use is rural in nature. The submitter is concerned that neighbouring sites will complain about the rural uses on the site. Therefore, the submitter seeks to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity to avoid complaints from neighbours about adjacent farming. | | |
| Paul Brown | FS5 | FS5.4 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and policies | Support | Allow the submission relief. | The further submitter supports the submission point to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity. | Y | Y |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.8 | Visitor accommodation | DEV-XLU-R3 1(a) Visitor Accommodation | Oppose | Delete rule. | The submitter considers the rule will result in adverse effects from traffic and noise and have adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the area. | | |

Planning 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 |
|------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.9 | Building standards | DEV XLU s4 3(a) Setbacks from Internal Boundaries | Oppose | Delete standard. | The submitter notes that the standard enables townhouse type development which is not appropriate for the area and will result in adverse effects on character and amenity values. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.11 | Noise | DEV XGR 31(b) Noise | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter is concerned that existing farming activities could trigger this rule and consent could be required. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.12 | Hazardous substances | DEV XGR 5 Hazardous Substances | Oppose. | Amend. | The submitter considers this rule needs to be amended to ensure that existing sites can continue to use and store fertilisers and farm sprays for existing rural uses. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.13 | Building standards | DEV XSUB S1-1 Density / Minimum Site Size and any relevant objectives and policies and other relevant rules | Oppose. | Amend/delete. | The submitter considers that the Medium Density Residential Zone should be changed to Low Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.16 | Subdivision | DEV X REQ 2 Subdivision or Development that will enable 50 or more residential units or residential unit equivalent in the development area | Support in part | None stated. | The submitter supports the walkway to the village. | | |
| Charlotte Boonen | 79 | 79.18 | Visitor accommodation | DEV XLU R5 1 a Home Stay Accommodation | Oppose | Amend. | The submitter considers that home stay accommodation should be enabled in a separate dwelling on site for existing landowners. | | |
| Sue McKay | 80 | 80.2 | Zoning | Business Neighbourhood and Mixed Use Centre Zone, Objectives and Policies and Rules | Oppose | Delete | The submitter notes that Mangawhai has a number of commercial and business areas already which has created urban sprawl throughout Mangawhai and Mangawhai Heads. The submitter considers that another commercial area will potentially emphasise the adhoc commercial sprawl through the area, and therefore result in adverse amenity effects. | | |
| Sue McKay | 80 | 80.3 | Residential development | DEV - XLU - R6 - Comprehensively designed residential development | Oppose | Delete rule and associated objectives and policies. | The submitter considers that 350m ² is too small for Mangawhai, and that the level of proposed intensification is not appropriate and not consistent with the character or amenity values of the township. | | |
| Sue McKay | 80 | 80.4 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and Policies | Oppose | Add in an objective and policy related to reverse sensitivity. | The submitter notes that at present the sites are zoned as rural and land use is rural in nature. The submitter is concerned that neighbouring sites will complain about the rural uses on the site. Therefore, the submitter seeks to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity to avoid complaints from neighbours about adjacent farming. | | |
| Paul Brown | FS5 | FS5.5 | Objectives and policies | Objectives and policies | Support | Allow the submission relief. | The further submitter supports the submission point to include an objective and policy to address reverse sensitivity. | Y | Y |

