

Traffic 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
Elizabeth Nichols-Gill	5	5.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete all PPC85 in its entirety	The submitter considers that this plan change, and other large, planned subdivisions will impact and increase pressure of infrastructure. Additionally, the submitter considers the plan change will further impact on traffic congestion. The submitter is also concerned with the potential for increase in rates.	N	N
Karen Staples	6	6.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete all PPC85 in its entirety	<p>The submitter details a number of concerns which are as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strain on health services – submitter is concerned that the plan change would increase population without plans to expand on existing healthcare services 2. Roading and traffic impacts – submitter considers that the existing roads are not sufficient to support the plan change, and the consequential increase in roading demand. 3. Schooling capacity – submitter is concerned that the existing schools would not be able to accommodate the additional demand 4. Limited employment opportunities – submitter is concerned that the limited number of jobs available will result in a significant portion of residents being required to commute for work. 5. Environmental Impact and Beach Overcrowding – submitter is concerned that the additional residential development will place further strain on beaches and natural environments, and result in overcrowding. 6. Strain on utilities and power supply – the submitter notes that Mangawhai intermittent power cuts and is concerned that the plan change will place additional pressure on the electrical infrastructure. 	N	Y
Mangawhai Matters Incorporated	FS1	FS1.26	Rezoning	PC85 in its entirety	Support	Allow the submission relief	The further submitter supports the submission point that the development facilitated by PC85 will not be able to be accommodated by existing infrastructure.	Y	Y
Juan Miguel Hamber	9	9.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete all PPC85 in its entirety	<p>Submitter considers that Mangawhai does not have sufficient infrastructure to accommodate the level of additional development that the plan change will bring.</p> <p>The submitter also notes that the current roading infrastructure is not adequate to the support the plan change. Additionally, the submitter considers that there is sufficient provision for growth and development through other developments (The Hills).</p>	N	Y
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. 	N	N

Traffic 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"> 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. 		
Lena Nelson	12	12.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete all PPC85 in its entirety	The submitter notes their concerns are around the current infrastructure which is struggling. They are also concerned with schooling capacity, medical facilities and traffic congestion.	N	Y
Kristina Kahn	16	16.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete all PPC85 in its entirety	The submitter is concerned that the proposed development will result in a large increase in traffic volume and therefore will increase traffic safety issues, with particular regard to school drop off and pickup.	N	Y
Peter Kemp	17	17.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety	The submitter is concerned that the proposed development will result in additional pressure on the roads which already face high traffic volumes.	N	N
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. 	Y	Y

Traffic 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"> 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. 		
Hayden Poole	22	22.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose in part	<p>The submitter seeks the following requested relief:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce the scale and density of the proposed zoning. Require infrastructure and sewage upgrades before any large-scale subdivision or building consents are granted. Strengthen protections for the Mangawhai estuary and surrounding ecology, including greater setbacks from waterways and coastal hazard zones. Limit development in areas identified as high risk for coastal hazards and flooding. 	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change as currently drafted due to a number of reasons and concerns, as below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure and services – the submitter notes that Mangawhai’s existing infrastructure, inclusive of roads, water supply and stormwater systems Sewerage and wastewater – the submitter considers that Mangawhai’s wastewater treatment plant has limited capacity and that additional development will put pressure on the existing network. The submitter considers that the development should not proceed until there is a proven plan to upgrade sewerage infrastructure that safeguards public health and the environment. Estuary and coastal protection – the submitter notes that the proposed development area sits within an ecologically sensitive environment and notes their concern around an increase in urban runoff, sedimentation and pollution. The submitter considers that given the climate change and sea level risk, intensive development should not expand into these areas. Ecological sensitivity – the submitter notes that while the plan change includes ecological feature maps, the rezoning rural land for more intensive use will place further pressure on these areas. 	N	N
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	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.	N	N

Traffic Submissions

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
							The submitter 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		
Kirsti Burns	26	26.2	General	Staging of the development	Oppose	Not specified	The submitter is concerned that infrastructure will not be built until sections have been sold. The submitters considers that infrastructure, such as roads and stormwater drains, and site filling to mitigate flood risk should be established prior to any buildings.		
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. The plan change will result in adverse noise effects from the construction phase of the development, but also potential increase in noise from additional powered boats and jet skis. 	Y	Y
Vicky and Timothy Andrew	29	29.1	Rezoning	DEV XP3-2 – transportation and connectivity	Oppose	Amend	Submitter considers that a right hand turn bay will be insufficient with the new development and the number of people during holiday and weekend periods.	Y	Y
Riverside Holiday Park 2007 Limited	32	32.2	General	Structure plan/development area provisions	Support in part	<p>For the balance of the plan change site excluding 41 Blackswamp Road, the submitter seeks the following requested relief:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision for no-complaints covenants within the relevant zone standards that apply to the residential and rural lifestyle zones that adjoin 41 Black Swamp Road (Riverside Holiday Park). Deletion of the 'Coastal fringe enhancement and public walkway' from the Structure Plan in Appendix 4. The implementation of pedestrian and cyclist connectivity along Black Swamp Road. 	<p>The submitter identifies a number of concerns with the structure plan and development area provisions as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed Coastal fringe enhancement and public walkway will not have the actual levels of public benefit. Additionally, the submitter is concerned that the practicality and costs have not been fully considered. Submitter queries whether the proposed alignment of the indicative road will provide the most efficient and appropriate mechanism given there appears to be little consideration in respect to upgrades and improvements to Black Swamp Road. Submitter notes there may be a need for traffic improvements, such as a roundabout, at the intersection of Black Swamp Road, 		

