Submission			Wants to	Joint Hearing				
#	Sub Point #	Submitter Name	Heard Y/N	Y/N	Support/Oppose/Neutral	Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons for Submission
							Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
46	9	John Stephens	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Amenity	with additional information.	development on the surrounding amenity values.
	_				_		Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the
54	9	Robin Hale	У	Υ	Oppose	Amenity	with additional information.	development on the surrounding amenity values.
		w e. l	l					
58 60		Katie Richards Jan Colhoun	N		Oppose	Amenity Amenity	None stated. None stated.	Small lot size not in keeping with special character of the area.
60		Jan Comoun	T	T	Not stated	Amenity		Mangawhai character will be adversely affected.
63	0	Cront McCorthy	v	v	Seek Amendment	Amanitu	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the
03	9	Grant McCarthy	T	T	seek Amendment	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	development on the surrounding amenity values. High density proposed not in keeping with the surrounding amenity
64	0	Aaron McConchie	v	v	Seek Amendment	Amenity	with additional information.	values and does not attempt to fit in.
04		Aaron McConchie	т	Ť	seek Amendment	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the
73	۵	Ross Hinton	v	v	Seek Amendment	Amenity	with additional information.	development on the surrounding amenity values.
/3		NOSS THIRLOTT		i e	Seek Amendment	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the
79	9	Denise Stuart	Y	v	Oppose	Amenity	with additional information.	development on the surrounding amenity values.
,,,		Demise Studie	'		Оррозс	Patterney	Publicise what has been granted and additional public	Mangawhai is a coastal rural community and want to keep it that
85	6	Sue Clayton	Y	v	Oppose	Amenity	consultation.	way.
- 55		out dayton			оррозс	, and a	Constitution	Urban design assessment does not consider the Mangawhai
								Community Development Plan and the desires of that plan regarding
86	4	Paul Hendrickx	Υ	Υ	seeks amendment	Amenity	None stated.	housing typology.
						,		Residential density is not in keeping with the open space and
89	5	Gainor & Graham Kerrigan	N	Υ	Oppose	Amenity	None stated.	amenity of Mangawhai.
						·	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	, ,
90	4	Doug Lloyd	N	N	Seek Amendment	Amenity	with additional information.	Number of lost will not fit with Mangawhai's special nature.
30		Doug Lloyu		,,	Seek Amendment	Amenicy	With additional information.	Proposal misses the opportunity to develop a sustainable and unique
								town centre that reflects the character of the surrounding
93	5	Maylene Lai	Y	v	Oppose	Amenity	None stated.	environment, 350m2 is too small.
33		mayiene zar			оррозс	runcincy	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	erranement, oberne is too small
94	2	Douglas V Moores	N	N	Oppose	Amenity	with additional information.	Density is detrimental to rural character of Mangawhai.
		ÿ			- P. P	· ·		High density urban development is visually incongruent with the
							Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	rural landscape and detracts from the character of Mangawhai and
94	7	Douglas V Moores	N	N	Oppose	Amenity	with additional information.	the natural areas.
98	6	Martina Tschirky	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Amenity	None stated.	Inadequate in the rural setting.
						1		
101	2	Madara Vilde	Υ	У	Oppose	Amenity	Decline application in current form.	Concerned about the impact of proposal on landscape values.
							Decline application until a revised housing density is	This plan change imposes a high density urban solution to a
103	2	Gerard Wooters	N	N	Seek Amendment	Amenity	provided.	rural/beach town environment.
				1		<u> </u>	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the
112	9	Andrew Paul	N	N	Oppose	Amenity	with additional information.	development on the surrounding amenity values.
							Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the
125	9	Nick Carre	N	N	Seek Amendment	Amenity	with additional information.	development on the surrounding amenity values.
							Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the
127	9	Georgina Carre	N	N	seeks amendment	Amenity	with additional information.	development on the surrounding amenity values.
								High density and lack of greenspace not in keeping with the rural
130	1	Mike Ferguson	Υ	N	Oppose	Amenity	Decline plan change and retain the current provisions.	environment of the area.
	_		l	[_	<u>.</u>		This will completely ruin n the feel and affect the beautiful
133	3	Francesca von Wurzbach-Purcell	N	N	Oppose	Amenity	None stated.	environment for financial gain.

		_	1		1		,
							APPENDIX 16.1: ESTUARY ESTATES DESIGN AND ENVIRONMENTAL
							GUIDELINES Provision of design and environmental guidelines is
							essential to ensure that the design of both residential and business
							dwellings is done in an appropriate way, PARTICULARLY where there
							is greater density and intensification as is the case in the Proposed
							Plan change.
							I SUPPORT some amendment to the original guidelines but OPPOSE
							the extent of the amendments proposed.
							I urge the incorporation of clear and enforceable design and
							environmental guidelines in Section 16 to enhance the integrity of
134	11 Belinda Vernon	v	N	0,,,,,,,	Amanitu	Cook amondment	_ = :
134	11 Bellilda Vernon	T	IN	Oppose	Amenity	Seek amendment.	development of this important area in the future.
1							Landscape report gives a more favourable assessment that what is
							likely to occur e.g. reference to two story commercial/ retail
138	9 John Dickie	v	N	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change.	development yet the proposal infers greater heights.
138	3 John Dickle	+	i v	Оррозе	Amenity	becline the plan change.	Concerned about the increase in housing and impact on character of
151	2 Francis & Michael Hookings	v	v	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change.	Mangawhai.
151	2 I Tancis & Wilchael Hookings	<u>'</u>		Оррозе	Amenity	became the plan change.	Iviangawnai.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the
450	0 C-1-111	.,			A	1	
152	9 Carla Hood	Y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	with additional information.	development on the surrounding amenity values.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the
153	9 Philippa Muller	N	Υ	Oppose	Amenity	with additional information.	development on the surrounding amenity values.
							Concerned about the revised mix of housing and the relationship
							with the Mangawhai settlement and the character defined by
154	2 Philip James McDermott	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Amenity	Seek amendment.	modest density and extensive vegetation cover.
155	8 Christine Basham	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about impact of lighting on night sky.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Concerned that the high density development will affect the special
156	6 Clive Boonham	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Amenity	with additional information.	character of Mangawhai.
							greenspace and landscaping will not provide adequate amenity,
158	9 Alister Kim Hamilton	У	У	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change.	Pedestrian links to amenities and open spaces are insufficient.
							The proposal does not preserve the rural village character of
159	1 Anne Hollier	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change.	Mangawhai as discussed.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Concerned that the high density development will affect the special
160	6 Judith Anne Boonham	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Amenity	with additional information.	character of Mangawhai.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Minimum size of 350m2 is too small and will change the special
161	Linda Ritchie	N	Υ	Oppose	Amenity	with additional information.	character of Mangawhai.
T		1				Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	
162	Melanie Jane Gallo	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Amenity	with additional information.	Concerned about impact on amenity and environment.
		_					Does not adequately take into account the impact of the
163	4 Sue Fountain	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change.	development on the surrounding amenity values.
		1				Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the
164	9 Alan Preston	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Amenity	with additional information.	development on the surrounding amenity values.
							High density will ruin the character of Mangawhai. Density is better
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	than spawl but the application understate the effect on character,
165	3 Alex and Linley Galbraith	n	Υ	Oppose	Amenity	with additional information.	natural features of the land.
						Destination also also and the second	December of the state of the st
467	O Tanu Bake :	l.	V	0,,,,,,,	Amanitu	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	
167	9 Tony Baker	У	Y	Oppose	Amenity	with additional information.	development on the surrounding amenity values.
4.00	O ladda Kall:	l.,	v	0,,,,,,	Amonitu	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the
169	9 Jedda Kelly	У	Y	Oppose	Amenity	with additional information.	development on the surrounding amenity values.
4	O Fuen Hesten	l.,	v	0	Amanitu	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the
171	9 Euan Upston	У	Y	Oppose	Amenity	with additional information.	development on the surrounding amenity values.
179	David & Janet Norris	N	v	Oppose	Amenity	Further information and consultation.	Residential intensity will adversely effects character of Mangawhai.
1/9	David & Janet Norths	114	1	Ohhose	Amenity	i di dici imonifiadon and consultation.	nesidential intensity will adversely effects character of Mangawildi.

						1	
							greenspace and landscaping will not provide adequate amenity,
184	9 Rob & Mary Farmer	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change.	Pedestrian links to amenities and open spaces are insufficient.
185	1 Faye & James Shewan	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and request further information.	What is proposed does not reflect Mangawhai.
185	5 Faye & James Shewan	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and request further information.	Concerned about intensity and impact on character of Mangawhai.
189	3 Grant Mitchell	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Amenity	Number of housing to remain at 550.	Scale of housing will change the character of Mangawhai.
193	4 Kathy Gordon	n	N	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change.	High density development will ruin Mangawhai character.
196	1 David Macpherson	y	Υ	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change.	Proposal is not in keeping with the character of the area. Lack of focus on the amenity of the estuary.
197	1 Barbara Pengelly	Y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	None stated.	High density will effect the character of Magical Mangawhai and is not in keeping with the image of Mangawhai.
					7		High density will ruin the character of Mangawhai. Density is better than spawl but the application understate the effect on character,
198	1 Lisa Marshall	Y	у	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and request further information.	natural features of the land
198	2 Lisa Marshall	,	v	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and request further information.	Concerned about flooding. Area is low lying 3m leaves little scope for combined events (high tide/high rainfall) - further research required.