Planning 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 McKay | 80 | 80.5 | Visitor accommodation | DEV-XLU-R3 1(a) Visitor Accommodation | Oppose | Delete rule. | The submitter considers the rule will result in adverse effects from traffic and noise and have adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the area. | | |
| Sue McKay | 80 | 80.6 | Building standards | DEV XLU s4 3(a) Setbacks from Internal Boundaries | Oppose | Delete standard. | The submitter notes that the standard enables townhouse type development which is not appropriate for the area and will result in adverse effects on character and amenity values. | | |
| Sue McKay | 80 | 80.7 | Building standards | DEV XSUB S1-1 Density / Minimum Site Size and any relevant objectives and policies and other relevant rules | Oppose. | Amend/delete. | The submitter considers that the Medium Density Residential Zone should be changed to Low Density Residential Zone. | | |
| Sue McKay | 80 | 80.9 | Subdivision | DEV X REQ 2 Subdivision or Development that will enable 50 or more residential units or residential unit equivalent in the development area | Support in part | None stated. | The submitter supports the walkway to the village. | | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.21 | Radioactive material | DEV X-G-R6 – Radioactive material | Support in part | Amend clause 2 as follows: 2. Activity status when compliance not achieved: Discretionary <u>Non-complying</u> | The submitter considers that a non-complying activity status more appropriate than discretionary | | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.23 | Earthworks | DEV X-G-S1 Earthworks | Oppose in part | Amend as follows: 2. The maximum height or depth of any cut or fill face shall not exceed 1.5m over a continuous distance of less than <u>more than</u> 50m within a site. | The submitter considers the wording as notified is confusing and results in a meaning that is unintended. | | |
| Department of Conservation | 81 | 81.24 | Subdivision | DEV X-R1 Subdivision | Support in part | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For clause h – see submission point on DEV X-O10, above (refer submission point 87.12). For clause c – see submission point on the Structure Plan, above, regarding the need to clarify the relative location of the walkways and the planted buffers. Retain as notified clauses d and e, and the requirement in clause c for native revegetation planting, to a minimum of 10m from the edge of natural wetlands, intermittent and permanent streams, and indigenous vegetation identified within the Mangawhai East Structure Plan, to be established and protected in perpetuity. Amend clause I to include a ban on the keeping of dogs. Add the following matters of discretion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effects on natural character values of the Mangawhai High Natural Character Areas | <p>The submitter seeks a number of amendments to the rule for the following reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clause h – refer submission point 87.12 - Clause c – refer submission points above - Clauses d and e – submitter supports these clauses - Clause I – the submitter supports the clause with a recommendation to also ban dogs due to risks to threatened wildlife. - Landscape protection area – the submitter considers further clarification is needed as it isn't shown or explained in the Structure Plan or planning maps. | | |

Planning 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"> - Effects on indigenous biodiversity values, including the values of the Northern and Southern Significant Natural Areas • Clarify which area is covered by the “Landscape Protection Area” referred to at clause f of the matters of discretion. | | | |
| 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"> • 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. • 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. • 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. | Y | Y |
| Paul Brown | FS8 | FS8.5 | 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 |
| 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"> • 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. • 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 | Y | Y |

Planning 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>ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statutory assessment – the submitter considers the effects of PPC85 on the environment are 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. | | |
| 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"> 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. 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. 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. | Y | Y |
| 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 |

Planning 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 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|----------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Douglas Algie Lloyd | 86 | 86.1 | General | PPC85 in its entirety | Oppose | Delete PPC85 in its entirety. | <p>The submitter provides a number of reasons why they oppose the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spatial Plan – the submitter notes that the spatial plan references the proposed development area and does not recommend an intensified development pattern. Proposed district plan – the submitter notes that the proposed district plan does not identify the land in PPC85 for urban development or recommend re-zoning. Lack of infrastructure – the submitter is concerned that the existing infrastructure cannot accommodate the proposed development. | Y | Y |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.6 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that PC85 is inconsistent with the Proposed District Plan. | Y | Y |
| Derek Westwood | FS2 | FS2.11 | General | Flooding | Oppose | That the Council impose conditions ensuring stormwater and flooding neutrality, allowing PPC85 to proceed responsibly. | The further submitter opposes the submission as it opposes PPC85 in its entirety citing the Spatial Plan. | 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"> Intensive urbanisation –the proposed plan change does not align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan and District Plan. Mixed use/commercial hub – queries whether another commercial hub is needed given there are three commercial areas already. 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. Wastewater – submitter considers that the proposed plan change does not adequately address wastewater management. Traffic – the submitter is concerned that the proposal will result in an increase in safety issues. Housing demand in Mangawhai – the submitter queries whether the current level of growth will continue, necessitating additional lots. 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. Coastal bird taonga and outstanding natural landscape – submitter considers that these matters are not satisfactorily addressed. | N | N |
| Mangawhai Matters Incorporated | FS1 | FS1.7 | Rezoning | PC85 in its entirety | Support | Allow the submission relief | The further submitter supports the submission point that PC85 is inconsistent with the Proposed District Plan. | Y | Y |