Traffic 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 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>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).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the proposed cycleway across the Insley Street bridge requires further detail given the current pedestrian safety risks present. 		
Derek Westwood	FS2	FS2.5	General	Stormwater	Oppose	That limited weight be given to this submission where it conflicts with flood management requirements	The further submitter opposes the submissions focus on traffic/density while disregarding flooding impacts	Y	Y
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
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 	Y	Y

Traffic Submissions

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
							<p>environmental effects and demonstrate a need for additional land to support Mangawhai's growth. They particularly support the ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long-term environmental outcomes than leaving the area undeveloped. Additionally, the development will enhance public walking, cycling, and vehicle safety infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		
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. 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. 	N	N
Hugh Benn	37	37.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 as notified, or with amendments within scope.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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- 	Y	Y

Traffic 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>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. 		
Arthur & Jocelyn Rutherford	40	40.5	Transport	New standard	Support	<p>Add a new standard as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>The intersection at Insley Street and Black Swamp Road shall be a roundabout intersection prior to s.224c approval for any development within the Development Area.</u> <u>The roundabout intersection shall be designed to Austroad standards.</u> <u>The intersection shall include landscaping and design features to achieve a quality entrance to the Development Area</u> <u>A pedestrian footpath and cycleway, connecting the Development Area with Mangawhai township, along the estuary edge of Black Swamp Road shall be constructed to the engineering standards in conjunction with the any development in the Development Area.</u> 	The submitter seeks to include a requirement for the establishment of a roundabout at Insley Street and Black Swamp Road intersection.		
Arthur & Jocelyn Rutherford	40	40.6	Transport	DEVX-G-S4 Traffic Intensity	Oppose	<p>Amend standard as follows:</p> <p>Accordingly, <u>up to 18 daily one way vehicle movements per site, excluding construction traffic only,</u> should be permitted.</p>	The submitter notes that the standard traffic generation from a residential site can be up to 9 one-way vehicle movements, and that minor residential dwellings are permitted in all residential zones allowing for an additional 6 vehicle movements		
Arthur & Jocelyn Rutherford	40	40.10	Subdivision	Information Requirements DEVX-REQ2 Subdivision or Development that will enable 50 or more residential units or residential unit equivalents in the Development Area	Oppose	<p>The Development Area anticipates development /intensification and therefore the Developer should undertake an upgrade to the intersection of Insley Street and Tomarata Road and provide a roundabout intersection.</p> <p><u>Information Requirements DEVX-REQ2 Subdivision or Development in the Development Area</u></p>	The intersection of Insley Street and Tomarata Road/Black Swamp Road is a key entry point into Mangawhai. With future development, the submitter considers it should be upgraded to a roundabout to improve traffic flow and ensure pedestrian and cyclist safety. The submitter considers that, due to nearby property access and expected traffic growth, a roundabout is necessary as a safety measure.		
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>	N	N

Traffic 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>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>		
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. 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. 	Y	N
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

Traffic 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
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. 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. 	Y	N
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 	N	Y

Traffic 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>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.</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. 		
Darren and Kim Hughes	49	49.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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
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

Traffic 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. 		
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 Statement. The submitter considers the plan change also meets the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan. 	Y	Y

Traffic 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
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
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. 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 	Y	Y

Traffic Submissions

Submitter name	Submitter number	Submission point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in part	Relief sought	Reason for submission	Request to be heard	Joint heard where similar submission
							the objectives of both the Plan Change and the Kaipara District Plan.		
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
Heather Rogan and Dianne Piesse on behalf of the New Zealand Fairy Tern Trust	58	58.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety.	<p>The submitter is opposed to the plan change for a number of reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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
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;	Y	Y