130	2 Elsa Warshan	'	,	Оррозс	Patterney	became the plan change and request farther information.	Concerned that the community facilities have been removed from
18	7 Sascha Tschirky	N	Y	Oppose	Community Facilities	Decline the plan change.	the proposal.
							Questions what has banconed to the retirement home supermarket
21	3 Raewyn Dodd	N	N	Oppose	Community Facilities	Decline the plan change.	Questions what has happened to the retirement home, supermarket and college.
							The development should be required to provide things that are
22	5 Ken Marment		.	0	Community facilities	Dealine the relevant on the second	currently lacking such as commercial centre, parks, schools, medical centre, shops and services. Not put more strain on existing.
22	5 Ken Warment	IN .	IN .	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	Questions where the community facilities have gone, and considered
35	1 Mark Macdonald	N	N	Oppose	Community facilities	None stated.	that the application is no longer what was supported by the community.
							Concerned that the proposal no longer includes pool or recreation
55	6 Gary Cameron	N	Υ	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	facilities. Also concerned about size of retirement village - 135 beds is too small and will be too expensive for locals.
							Concerned that the proposal no longer includes pool or recreation
							facilities. Also concerned about size of retirement village - 135 beds
55	7 Gary Cameron	N	Y	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	is too small and will be too expensive for locals.
							Concerned that the proposal no longer includes pool or recreation facilities. Also concerned about size of retirement village - 135 beds
56	6 Elizabeth Cameron	N	Y	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	is too small and will be too expensive for locals.
							Concerned that the proposal no longer includes pool or recreation facilities. Also concerned about size of retirement village - 135 beds
56	7 Elizabeth Cameron	N	Υ	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	is too small and will be too expensive for locals.
7,	8 Rachael Williams		v	Onnese	Community facilities	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Supports retirement facility but seeks more detail regarding the number of units, when it will be available and if it will be a franchise.
71 80	6 Brenda Coleman	N N	N	Oppose Oppose	Community facilities Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	Mangawhai needs a new school.
οU	o o crida Coleman		1,	Ομμοσε	community facilities	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	
95	3 Ella Grant	N	N	Oppose	Community facilities	with additional information.	number of units, when it will be available and if it will be a franchise.
113	2 Jo Lewin	N	N	Oppose	Community facilities	None stated.	Need to understand population increase to provide for key facilities for the community such as schools libraries and medical.
113	Z po cewiii	1''	P**	Oppose	Community facilities	mone stated.	tor the community such as schools libraries and medical.

			1	1			I
							By enabling flexibility in the sub zone provisions so as to respond to
120	2 Sherryll Burke	N	N	Oppose	Community facilities	Seek amendment.	changes I the community needs for recreation and leisure trends.
					,		Wants to know what is being proposed in terms of school, open
							spaces, supermarket, retirement village and walking tracks.
							Concerned that the requirements to be in line with maps 4 - 11 has
126	6 Joby Beretta	N	v	Seek Amendment	Community facilities	Request further information.	been removed.
120	б Јору Вегеца	IN	T	Seek Amendment	Community facilities	Request further information.	
							Concerned about the cancelling of community facilities, particularly
							schools, shows lack of future proofing. Proposal no longer provides
130	6 Mike Ferguson	Y	N	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline plan change and retain the current provisions.	any community good.
							16.3.5 Deletion of Community Objective
134	6 Belinda Vernon	Υ	N	Oppose	Community facilities	Seek amendment.	Existing clause: To create a community focal point in the Estuary
							No justification for the removal of education facilities from chapter
138	3 John Dickie	Υ	N	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	16.
							Pressure on community facilities (doctors schools, facilities) will be
							too much. Concerned that the applicant is no longer proposing any.
							Requests comprehensive plan as to how the community facilities will
140	4 Stephanie Gibson	N	N	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	cope.
142	7 Abby Meagher	N	N	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change. Decline the plan change.	Concerned about lack of school capacity.
142	/ Abby Wedgilei	I N	IN	Оррозе	community facilities	beame the plan thange.	Concerned that Mangawhai doesn't have the facilities to
							=
							accommodate the increase in population, particularly concerned
147	5 David Goold	N	N	Oppose	Community facilities	Seek amendment.	about medical services.
							Community looses out with the removal if community facilities.
155	4 Christine Basham	v	v	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	Existing facilities wont be able to cope.
155	4 Christine Bushum	+		Оррозс	community radiicles	became the plan thange.	Increased density will have significant effect on facilities and result in
							higher and faster transmission of diseases. Health facilities are all
450	A Aliston Kim Hamilton			0	Community facilities	Dealine the plan shappe	
158	4 Alister Kim Hamilton	У	У	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	ready under pressure.
							Concerned about impact on schools due to inadequate provision.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	
162	Melanie Jane Gallo	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Community facilities	with additional information.	provide consensus position in line with local community needs.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Needs to be provision for education facilities given the significant
164	10 Alan Preston	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Community facilities	with additional information.	increase in population the proposal will result in.
							Questions what community facilities will be provided, especially in
							regards to schools. What conversations have been had with central
177	2 Graham Bayes	Y	v	Oppose	Community facilities	Request further information.	government.
		- 	ľ				Development will exacerbate existing issues, particularly in terms of
179	David & Janet Norris	N	v	Oppose	Community facilities	Further information and consultation.	capacity of schools.
1/9	David & Janet North	14		Ohhose	community racintles	Tarther information and consultation.	Increased density will have significant effect on facilities and result in
							<u> </u>
		l,	l,				higher and faster transmission of diseases. Health facilities are all
184	4 Rob & Mary Farmer	Y	Y	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	ready under pressure.
		1					
		1					
		1					
193	5 Kathy Gordon	n	N	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about school capacity.
	,			P.P		.,,	Concerned about lack of provision for education needs given the
198	3 Lisa Marshall	Y	v	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change and request further information.	increase in population.
130	3 Lisa ividi silali	-1'	, ,	Oppose	community racintles	Seame the plan change and request farther information.	no case in population.
		1				Accurance from Kainara Council that his areaset b	
						Assurance from Kaipara Council that his property wont be	
		L.	l	1_			Concerned about dust, vermin and pests, land slumping/movement,
28	1 Geoffrey William Campbell	N	N	Oppose	Construction effects	during construction to ensure compliance.	pooling of water due to construction works .

			ı		1		
							The plan change is not supported by consultation from the
							community. The applicant has made no effort to include the
							community and it is a concern that council are considering these
4	3 David James Cunningham	v	v	0,,,,,,,	Consultation	Dealing the plan shange	changes without community consultation.
4	3 David James Cunningham	T	T	Oppose	Consultation	Decline the plan change.	
	S		.,		Communitation	Dealing the plan shapes	Concerned about failure in transparency on this subject with the
6	6 Samantha Wood	N	N	Oppose	Consultation	Decline the plan change.	general public.
							The applicant have not acted openly by consulting the public under
8	2 Gill Wharfe	N	N	Oppose	Consultation	None stated.	one plan, and then changing this to increase density of housing.
							No public consultation, the proposal is not aligned with the vision for
							Mangawhai and not what was proposed to the public initially. The
13	8 Desna Pilcher	N	N	Oppose	Consultation	Decline the plan change.	developers should stick to what they planned originally.
							Developers promised consultation with the ratepayers for any
							altered plans, 'behind the scenes' deals have been made without
20	2 Andrew Rae	N	N	Oppose	Consultation	None stated.	consultation.
						Changes should not be allowed until consultation is made	Consultation has been inadequate and appears to be rushed
26	4 Simon Hardley	N	N	Oppose	Consultation	and community support achieved.	through by Council.
20	4 Simon Haratey			Оррозс	Constitution	and community support demoved.	Would like further and more transparent consultation for rate
30	6 Sandie Souter	N	N	Onnoco	Consultation	Further consultation.	I -
30	6 Sandle Souter	IN	IN	Oppose	Consultation	Further consultation.	payers. Does not feel consultation was adequate, that the community lack of
				_		_ ,, ,, ,	turn out to any consultation was due to it not being properly
38	3 Adam Minoprio	N	N	Oppose	Consultation	Decline the plan change.	advertised.
							Concerned that rate payers have not been told the truth or given
53	2 Ray Crocker	N	N	Oppose	Consultation	Decline the plan change.	appropriate notification.
							Concerned about the lack of consultation on the changes with the
62	1 Paul David Rae	N	Υ	Oppose	Consultation	None stated.	community.
							Questions why the notice was given during lockdown, considers this
68	6 Peter Nicholas	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Consultation	None stated.	didn't give enough tom for interested parties to respond.
						Council rejects application and requires further supporting	Requests further consultation with ratepayers before entering into
78	7 Ian Fish	Υ	Υ	seeks amendment	Consultation	evidence.	any agreements re: wastewater.
80	9 Brenda Coleman	N	N	Oppose	Consultation	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about transparency and consultation.
				- Indiana in the second			Not enough notice, some residents received notification others
						Publicise what has been granted and additional public	didn't - effects everyone. Need more transparency and more
85	2 Sue Clayton	v	v	Oppose	Consultation	consultation.	community meetings involving council.
63	2 Sue Clayton	-		Орроѕе	Consultation	consultation.	Questions how the community consultation and feedback has been
93	2 Maylene Lai	.,	v/	0	C	None stated.	
93	2 Maylene Lai	Y	Y	Oppose	Consultation	None stated.	taken into account.
							Requests further consultation that includes weekends and evenings
130	10 Mike Ferguson	Υ	N	Oppose	Consultation	Decline plan change and retain the current provisions.	to allow full contribution.
							Submission timeframe should have been extended in light of COVID.
							Concerned that the communities concerns have not adequately been
						That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the	considered. Council must act with integrity and transparency.
131	1 Moira Jackson	Υ	Υ	seek amendment	Consultation	developer.	Further consultation required.
							Concerned that the community wont be consulted in the future on
							issues such as road layout, walkways, connection and landscape
138	11 John Dickie	Υ	N	Oppose	Consultation	Decline the plan change.	effects of detailed plans.
140	7 Stephanie Gibson	N	N	Oppose	Consultation	Decline the plan change.	Requests transparency from Council.
	· ·			1		·	·
							KDC has not given effects to the relevant objectives of the NPS UDC
							in the way it has approached community consultation because it has
							separated the consultation facts and figures about infrastructure
1 4 4	4 Joel Cayford	v		Onnoco	Consultation	None stated.	capacity, costs and who and how those matters will be provided for.
144	4 Juei Caylulu	- '		Oppose	CONSUITATION	INOTIE Stateu.	capacity, costs and who and now those matters will be provided for.
4.45	4 Iulia Blandtand	N	N.	0,,,,,,,	Consultation	Deguise further information and another after	Dogwoods mare nublic consultation
145	4 Julie Blanchard	N	IN	Oppose	Consultation	Require further information and confirmation of servicing.	Requests more public consultation.
	.1						Requests transparency. Considers the process to have been 'blurry'
147	6 David Goold	N	N	Oppose	Consultation	Seek amendment.	and that not all information required has been provided.

			1	1	1		In
186	5 Sally & Richard Wood	N	Y	Oppose	Consultation	None stated.	Requests an open and transparent conversation with Council with no redactions or closed meetings.
							Two sites are identified as contaminated, only one is shown on the
138	10 John Dickie	Υ	N	Oppose	Contamination	Decline the plan change.	maps, not clearly identified what will happen with soil.
						·	The proposal will adversely affect Te Ao Maori and will affect Atua
							Maori in particular. The mana of the land will be diminished and spoil
139	1 Renata Blair	Υ	N	Oppose	Cultural	Decline the plan change.	the sacredness of Mangawhai.
						·	_
							Concerned about impacts of residential pests such as cats and dogs
5	6 Alex Flavell-Johnson	N	N	Oppose	Ecology	Decline the plan change.	on sensitive wildlife around the estuary and wider landscape.
8	3 Gill Wharfe	N	N	Oppose	Ecology	No runoff is discharged into the estuary.	These changes will impact the natural environment of the estuary.
						Change zoning of area 3D from 1000m2 to a rural zoning	Concerned about impact on wetland area which are habitat to
31	2 Ross Hill	N	N	Oppose	Ecology	as per earlier proposal and protect wetland area.	endangered bird species such as the Bitten.
32	3 Emma Mallock	N	N	Oppose	Ecology	None stated.	Delicate ecosystems of Mangawhai need to be protected.
							Requests protection of the Tara estuary by ensuring the existing
							protections remain and increasing the protections under section
						Amend to increase protection and require monitoring of	16.3, requests ongoing monitoring to ensure estuary is safe for
34	1 Suzanne Cameron	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Ecology	the estuary.	recreation activities, wildlife and harvesting of kai.
							Increase in scale of development will have adverse effects on the
39	2 Sarah Biggs	N	N	Oppose	Ecology	Decline the plan change.	beach and estuary.
41	3 Clive Currie	Y	N	Oppose	Ecology	Decline the plan change.	Impact on the environment will be significant.
							Wetland protection area should be 31ha and shows stormwater
							ponds in subzone 8 area which should be protected. Stormwater and
58	6 Katie Richards	N	N	Oppose	Ecology	None stated.	silt should not run into protected wetland.
60	4 Jan Colhoun	Y	Y	Not stated	Ecology	None stated.	Concerned about effects on the estuary.
67	1 Allanna Pendleton	v	v	0,,,,,,,	Foology	Decline the plan change unless applicant pays for own water supply and wastewater disposal.	Concerned about pollution of the estuary.
81	3 David Beattie	T N	N N	Oppose Oppose	Ecology Ecology	None stated.	Natural resource including wetland will be impacted.
- 01	3 David Beattle	IN .	14	Оррозе	Ecology	None stated.	Ecological survey needs updating and unique flora and fauna
							preserved (bittern, fern birds, cabbage tree forest, tidal interface and
88	4 Cameron Shaw	v	v	Oppose	Ecology	None stated.	wetland areas). Need pest control.
91	5 Jonathan Drucker	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Ecology	Amend the application.	Concerned about impact on endangered species.
							Questions how thoroughly the environut impacts on the estuarine
93	3 Maylene Lai	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Ecology	None stated.	environment and wetlands have been considered.
	1,7						Wetland needs huge consideration. I back onto the central, I have
							beautiful covenant wetlands where I have eel and bitten and no
96	1 S & G Hockenhull	N	y	seek amendment	Ecology	Increase wetland requirements.	native.
			T T			· ·	
							Concerned about ecological matters and highlights inaccuracies
							within Ecology Assessment prepared by Freshwater Solutions.
							Considers it to be based on outdated information. Submission
							identifies that the wetland area contains species of regional and
							national significance, and critically endangered species, and requests
							further survey and mitigation measures to prevent impacts from
							increased anthropic pressures. Considers that there are areas of
							habitat for a number endangered/at risk species and should be
							considered significant. Consideration hasn't been given to NPS
							Freshwater. Ecological assessment fails to consider impacts from
							stormwater run off, requests and ecology addendum assessing
101	1 Madara Vilde	Υ	у	Oppose	Ecology	Decline application in current form.	actual effects from cumulative impacts.
							Removal/lack of buffer areas contradicts the communities push on
130	7 Mike Ferguson	Υ	N	Oppose	Ecology	Decline plan change and retain the current provisions.	predator control.

		T		1	1	T		
								16.3.1 Natural Environment Objective: Amendment and replacement
								l
								of Green Network Objective: 16.3.1, 16.3.1.1.1: SUPPORT the general
								thrust of the amended objective but PROPOSE that it be stronger to
								reflect the values expressed in the subsequently deleted clause
								16.3.7 as subsection 16.3.1.1.1 does not adequately capture the
								guidance expressed in 16.3.7. Specifically, neither 16.3.1 nor
								16.3.1.1.1 refer to 'activities' nor to the wider 'Mangawhai Harbour'
								which will be directly impacted by discharges from Mangawhai
								Central. While discharges may come under the authority of
								Northland Regional Council a policy statement in the Plan Change is
134	5	Belinda Vernon	Υ	N	Oppose	Ecology	Seek amendment.	an important statement of intent.
								removal of the Natural Environment Objective ONLY if its inclusion at
134	7	Belinda Vernon	Υ	N	Oppose	Ecology	Seek amendment.	16.3 Objectives and Policies has equal weight and influence to being
134	8	Belinda Vernon	v	N	Oppose	Ecology	Seek amendment.	removal of the Natural Environment Objective ONLY if its inclusion at
154		Delinda Vernon	<u>'</u>	1	Оррозс	Leology	Seek amenament.	Considers there will be significant negative impact on critical
135	2	Lawrence Lowe	N	N	Onness	Ecology	Decline the plan change.	ecological and environmental issues.
155		Lawrence Lowe	IN	IN	Oppose	Ecology	Decline the plan change.	-
420			.,					Some recommendations of the ecologist report have not been
138	8	John Dickie	T	IN	Oppose	Ecology	Decline the plan change.	followed with no reason or analysis as to why.
				1				Concerned about impact on estuary from run off with development
								being so close. Requests comprehensive plan as to how impacts on
140		Stephanie Gibson	N	N	Oppose	Ecology	Decline the plan change.	the environment will be reduced.
141	3	Karl Kadlec	N	N	Oppose	Ecology	Decline the plan change.	Wetlands need to be protected.
								Concerned about discharge into harbour, impact on wildlife including
142	5	Abby Meagher	N	N	Oppose	Ecology	Decline the plan change.	shore birds.
								Concerned about the impact the development will have on the
147	4	David Goold	N	N	Oppose	Ecology	Seek amendment.	environment.
								Intensive development so close to the estuary risks long term
								adverse effects on ecology of the estuary and downstream
								consequences for the feeding areas of he NZ fairy Turn - NZ's rarest
								endemic breeding bird. Mangawhai is its most significant breeding
157	1	NZ Fairytern trust	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Ecology	Decline the plan change.	area.
159	5	Anne Hollier	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Ecology	Decline the plan change.	existing natives and wetlands should be protected.
							Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Concerned about proximity of development to estuary and
161		Linda Ritchie	N	Υ	Oppose	Ecology	with additional information.	environmental effects.
								30m setback from spring tide has not been applied and will leave to
176	3	Peter Rothwell	v	v	Oppose	Ecology	Not stated	ecological effects which have not bee adequately considered.
			i'	,	- PP	11.107		Of particular concern is the proposal to abandon the wetlands for
								soakage between the developed areas and the estuary so water can
183		Trewby & Rosemary Bull	N	v	seek amendment	Ecology	Due consideration to these matters.	flow straight through to the harbour.