Traffic 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. 		
Fire and Emergency NZ	60	60.11	Transport	DEV X-G-S3 Vehicle Crossings	Support in part	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>DEV X-G-S3 Vehicle Crossings</p> <p>1. New vehicle crossings on to roads shall be designed, constructed and located in accordance with the Kaipara District Council Engineering Standards 2011 or any relevant update, and shall comply with the following:</p> <p>...</p> <p>e. For an accessway or driveway servicing up to 6 residential units the minimum width shall be 3.0<u>5</u>m.</p> <p>...</p>	The submitter seeks to increase the minimum vehicle crossing width from 3m to 3.5m to align with SNZ PAS 4509:2008 which requires a minimum width of 3.5m for fire appliances to access the site.		
Fire and Emergency NZ	60	60.12	Subdivision	DEV X-R1 Subdivision	Support in part	<p>Correct standard references so that DEV X R1(1)(m) is as follows:</p> <p>iii. DEV1-S13 DEV X-SUB-S5 Vehicle Crossings</p> <p>iv. DEV1-S14 DEV X-SUB-S6 Roads, Vehicle Access, Pedestrian Walkways and Cycleways</p> <p>v. DEV1-S15 DEV X-SUB- S7 Water Supply</p>	The submitter seeks to make sure the references in DEV X-R1 aligns with the Subdivision Standard references.		
Fire and Emergency NZ	60	60.13	Subdivision	DEV X-SUB-S5 Vehicle Crossings	Support in part	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>DEV X-SUB-S5 Vehicle Crossings</p> <p>1. New vehicle crossings on to roads shall be designed, constructed and located in accordance with the Kaipara District Council Engineering Standards 2011 or any relevant update, and shall comply with the following:</p>	The submitter seeks to increase the minimum vehicle crossing width from 3m to 3.5m to align with SNZ PAS 4509:2008 which requires a minimum width of 3.5m for fire appliances to access the site.		

Traffic 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				
						... e. For an accessway or driveway servicing up to 6 residential units the minimum width shall be 3.0 5 <u>5</u> m. ...							
Fire and Emergency NZ	60	60.14	Transport	DEVX-SUB-S6 Roads, Vehicle Access, Pedestrian Walkways and Cycleways	Support in part	Amend as follows: DEV X-SUB-S6 Roads, Vehicle Access, Pedestrian Walkways and Cycleways ... 2. Roads, Vehicle Access , Pedestrian and Cycle Networks shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the Kaipara District Council Engineering Standards 2011 or any relevant update, except as they relate to the following: ... 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Matters over which discretion is restricted: ... <u>o. Mitigation to address safety and/or efficiency, including access clearance requirements for emergency services.</u>	The submitter seeks the requested relief for the following reasons; <ul style="list-style-type: none">To clarify to plan users what the standards apply to; andTo add a new matter of discretion which requires consideration of access requirements where there is a non-compliance with the access standards.						
Fire and Emergency NZ	60	60.16	Transport	Table DEV X Table 1.1 Mangawhai East Development Area Road, Private Way, Cycle Way and Property Access	Support in part	Amend as follows: Road Hierarchy Private access: <u>1.</u> serving up to 6 units/lots, and <u>2.</u> less than 50m in length, <u>and</u> <u>3. Where located in an area with a fully reticulated water supply system (including hydrants) available.</u> Private Accessway: <u>1.</u> serving 7-30 units/lots (not vested), or <u>2.</u> serving up to 6 that is over 50m in length, <u>or</u> <u>3. Where located in an area that does not have a fully reticulated water supply system (including hydrants) available.</u> <table border="1"><tr><td>Road hierarchy</td><td>Minimum radius (m)</td></tr><tr><td>Private Accessway serving 7 – 30 units/lots (not vested) or serving up to 6</td><td>610m subject to vehicle tracking for</td></tr></table>	Road hierarchy	Minimum radius (m)	Private Accessway serving 7 – 30 units/lots (not vested) or serving up to 6	6 10 m subject to vehicle tracking for	The submitter notes that as currently drafted, the table does not recognise scenarios where some non-reticulated lots are road fronting and FENZ will be able to access onsite waste supply for firefighting from the road. The requested relief will be able to accommodate for this scenario. Additionally, the submitter notes that a 10m radius would be required to enable an 8m medium rigid truck to turn in accordance with Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency on-road tracking curves.		
Road hierarchy	Minimum radius (m)												
Private Accessway serving 7 – 30 units/lots (not vested) or serving up to 6	6 10 m subject to vehicle tracking for												