103		newby a Rosemary Bun	1		Seek uniendmene	Leology	Due consideration to these matters.	Questioning where the developer intents to get power for the
6	4	Samantha Wood	N	N	Oppose	Electricity Supply	Decline the plan change.	proposed development if not from Maungaturoto.
148		Grant O'Malley	N	N	Oppose	Estuary	seek amendment to residential intensity.	Concerned about effects on the estuary.
146	4	Grant O Ividiley	IN	14	Оррозе	Latuary	seek amenument to residential intensity.	concerned about effects off the estuary.
				1				Concerned about the pressure on existing shops and that the light
13	^	Desna Pilcher	N	N	0,,,,,,	Industrial / Commercial Land	Dealing the plan shange	industrial land has disappeared in favour of tiny house sites.
13	9	Desira Filcriei	IN	14	Oppose	muustilai / Commercial Lanu	Decime the platt change.	
25	_	Mark Mandanal	N.	l _N	0,,,,,,	Industrial / Comments	Nana stated	Identifies lack of industrial land and questions if this will be supplied
35	6	Mark Macdonald	N	IN	Oppose	Industrial / Commercial Land	None Stated.	by KDC elsewhere.
	_			L.		l		
44	2	Nigel Slight	N	N	Seek Amendment	industrial / Commercial Land	Maintain full commercial area for future growth.	Concerned with the reduction in commercial land.
						l	_ , , , ,	
55	4	Gary Cameron	N	Y	Oppose	Industrial / Commercial Land	Decline the plan change.	Opposes the reductions of shopping and business areas.
		51: 1 . 1 . 6		L				
56	4	Elizabeth Cameron	N	Υ	Oppose	Industrial / Commercial Land	Decline the plan change.	Opposes the reductions of shopping and business areas.
				1				
				1				Requires more information pertaining to business and service zones
				1			Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	and how education facilities are provided for. Provision needs to be
71	6	Rachael Williams	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Industrial / Commercial Land	with additional information.	made for schools as current ones are at capacity.
				1				
81	2	David Beattie	N	N	Oppose	Industrial / Commercial Land	None stated.	Commercial development is over ambitious.

			-				T
							Requires more information pertaining to business and service zones
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	and how education facilities are provided for. Provision needs to be
95	4 Ella Grant	N	N	Oppose	Industrial / Commercial Land	with additional information.	made for schools as current ones are at capacity.
							Already s shortage - reduction for residential land will limit future
				_			employment opportunities locally. Commercial land should not be
158	5 Alister Kim Hamilton	У	У	Oppose	Industrial / Commercial Land	Decline the plan change.	reduced.
177	5 Graham Bayes	v	.,	Onnoco	Industrial / Commercial Land	Request further information.	Wants to understand the proposed layout given the reduction in Business/Service 7 Land.
1//	5 Granam Bayes	T	У	Oppose	industrial / Commercial Land	Request further information.	Already's shortage - reduction for residential land will limit future
							employment opportunities locally. Commercial land should not be
184	5 Rob & Mary Farmer	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Industrial / Commercial Land	Decline the plan change.	reduced.
	,				·		Increase in size of Subzone 7 I oppose the proposed plan change it
							extends the light industry zone that abuts existing residential by 7-
							10%. This is unnecessary. Was originally childcare - this should be
184	10 Rob & Mary Farmer	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Industrial / Commercial Land	Decline the plan change.	retained.
							Infrastructure cannot handle such intensive development. More
						Strict measures around the release of land and the	work needed on infrastructure particularly water provision, roading,
7	2 Jo Lee	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	density of development.	green spaces, septic.
						Any necessary ungrades to reading westewater and	
						Any necessary upgrades to roading, wastewater and other infrastructure should be paid for by the developer	
						and not Kaipara Residents. If approved seeks written	The reduction of property size and increase in population will add
						assurance from Council and applicants that any upgrades	additional strain onto 'inadequate' infrastructure. Ratepayers should
17	1 Graham Gough	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	to cater for increased demand will be at developers cost.	not have to pay for any necessary upgrades.
				- Spp-			Mangawhai infrastructure is not robust enough to cope with the
19	7 Corinne Callinan	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	None stated.	level of housing proposed.
							Questions how infrastructure including shopping centres and car
21	6 Raewyn Dodd	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change.	parks will cope with and extra 1000+ houses, particularly in summer.
							Mangawhai lacks infrastructure - Roads, water supply, schools,
							shops, parking. This will not be improved with yet another large
22	3 Ken Marment	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change.	development.
							Mangawhai lacks infrastructure - Roads, water supply, schools,
22	4 Ken Marment	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change.	shops, parking. This will not be improved with yet another large development.
22	4 Ken Warniene			Оррозе	initiastructure (deneral)	became the plan change.	development.
							Concerned with inadequate planning and assessment of
							infrastructure needs including drainage, wastewater, roading and car
							parking,. Needs careful planning, retention of green spaces, road
27	1 Janet Jacob	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change.	linkages, walk and cycle ways, and a green spatial look.
						Change zoning of area 3D from 1000m2 to a rural zoning	Current zoning will relate in too big of a population and result in
31	3 Ross Hill	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	as per earlier proposal.	pressures on roading, water supply and sewage.
							Concerned about the impact on infrastructure including car parking,
25	4 Mark Mandonald	N	l _N	0	Infrastructura (Cancii-II	Nana stated	wastewater and water supply and the impact that will have on
35	4 Mark Macdonald	IN	IN	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	None stated.	ratepayers.
41	2 Clive Currie	y	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change.	The impact of the proposal will adversely affect infrastructure.
71	2 Clive Currie	"	- 1	эррозс	initiastructure (General)	became the plan change.	The density of housing is not appropriate for the existing
43	2 David & Marion Pilmer	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change.	infrastructure.
45	5 Vivienne Martens	N	N	Seek Amendment	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about the limitation of existing infrastructure.
j			İ				
			1				
			1				
							Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally
46	7 John Stephens	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Infrastructure (General)	with additional information.	proposed.
	.]		L.		L	Decline the plan change and require the applicant to	Potential for detrimental effect on existing infrastructure (including
47	4 Anne Robbins	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Infrastructure (General)	reduce the number of residential allotments.	wastewater and emergency water supply).
	2 Bass Canadian	. .	I. .	0	Information (Comp. 1)	Dealine the plan shapes	The proposal will put too much pressure on the existing
53	2 Ray Crocker	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	infrastructure Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally
54	7 Robin Hale	v	v	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	with additional information.	proposed.
54	/ NUUIII Hale	у	['	Oppose	illinastructure (General)	with additional information.	ргорозеи.

		1			1		
							Concerned about the increased pressure on infrastructure that is
	4. 6.1					That the applicant be responsible for providing	already strained (particularly in summer) and potential costs for
61	1 Jane Geldenhuys	N	N	Not stated	Infrastructure (General)	infrastructure.	ratepayers.
62	Count MacCoutley	\ <u>'</u>			Information (Community	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally
63	7 Grant McCarthy	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Infrastructure (General)	with additional information.	proposed.
C 4	C Asses MacConship	.,		Cook Assessment	Information (Community	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally
64	6 Aaron McConchie	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Infrastructure (General)	with additional information.	proposed.
	20 .10 .	.,	.,				Concerned about the impact on infrastructure including schools
65	3 David Grant	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Infrastructure (General)	Review and change with the community in mind.	water supply and stormwater.
	a Company	l					Concerned about the impact on existing services that are already
66	4 Gail Williams	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	None stated.	inadequate including parking, shops and roads.
			L			Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally
73	7 Ross Hinton	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Infrastructure (General)	with additional information.	proposed.
					1	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally
74	7 Joy Murray	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Infrastructure (General)	with additional information.	proposed.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally
76	7 Phillip Murray	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Infrastructure (General)	with additional information.	proposed.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally
79	7 Denise Stuart	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	with additional information.	proposed.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally
82	7 Neil Wilson	N	Υ	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	with additional information.	proposed.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally
84	7 Graham & Gloria Drury	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	with additional information.	proposed.
88	6 Cameron Shaw	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	None stated.	Questions what is proposed for lighting.
89	4 Gainor & Graham Kerrigan	N	Υ	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	None stated.	Residential density puts too much pressure on infrastructure.
							Concerned about lack of infrastructure upgrades and ability to for
91	4 Jonathan Drucker	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Infrastructure (General)	Amend the application.	infrastructure to cope.
					` · · ·	•	
							Questions where the detailed solutions are for infrastructure and the
93	4 Maylene Lai	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	None stated.	resulting pressures on the community by this development.
33				оррозс		Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally
112	7 Andrew Paul	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	with additional information.	proposed.
	7 march 1 dai	.,		оррозс	initiasti detare (deneral)	With dealtoner mornistics.	The development will destroy the existing infrastructure of the
							Village and the Heads and will have an enormous adverse
							environmental effects. wastewater, water supply and water runoff
116	3 John White	v	v	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change.	are issues that have not been addressed.
110	3 John White		<u>'</u>	Oppose	illinastructure (General)	Decline the plan change.	are issues that have not been addressed.
							Number of residential allotments not stated. Chapter 16 states no
120	4 Charmill Durka	N	NI.	0,,,,,,,	Infrastructura (Canaral)	Seek amendment.	more that 500 but this is being removed. Needs to be a cap.
120	4 Sherryll Burke	IN	IN	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Seek amenument.	more that 500 but this is being removed. Needs to be a cap.
							Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally
125	7 Nick Carre	N	N	Seek Amendment	Infrastructure (General)	with additional information.	proposed.
		l	L	L			Concerned about impact on current facilities such as schools doctors
126	2 Joby Beretta	N	Y	Seek Amendment	Infrastructure (General)	Request further information.	and the beach.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally
127	7 Georgina Carre	N	N	seeks amendment	Infrastructure (General)	with additional information.	proposed.
		1					Increased level of development overburden existing infrastructure
		1					the cost of this will no only costs existing ratepayers but not be fairly
130	5 Mike Ferguson	Υ	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline plan change and retain the current provisions.	distributed through Kaipara.
133	2 Francesca von Wurzbach-Purcell	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	None stated.	Consideration has not been given to correct infrastructure.
		l					proposed development will adversely impact the current
							infrastructure of the Village and the Heads. Including but not limited
							to traffic control, noise issues, water storage and management,
135	1 Lawrence Lowe	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change.	waste management, sewage management and public green space.
		İ	1	1	` '	· -	proposed development will adversely impact the current
		1					infrastructure of the Village and the Heads. Water storage,
							wastewater, run off and public green space have not been
136	1 Catherine Arnault	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change.	addressed.
130	2 Catherine Arnault		+	оррозс	astructure (General)	became the plan change.	333.0550.
			L.	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about impact on infrastructure and future requirements.
143	1 Peter Bankers	V	N				

							T
							Concerned about the impact on infrastructure considers there to be
							no evidence that the application is taking a co-ordinated approach to
							infrastructure planning and suggests that the technical reports,
144	1 Joel Cayford	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	None stated.	particularly traffic is deficient.
	ĺ				, ,		development of this size - will the developer be required to pay for
145	3 Julie Blanchard	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Require further information and confirmation of servicing.	any upgrade needed.
1.5	S same Stationard	1		оррозс	illinastractare (General)	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally
152	7 Carla Hood	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	with additional information.	proposed.
					,	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally
153	7 Philippa Muller	N	Υ	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	with additional information.	proposed.
							Requests a review of impact on scale and costs of fixed infrastructure
							of alternative levels of residential provision and the inclusion of a
							policy indicating how costs will be met. Requests a credible
454		.,	.,				assessment of the development on infrastructure and incorporation
154	4 Philip James McDermott	Y	Y	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Seek amendment. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	into asset management and long term plans.
156	9 Clive Boonham	v	v	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	with additional information.	Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally proposed.
130	5 Cive Boomian			Оррозе	illinastructure (General)	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally
160	9 Judith Anne Boonham	Υ	Y	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	with additional information.	proposed.
100	3 Sudici 7 time Decimani		<u> </u>	Оррозс	illinasti actare (ceneral)	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally
164	7 Alan Preston	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	with additional information.	proposed.
					,	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally
165	4 Alex and Linley Galbraith	n	Υ	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	with additional information.	proposed.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally
167	7 Tony Baker	У	Υ	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	with additional information.	proposed.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally
169	7 Jedda Kelly	У	Υ	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	with additional information.	proposed.
							Concerned about impact of increased residential development on
170	3 John Dawson	Y	Y	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Not stated	infrastructure and the environment.
171	7 Euan Upston	.,	v	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally proposed.
1/1	/ Luan opston	У		Оррозе	illinastructure (General)	with additional information.	Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally
175	3 John Southward	Y	v	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Not stated	proposed.
176	4 Peter Rothwell	v	v	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Not stated	Light pollution has not been adequately addressed.
			,		, ,		. ,
							Wants to understand location of services and what will be done to
							accommodate the development for the following: power, water,
							potable, washdown/fire fighting including storage tanks, sewerage
							disposal including any holding tanks, stormwater disposal including
177	6 Graham Bayes	Υ	У	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Request further information.	settling tanks, comms, data, any gas requirements.
405	disable !	l,		0	Information in 100 "	Dealton the plan shapes and the first of the state of	Command that there is no manifely to
198 203	4 Lisa Marshall 1 Katherine Ballantyne	Y N	y N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General) Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change and request further information.	Concerned that there is no provision for solar power. Main concerns are to do with water and waste water.
203	1 Natherine Ballatitytie	IN	IN	Oppose	imastructure (General)	Decline the plan change.	Oppose the application on the grounds that the aquifer will not
							support the development without risking our emergency water and
							that the waste water system does nothave the capacity for that
204	1 Katherine Ballantyne	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change.	many new connections.
						<u> </u>	·
							Concerned that sewerge and water supply infrastructure cannot
205	1 Lisa Steiner	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change.	cope. Also concerned about odour from chemicals for effluent dam.
							Get the town infrastructure right first before thinking about
							expanding residential unneccesarily. The proposal takes more water
							and puts pressure on sewerage system that has caused the town so
206	2 Julie Monaghan	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change and revisit the original vision.	much anguish over capacity previously.
	2 Prope Visit-i-la	l _N	N.	0	Noticed Uses de	Dealine the plan shange	Application should be declined due to the Tsunami zone and the
14	3 Ryan Vujcich	N	N	Oppose	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change.	proximity to the Mangawhai Estuary. Concerned that infill will result in increased flooding, questions how
19	4 Corinne Callinan	v	v	Oppose	Natural Hazards	None stated.	will this be managed.
24	6 Roger & Megan Kendall	Y	Y	Oppose	Natural Hazards	None stated.	Concerned with increased flooding into the harbour.
	o mobel a megan kendali			Tobbook	11020103		man marcasca modamy into the harboar.

	T				T		
46	4 John Stephens	Y Y		Seek Amendment	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about flooding due to location on edge of estuary and climate change threats. Provision for flooding not adequate - further research need to understand what is acceptable for the site.
54	4 Robin Hale	у ү	. (Oppose	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about flooding due to location on edge of estuary and climate change threats. Provision for flooding not adequate - further research need to understand what is acceptable for the site.
63	4 Grant McCarthy	Y Y		Seek Amendment	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about flooding due to location on edge of estuary and climate change threats. Provision for flooding not adequate - further research need to understand what is acceptable for the site.
73	4 Ross Hinton	Y		Seek Amendment	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about flooding due to location on edge of estuary and climate change threats. Provision for flooding not adequate - further research need to understand what is acceptable for the site.
74	4 Joy Murray	Y		Seek Amendment	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about flooding due to location on edge of estuary and climate change threats. Provision for flooding not adequate - further research need to understand what is acceptable for the site.
76	4 Phillip Murray	Y		Seek Amendment	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about flooding due to location on edge of estuary and climate change threats. Provision for flooding not adequate - further research need to understand what is acceptable for the site.
78	1 lan Fish	Y Y		seeks amendment	Natural Hazards	Council rejects application and requires further supporting evidence.	Concerned about flooding - shouldn't be building massive infrastructure in flood prone areas. Climate change needs to be considered.
79	4 Denise Stuart	Y Y		Oppose	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about flooding due to location on edge of estuary and climate change threats. Provision for flooding not adequate - further research need to understand what is acceptable for the site.
82	4 Neil Wilson	N Y	. (Oppose	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about flooding due to location on edge of estuary and climate change threats. Provision for flooding not adequate - further research need to understand what is acceptable for the site.
83	4 Graeme White	N Y		Oppose	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	provisions relating to flooding not adequate.
84	4 Graham & Gloria Drury	Y		Oppose	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about flooding due to location on edge of estuary and climate change threats. Provision for flooding not adequate - further research need to understand what is acceptable for the site.
100	3 Johanna Kloostenboer	Y Y		Oppose	Natural Hazards	None stated.	Area floods in winter, careful drainage needed.
112	4 Andrew Paul	N N	1 (Oppose	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about flooding due to location on edge of estuary and climate change threats. Provision for flooding not adequate - further research need to understand what is acceptable for the site.
125	4 Nick Carre	N N	1 5	Seek Amendment	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about flooding due to location on edge of estuary and climate change threats. Provision for flooding not adequate - further research need to understand what is acceptable for the site.
127	4 Georgina Carre	N N	I s	seeks amendment	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about flooding due to location on edge of estuary and climate change threats. Provision for flooding not adequate - further research need to understand what is acceptable for the site.
142	4 Abby Meagher	N N	1 (Oppose	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about flooding. Area is low lying 3m leaves little scope for combined events (high tide/high rainfall) - further research required.
152	4 Carla Hood	Y	. (Oppose	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about flooding due to location on edge of estuary and climate change threats. Provision for flooding not adequate - further research need to understand what is acceptable for the site.

r -							T
153	4 Philippa Muller	N	Y	Oppose	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about flooding due to location on edge of estuary and climate change threats. Provision for flooding not adequate - further research need to understand what is acceptable for the site.
156	5 Clive Boonham	Y	Y	Oppose	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about adequate water supply and pressure for fire fighting purposes, particularly during drought. Concerned about flooding given proximity to the estuary and climate change - needs and independent review paid for by the applicant.
160	5 Judith Anne Boonham	Y	Y	Oppose	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about adequate water supply and pressure for fire fighting purposes, particularly during drought. Concerned about flooding given proximity to the estuary and climate change - needs and independent review paid for by the applicant.
164	4 Alan Preston	Y	Y	Oppose	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about flooding due to location on edge of estuary and climate change threats. Provision for flooding not adequate - further research need to understand what is acceptable for the site.