Traffic 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
						lots that is over 50m in length	anticipated design vehicle			
						And any consequential changes to give effect to the relief sought.				
Samuel Wilson	61	61.1	Rezoning	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.		<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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
Pamala and Allen Collenge	62	62.1	Transport	DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity	Oppose	Amend the policy to require a roundabout		The submitter considers a right hand turn bay will not be sufficient.	Y	Y
Eve Nicola Susan	63	63.1	Transport	DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity	Oppose	Amend the policy to require a roundabout		The submitter considers a right hand turn bay will not be sufficient.	N	Y
Paul Brown	FS9	FS9.3	Transport	DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity	Support	Allow the submission relief		The further submitter supports the submission point that a right hand turn bay will be insufficient, and a round about is preferred.	Y	Y
John Michael Bornhauser	64	64.1	Transport	DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity	Oppose	Amend the policy to require a roundabout		The submitter considers a right hand turn bay will not be sufficient.	Y	Y
Paul Brown	FS9	FS9.4	Transport	DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity	Support	Allow the submission relief		The further submitter supports the submission point that a right hand turn bay will be insufficient, and a round about is preferred.	Y	Y

Traffic 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
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
Heather and Colin Young	66	66.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Decline PPC85 until the outlined issues are properly resolved.	<p>The reasons the submitter does not support the plan change are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schooling and infrastructure – concerns that existing schools are already operating at or near capacity, and there is no local public high school. Lack of clear plan to expand education facilities. • Sewerage water quality in Estuary – the submitter notes that the school is not on the Mangawhai sewerage scheme. Concerns with the water quality of the estuary from sewage runoff. • Sewerage and wastewater management – questions whether the existing system can cope given historic challenges with wastewater management. • Fairy Tern habitat – the plan change will disturb the Fairy Tern habitat through increased noise, humans and domestic animals • Public transport deficiency – the lack of reliable public transport options and that the increase in population from the plan change will result in greater reliance on private vehicles. • Road Infrastructure and quality – the roads are not equipped to handle the increase in traffic volumes from the plan change and that many of the existing roads are narrow, poorly maintained and lack pedestrian and cycling infrastructure. 	N	Y
Alan Rogers	67	67.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC85 in its entirety, or undertake necessary amendments as needed.	<p>The submitter provides a number of reasons for their support of the plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	Y	Y

Traffic 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"> 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. 		
Raewyn Margaret and Neil Robert	70	70.1	Transport	DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity	Oppose	Amend the policy to require a roundabout	The submitter considers a right hand turn bay will not be sufficient.	Y	Y
Paul Brown	FS9	FS9.5	Transport	DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity	Support	Allow the submission relief	The further submitter supports the submission point that a right hand turn bay will be insufficient, and a round about is preferred.	Y	Y
Abigail and Francis Meagher	71	71.1	Transport	DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity	Oppose	Amend the policy to require a roundabout	The submitter considers a right hand turn bay will not be sufficient.	Y	Y
Paul Brown	FS10	FS10.1	Transport	DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity	Support	Allow the submission relief	The further submitter supports the submission point that a right hand turn bay will be insufficient, and a round about is preferred.	Y	Y
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. 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. 	N	Y
Bryce Taylor	75	75.1	Transport	DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity	Oppose	Amend the policy to require a roundabout	The submitter considers a right hand turn bay will not be sufficient.	Y	Y

Traffic 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
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
Mangawhai Matters Incorporated	FS1	FS1.28	Rezoning	PC85 in its entirety	Support	Allow the submission relief	The further submitter supports the submission point that the development facilitated by PC85 will not be able to be accommodated by existing infrastructure.		
Gareth Jones	77	77.1	General	PPC85 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC85 in its entirety	<p>The submitter details a number of reasons why they oppose the proposed plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure – that there is not sufficient infrastructure to support the development, and that Mangawhai sewerage system is already at capacity. Additionally, the submitter is concerned that roading is not sufficient and roads are already congested. Environmental impact – that the increased development will lead to further decline in the health of the estuary from increased stormwater runoff. That there is no need for a fourth commercial hub and that an additional hub could lead to commercial closures and empty buildings. That Black Swamp Road is prone to waterlogging and flooding, and questions who will compensate home and business owners should the land flood? The submitter considers the area should remain rural with horticultural and agricultural activities only. The submitter considers that the increase in residential density will increase pressure on infrastructure. 	N	N
Charlotte Boonen	79	79.1	Transport	DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity	Oppose	Amend the policy to require a roundabout	The submitter considers a right hand turn bay will not be sufficient.	N	Y

Traffic 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	FS10	FS10.2	Transport	DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity	Support	Allow the submission relief	The further submitter supports the submission point that a right hand turn bay will be insufficient, and a round about is preferred.	Y	Y
Sue McKay	80	80.1	Transport	DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity	Oppose	Amend the policy to require a roundabout	The submitter considers a right hand turn bay will not be sufficient.		
Paul Brown	FS10	FS10.3	Transport	DEV XP3 - 2 Transportation and Connectivity	Support	Allow the submission relief	The further submitter supports the submission point that a right hand turn bay will be insufficient, and a round about is preferred.	Y	Y
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
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 ecological protections, which are expected to deliver better long- 	Y	Y

Traffic 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>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. 		
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
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. 	N	N

Traffic 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">• 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.		