165	5 Alex and Linley Galbraith	n	Y	Oppose	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about flooding due to location on edge of estuary and climate change threats. Provision for flooding not adequate - further research need to understand what is acceptable for the site.
167	4 Tony Baker	у	Y	Oppose	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about flooding due to location on edge of estuary and climate change threats. Provision for flooding not adequate - further research need to understand what is acceptable for the site.
169	4 Jedda Kelly	у	Υ	Oppose	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about flooding due to location on edge of estuary and climate change threats. Provision for flooding not adequate - further research need to understand what is acceptable for the site.
171	4 Euan Upston	y	Υ	Oppose	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about flooding due to location on edge of estuary and climate change threats. Provision for flooding not adequate - further research need to understand what is acceptable for the site.
174	4 Neil Torrie	N	Υ	Oppose	Natural Hazards	Provisions to be reviewed and greater margins provided for extreme events.	Concerned with the provisions relating to flooding, 3m ASL leaves little scope for combined events. Further research required to quantify margin.
194	4 Raewyn Torrie	N	Y	Oppose	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about flooding. Area is low lying 3m leaves little scope for combined events (high tide/high rainfall) - further research required. There is a significant reduction in some green spaces and the total
4	4 David James Cunningham	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	removal of others. This will become an issue with increased infill housing.
5	4 Alex Flavell-Johnson	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Opposed to any loss of green space, especially the queens chain. Public reserves are important.
6	7 Samantha Wood	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Concerned regarding the failure to allocate riparian rights / queens chain for public access and buffer zone and lack of divide between development and estuary.
12	4 Rob Cameron	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	None stated.
13	3 Desna Pilcher	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Concerned with lack of public access to estuary and that the walking track has gone.
18	2 Sascha Tschirky	N	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about reduction and removal or proposed green space and walkways, and that no 'Queens Chain' has been put aside.
19	2 Corinne Callinan	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Concerned that green spaces have been removed and no 'Queens Chain' proposed.
							Concerned with the limited green/open spaces and lack of Queens Chain. Questions how Reserves, beaches and parks will cope with
21	2 Raewyn Dodd	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	increased numbers, particularly in summer.
23	4 Natalie Bray-Gunn	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Concerned about the loss of the gum diggers track which was gifted to the community, and the lack of Queens Chain.

		1	1		1		O
24	2 Roger & Megan Kendall	v	v	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Opposes the reduction of proposed green space, and lack of riparian reserve/queens chain.
27	2 Janet Jacob	v	· v	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Inadequate green space.
27	2 Janet Jacob	-		Оррозе	Open / Green space	Assurance from Kaipara Council that any Council Owned	madequate green space.
20	5 6 6 4 4 5 1 1				0 /0 0	Land between his property and the subdivision does not	
28	5 Geoffrey William Campbell	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	have its legal status changed to his disadvantage.	Land acts as buffer between the subdivision and his property.
30	4 Sandie Souter	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Increased public space.	Opposes decreased open space.
							Concerned about the lack of green space so as to provide for quality
35	2 Mark Macdonald	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	of life, particularly where such small lot sizes are proposed.
							Opposes the loss of green space including public access along the
36	2 Grant Renall	N	N	Seek Amendment	Open / Green Space	None stated.	estuary front for more houses.
38	2 Adam Minoprio	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Opposes the loss of green space.
	·						Questions if there will be walking tracks around the estuary as there
45	4 Vivienne Martens	N	N	Seek Amendment	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	was one until gum diggers track was closed.
-							Inadequate provision for walking and cycling tracks. Refers to
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playing
46	6 John Stephens	v	v	Seek Amendment	Open / Green Space	with additional information.	fields or courts.
40	6 John Stephens	T .	T	Seek Amendment	Open / Green space		neids of courts.
					_ ,	Decline the plan change and require the applicant to	
47	1 Anne Robbins	Y	Υ	Seek Amendment	Open / Green Space	reduce the number of residential allotments.	Opposes the reduction in public spaces.
							Inadequate provision for walking and cycling tracks. Refers to
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playin
54	6 Robin Hale	У	Υ	Oppose	Open / Green Space	with additional information.	fields or courts.
55	5 Gary Cameron	N	Υ	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Opposes the reduction of open and green space.
56	5 Elizabeth Cameron	N	Υ	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Opposes the reduction of open and green space.
						-	
58	5 Katie Richards	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Concerned with lack of provision for parks to enhance the area.
					open, orden space		Lack of recreation space not acceptable, contributions to reserves
59	3 Gary Colhoun	v	v	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	fund will get absorbed into general KDC Funding.
39	3 dary comoun			Орроѕе	Open / Green space	None stated.	
							Inadequate provision for walking and cycling tracks. Refers to
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playing
63	6 Grant McCarthy	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Open / Green Space	with additional information.	fields or courts.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Oppose plan change as inadequate recreation space, no large open
64	5 Aaron McConchie	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Open / Green Space	with additional information.	spaces for increase in residents.
68	4 Peter Nicholas	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Seeks clarity on reserve contribution.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Opposes the change to greenspace - inadequate provision for
71	5 Rachael Williams	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Open / Green Space	with additional information.	recreation. More needs to be allocated.
				1	i i	Council to address all issues so development is self	
						sustained, protect the harbour and if the development	
						proceeds - for it to be sympathetic to the existing	Would like to see Gum diggers track re-opened, believes it was gifte
70	5 Alison Baird	N.	N.	0	Open / Green Space	environment.	to the community and is part of queens chain.
72	5 Alison Bairu	IN	IN	Oppose	Open / Green space	environment.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
							Inadequate provision for walking and cycling tracks. Refers to
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playin
73	6 Ross Hinton	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Open / Green Space	with additional information.	fields or courts.
1							Inadequate provision for walking and cycling tracks. Refers to
1						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playing
74	6 Joy Murray	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Open / Green Space	with additional information.	fields or courts.
	o Joy Widi ay						Inadequate provision for walking and cycling tracks. Refers to
	o Joy Murray						induceduate provision for walking and cycling tracks. Refers to
	o Joy Murray					Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	
76		Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playing
	6 Phillip Murray	Υ	Y	Seek Amendment	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	
		Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Open / Green Space	with additional information.	esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playin fields or courts.
76	6 Phillip Murray	Y	Y			with additional information. Council rejects application and requires further supporting	esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playin fields or courts. Does not agree with reserves contribution, plenty of area to provide
		Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Open / Green Space Open / Green Space	with additional information.	esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playing fields or courts. Does not agree with reserves contribution, plenty of area to provide for open space as part of the development and should be provided.
76	6 Phillip Murray	Y	Y			with additional information. Council rejects application and requires further supporting evidence.	esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playing fields or courts. Does not agree with reserves contribution, plenty of area to provide for open space as part of the development and should be provided. Inadequate provision for walking and cycling tracks. Refers to
76 78	6 Phillip Murray 5 lan Fish	Y	Y		Open / Green Space	with additional information. Council rejects application and requires further supporting evidence. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playin fields or courts. Does not agree with reserves contribution, plenty of area to provide for open space as part of the development and should be provided. Inadequate provision for walking and cycling tracks. Refers to esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playin,
76	6 Phillip Murray	Y	Y Y			with additional information. Council rejects application and requires further supporting evidence.	esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playing fields or courts. Does not agree with reserves contribution, plenty of area to provide for open space as part of the development and should be provided. Inadequate provision for walking and cycling tracks. Refers to esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playing fields or courts.
76 78	6 Phillip Murray 5 lan Fish	Y	Y	seeks amendment	Open / Green Space	with additional information. Council rejects application and requires further supporting evidence. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playing fields or courts. Does not agree with reserves contribution, plenty of area to provide for open space as part of the development and should be provided. Inadequate provision for walking and cycling tracks. Refers to esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playing fields or courts.
76 78	6 Phillip Murray 5 lan Fish	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	seeks amendment	Open / Green Space	with additional information. Council rejects application and requires further supporting evidence. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playing fields or courts. Does not agree with reserves contribution, plenty of area to provide for open space as part of the development and should be provided. Inadequate provision for walking and cycling tracks. Refers to esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playing fields or courts.
76 78 79	6 Phillip Murray 5 Ian Fish 6 Denise Stuart	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	seeks amendment Oppose	Open / Green Space Open / Green Space	with additional information. Council rejects application and requires further supporting evidence. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playing fields or courts. Does not agree with reserves contribution, plenty of area to provide for open space as part of the development and should be provided. Inadequate provision for walking and cycling tracks. Refers to esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playing fields or courts. Lack of open space is disappointing, existing spaces can't cope - neer
76 78 79	6 Phillip Murray 5 Ian Fish 6 Denise Stuart	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	seeks amendment Oppose	Open / Green Space Open / Green Space	with additional information. Council rejects application and requires further supporting evidence. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playing fields or courts. Does not agree with reserves contribution, plenty of area to provide for open space as part of the development and should be provided. Inadequate provision for walking and cycling tracks. Refers to esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playing fields or courts. Lack of open space is disappointing, existing spaces can't cope - need more publicly accessible green space.

						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Inadequate provision for walking and cycling tracks. Refers to esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playing
84	6 Graham & Gloria Drury	Y	v	Oppose	Open / Green Space	with additional information.	fields or courts.
04	o Granam & Gioria Brary	<u> </u>		Оррозс	Open / Green space	Publicise what has been granted and additional public	Must be adequate parks and facilities other than cycle and walkways
85	3 Sue Clayton	Y	lγ	Oppose	Open / Green Space	consultation.	to support the community.
	S out they take			оррозс	Specific Section Species		Wants council to require land parcels for open space not financial
							contribution so that it can be properly planned e.g. spots field on the
86	5 Paul Hendrickx	Υ	Υ	seeks amendment	Open / Green Space	None stated.	flat.
88	7 Cameron Shaw	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Questions where walkways will go and timeframes.
				•			Opposes the lack of provision for open space, particularly along the
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	inner harbour and the older gum diggers track; has amenity value as
94	6 Douglas V Moores	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	with additional information.	well.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Opposes the change to greenspace - inadequate provision for
95	5 Ella Grant	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	with additional information.	recreation. More needs to be allocated.
98	5 Martina Tschirky	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	concerned with loss of recreation and green space.
						Decline the application. Council should be held account for granting resource consents illegally before the	
102	3 Bruce Rogan	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Open / Green Space	necessary district plan changes were approved.	Loss of green spaces total absence of forward planning.
		1					Not enough green spaces/recreational areas. This is not what the
104	2 Gillian Cottrell	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	community initially supported.
106	3 Grainne Taylor	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Loss of riparian areas is not supported.
							Opposes reduction In green space particularly along Estuary Reserve between Molesworth Dr and southern end of the existing nature vegetation area (subzone 8). Need more space and connectivity around subdivision and existing bush area. Wants confirmation that the Gum diggers track will continue beyond the southern end of
107	1 Jeannette Reid	Υ	У	Oppose	Open / Green Space	life span of wastewater plant.	nature vegetation area and that it will be maintained.
108	3 Tim Taylor	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Loss of riparian areas is not supported.
110	3 Benjamin Finney	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Loss of riparian areas is not supported.
							Inadequate provision for walking and cycling tracks. Refers to
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playing
112	6 Andrew Paul	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	with additional information.	fields or courts.
							The loss of green spaces, total absence of forward planning for
116	3 John White	Υ	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	critical resources.
							I highly disagree with the lack of riparian rights / queens chain and
							the amount of parks and or green and for the proposed number of
117	3 Lukas Kendall	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	housing
120	1 Sherryll Burke	N	N	Onnoco	Open / Green Space	Decline the proposal and require amendments to 16.8.2.2 and 16.3.1.1 and 16.3.5.1	oppose the proposed plan change because: - it does not include any provisions for re and green spaces. Oppose removal of provision from 16.3.1.1(3) & 16.3.5.1. Require Village Green (Map 5) to be vested in Council.
120	1 Silettyll burke	IN	IN .	Oppose	open / Green space	and 10.3.1.1 and 10.3.3.1	Questions what the developers obligations are to provide
121	3 Kara Stones	N	N	0	Ones / Green Space	None stated	greenspace and 'community projects' . Greenspaces must be retained including Gum diggers track and other open space along the
121 124	2 Arnie & Yvette Leeder	N	N	Oppose Oppose	Open / Green Space Open / Green Space	None stated. Decline the plan change.	estuary. Concerned about loss of green space.
124	Z Arrile & Tvette Leeder	IN	IN	Oppose	open / Green Space	Decime the plan change.	Inadequate provision for walking and cycling tracks. Refers to
		- 1				Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playing
125	6 Nick Carre	N	N	Seek Amendment	Open / Green Space	with additional information.	fields or courts.
123	O IVICK CALLE	114	14	Jeek Amenument	open/ dieen space	with additional information.	inclus of courts.
127	6 Georgina Carre	N	N	seeks amendment	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Inadequate provision for walking and cycling tracks. Refers to esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playing fields or courts.
	,g 2011C	- F			. p.s, s. s.s. opuse		Concerned with loss of riparian access to fishing spots, and lack of
							boundary reserves. Concerned this will put more pressure on ecological areas by not providing corridors for native species, and

Concerned developer. That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the approved; tracks with the developer. Suprior franches of presents and playing and playing traches with additional information. That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the approved; tracks with the developer. Suprior franches of presents and playing traches with additional information. That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the approved; tracks with the approved; and playing and playing tracks with the approved of the plan change. Suprior franches of presents and playing tracks with the approved of the plan change. That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the approved and playing tracks with the plan change. Suprior franches of presents and playing tracks with the plan change. That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the approved and playing tracks with the plan change. Concerned to a suprior franches place and playing tracks with additional information. That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the developer. Suprior franches of presents place and playing tracks with additional information. That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the developer. Suprior franches of presents and playing tracks with additional information. That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the developer. Suprior franches of presents and playing tracks with additional information. That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the developer. Suprior franches of presents place. That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the example of presents and playing tracks with additional information. That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the developer. Suprior franches of presents place. That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the example and playing the plan change. That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the example and playing the plan change. That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the plan change. That KDC do not enter into an agreement with additional information. That KDC do not enter into an agreem
That LDC do not enter into an agreement with the and playing and p
131 3 Moira Jackson Y Y seek amendment Open / Green Space developer. 134 2 Belinda Vernon Y N Support Open / Green Space None stated. 135 Susan Rowbotham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Seek amendment. 137 Susan Rowbotham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 138 2 John Dickle Y N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 140 5 Stephanie Gibson N N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 141 2 Peter Bankers Y N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 142 1 Julie Blanchard N N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 143 1 Julie Blanchard N N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 145 1 Julie Blanchard N N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 146 1 Julie Blanchard N N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 150 4 William Keth Draper N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 151 5 Fhilip James McDermott Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 152 6 Garla Hood Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 153 6 Philippa Muller N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade because the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or concerned Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or concerned Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or concerned Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or concerned Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or concerned Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or concerned Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or concerned Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or concerned Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted and landscape Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted and landscape Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted and landscape Decline the pl
134 2 Belinda Vernon Y N Support Open / Green Space None stated. 137 Susan Rowbotham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Seek amendment. 138 2 John Dickie Y N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 138 2 John Dickie Y N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 140 5 Stephanica Gibon N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 141 6 Abby Meaghor N N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 142 6 Abby Meaghor N N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 143 1 Julie Blanchard N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 145 1 Julie Blanchard N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 146 4 William Keith Draper N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 150 4 William Keith Draper N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 151 0 Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 152 6 Carla Hood Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 153 6 Philippa Muller N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanate with additional information. 154 5 Philip James McDermott Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Seek amendment. 155 7 Christine Basham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or company of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted seplanate with additional information. 155 7 Christine Basham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted page planate with additional information. 156 8 Clive Boonham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or company open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted page planate with additional information. 157 Christine Basham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted and landscape open decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted and landscape open decline the plan change and
134 2 Belinda Vermon Y N Support Open / Green Space None stated. 137 Susan Rowbotham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Seek amendment. 138 2 John Dickle Y N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 138 2 John Dickle Y N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 140 5 Stephanie Gibson N N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 141 2 G Abby Meaghter N N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 142 G Abby Meaghter N N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 143 1 Julie Blanchard N N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 144 1 Julie Blanchard N N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 150 4 William Keith Draper N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 150 4 William Keith Draper N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 150 4 Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. 151 5 Philip James McDermott Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. 150 8 Clive Boonham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. 150 Philip James McDermott Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. 151 Philip James McDermott Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. 150 Philip James McDermott Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted splanate and the plan change open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted splanate and the plan change open / Green Space Decline the plan change open / Green Space Decline the plan change open / Green Space Open / Green Space Decline the plan change open / Green Space
tranches of presents a presents at a present and a present
presents a example of concerned connectivity inhabitants vehicles. Set and the plan change of concerned connectivity inhabitants vehicles. Set and the plan change of concerned connectivity inhabitants vehicles. Set and the plan change of concerned connectivity inhabitants vehicles. Set and the plan change of concerned connectivity inhabitants vehicles. Set and the plan change of concerned connectivity inhabitants vehicles. Set and the plan change of concerned connectivity inhabitants vehicles. Set and the plan change of concerned connectivity inhabitants vehicles. Set and the plan change of concerned connectivity inhabitants vehicles. Set and the plan change of concerned connectivity inhabitants vehicles. Set and the plan change of concerned connectivity inhabitants vehicles. Set and the plan change of concerned connectivity inhabitants vehicles. Set and the plan change of concerned connectivity inhabitants vehicles. Set and the plan change of concerned connectivity inhabitants vehicles. Set and the plan change of concerned connectivity inhabitants vehicles for connectivity inhabitants vehicles. Set and the plan change of connectivity inhabitants vehicles. Set and the plan change of connectivity inhabitants vehicles for connectivity inhabitants vehicles. Set and the plan change of connectivity inhabitants vehicles for connectivity inhabitants vehicles. Set and the plan change and require it to be re-submitted indicts or connectivity and connectivity inhabitants information. Inadequate the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade inhabitants information. Inadequate connectivity of connectivity inhabitants information. Inadequate connectivity of connectivity inhabitants information. Inadequate connectivity of connectivity inhabitants information. Inadequate connectivity of connectivity inhabitants information. Inadequate connectivity inhabitants information. Inadequate connectivity inhabitants information. Inadequate connectivity inhabitants information. Inadequate connectivity inhabitants
134 2 Belinda Vernon Y N Support Open / Green Space None stated. example of Concerned Connectivity in Juliants with less of Concerned Connectivity in Juliants with less of Concerned Connectivity in Juliants with less of Concerned Connectivity in Juliants with less of Concerned Connectivity in Juliants with less of Concerned Connectivity in Juliants with less of Concerned Connectivity in Juliants with less of Concerned Connectivity in Juliants with less of Concerned Connectivity in Juliants (Indiants of Connectivity
Concerned Concer
Susan Rowbotham
Susan Rowbotham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Decline the plan change. Decline the plan change. Goncerned Jasa 2 John Dickie Y N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Decline the plan change. Gum digge Decline the plan change. Decline the plan change. Concerned Jasa 2 Peter Bankers Y N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Concerned Jasa 2 Peter Bankers Y N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Concerned Decline the plan change. Concerned Jasa 3 William Keith Draper N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Decline the plan change. Concerned Jasa 4 William Keith Draper N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted finadequate Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted finadequate Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or co Jasa 4 William Keith Draper N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or co Jasa 5 Philippa Muller N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or co Jasa 6 Philippa Muller N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or co Jasa 6 Philippa Muller N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or co Jasa 6 Philippa Muller N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or co Jasa 6 Philippa Muller N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or co Jasa 6 Philippa Muller N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or co Jasa 6 Philippa Muller N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or co Jasa 6 Philippa Muller N Y Oppose Open / Green Spac
Susan Rowbotham
Susan Rowbotham
Susan Rowbotham
138 2 John Dickie Y N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Goncerned districts fee 140 5 Stephanie Gibson N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Gum digget 142 6 Abby Meagher N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Concerned 143 2 Peter Bankers Y N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Concerned 145 1 Julie Blanchard N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Concerned 145 1 Julie Blanchard N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Concerned 150 4 William Keith Draper N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Concerned 150 Open / Green Space Decline the plan change Open / Green Space Decline the plan change Open / Green Space
138 2 John Dickie Y N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Goncerned districts fee 140 5 Stephanie Gibson N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Gum digger 142 6 Abby Meagher N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Concerned 143 2 Peter Bankers Y N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Concerned 145 1 Julie Blanchard N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Concerned 150 4 William Keith Draper N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Opposes the plan change Oppose Open / Green Space Open / Green Space Decline the plan change Oppose Open / Green Space
138 2 Juhn Dickie Y N Oppose
140 S Stephanie Gibson N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Gum digger 142 6 Abby Meagher N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Concerned
142 6 Abby Meagher N N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Concerned 143 2 Peter Bankers Y N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Concerned 145 1 Julie Blanchard N N Oppose Open / Green Space Require further information and confirmation of servicing. Opposes the Open / Green Space Open /
143 2 Peter Bankers Y N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Concerned 145 1 Julie Blanchard N N N Oppose Open / Green Space Require further information and confirmation of servicing. Opposes th 150 4 William Keith Draper N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanadee; 152 6 Carla Hood Y Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Open
143 2 Peter Bankers Y N Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Concerned
145 1 Julie Blanchard N N N Oppose Open / Green Space Require further information and confirmation of servicing. Opposes the 150 4 William Keith Draper N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Concerned Inadequate esplanades or Concerned with additional information. 152 6 Carla Hood Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information. 153 6 Philippa Muller N Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information. 154 5 Philip James McDermott Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Seek amendment. 155 7 Christine Basham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 156 8 Clive Boonham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information. 156 8 Clive Boonham Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information. 157 Concerned and landscape oppulation. Inadequate esplanades and require it to be re-submitted esplanades and landscape oppulation. In an ew nature of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanades and landscape oppulation. In a new nature of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted and landscape oppulation. In a new nature of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted and landscape oppulation. In a new nature of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted and landscape oppulation. In a new nature of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted and landscape oppulation. In a new nature of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted and landscape oppulation. In a new nature of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted and landscape oppulation. In a new nature of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted and landscape oppulation. In new nature of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted and landscape oppulation. In new nature of the plan change of the plan cha
150 4 William Keith Draper N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 152 6 Carla Hood Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information. 153 6 Philippa Muller N Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information. 154 5 Philip James McDermott Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Seek amendment. 155 7 Christine Basham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or community. 156 8 Clive Boonham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted explanade in fields or community. 156 8 Clive Boonham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted explanade in fields or community. 156 8 Clive Boonham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information. 157 Concerned and landscape oppulation, a new nature and require it to be re-submitted explanade infelds or community. 158 Clive Boonham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information.
150 4 William Keith Draper N Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 152 6 Carla Hood Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information. 153 6 Philippa Muller N Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information. 154 5 Philip James McDermott Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Seek amendment. 155 7 Christine Basham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or community. 156 8 Clive Boonham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted explanade in fields or community. 156 8 Clive Boonham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted explanade in fields or community. 156 8 Clive Boonham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information. 157 Concerned and landscape oppulation, a new nature and require it to be re-submitted explanade infelds or community. 158 Clive Boonham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information.
Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or co fields or co 152 6 Carla Hood Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information. 153 6 Philippa Muller N Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information. 154 5 Philip James McDermott Y Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Seek amendment. 155 7 Christine Basham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade infelds or co Requests p 156 8 Clive Boonham Y Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade infelds or co Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade infelds or co Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade infelds or co Open / Green Space With additional information.
Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or co fields or co 152 6 Carla Hood Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information. 153 6 Philippa Muller N Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information. 154 5 Philip James McDermott Y Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Seek amendment. 155 7 Christine Basham Y Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade in fields or co Requests p 154 5 Philip James McDermott Y Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Seek amendment. 155 7 Christine Basham Y Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 156 8 Clive Boonham Y Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information. 156 8 Clive Boonham Y Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information. 157 Concerned and landscappupulation, a new nature and new natur
Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or co fields or co 152 6 Carla Hood Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information. 153 6 Philippa Muller N Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information. 154 5 Philip James McDermott Y Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Seek amendment. 155 7 Christine Basham Y Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade in fields or co Requests p 154 5 Philip James McDermott Y Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Seek amendment. 155 7 Christine Basham Y Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 156 8 Clive Boonham Y Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information. 156 8 Clive Boonham Y Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information. 157 Concerned and landscappupulation, a new nature and new natur
Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Requests p Philip James McDermott Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Requests p Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted seplanade in additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted seplanade in additional information. Concerned and landscape and landscape with additional information. Concerned and landscape and landscape population, a new nature and landscape and
152 6 Carla Hood Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space with additional information. fields or co Inadequate esplanade in space with additional information. fields or co Inadequate esplanade in space with additional information. 153 6 Philippa Muller N Y Oppose Open / Green Space with additional information. 154 5 Philip James McDermott Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Seek amendment. 155 7 Christine Basham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 156 8 Clive Boonham Y Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space with additional information. 158 Open / Green Space O
Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade of fields or content of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade of fields or content of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade of fields or content of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade of fields or content of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade of t
Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade in fields or community. Seek amendment. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade in fields or community. Requests p Mangawha Community. Community. Community. Community. Community. Christine Basham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Decline the plan change. Community. Community. Chain. Inadequate esplanade in fields or community. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Concerned with additional information. Concerned and landscape population. a new nature.
Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade in fields or community. Seek amendment. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade in fields or community. Requests p Mangawha Community. Community. Community. Community. Community. Christine Basham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Decline the plan change. Community. Community. Chain. Inadequate esplanade in fields or community. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Concerned with additional information. Concerned and landscape population. a new nature.
153 6 Philippa Muller N Y Oppose Open / Green Space with additional information. fields or co
154 5 Philip James McDermott Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Seek amendment. Mangawha 155 7 Christine Basham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 156 8 Clive Boonham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information. 156 8 Clive Boonham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space With additional information. 156 Concerned and landscapopopulation, a new nature of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted fields or concerned and landscapopopulation.
154 5 Philip James McDermott Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Seek amendment. Mangawha 155 7 Christine Basham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Open / Green Space Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade in desplanade with additional information. Community Chain. Inadequate esplanade in desplanade in des
154 5 Philip James McDermott Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Seek amendment. Mangawha 155 7 Christine Basham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. 156 8 Clive Boonham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Open / Green Space With additional information. 156 Clive Boonham Oppose Open / Green Space Open / Gree
155 7 Christine Basham Y Y Qoppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade of fields or concerned and landscape population, a new nature.
155 7 Christine Basham Y Y Qoppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade of fields or concerned and landscape population, a new nature.
155 7 Christine Basham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. chain. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted splanded efields or company of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted splanded efields or company of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted splanded efields or company of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted splanded efields or company of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted splanded efields or company of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted splanded efields or company of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted splanded efields or company of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted splanded efields or company of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted splanded efields or company of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted splanded efields or company of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted splanded efields or company of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted splanded efields or company of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted splanded efields or company of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted splanded efields or company of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted splanded efields or company of the plan change.
156 8 Clive Boonham Y Y Qopose Open / Green Space With additional information. Inadequate esplanade of fields or co
Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade in fields or co with additional information. Concerned and landscapopulation, a new nature.
156 8 Clive Boonham Y Y Q Oppose Open / Green Space with additional information. fields or co
156 8 Clive Boonham Y Y Q Oppose Open / Green Space with additional information. fields or co
Concerned and landsca population, a new natu
and landsca population. a new natu
and landsca population. a new natu
population. a new natu
a new natu
a new natu
planting an
158 8 Alister Kim Hamilton y y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. of a Parklar
Inadequate
Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade
160 8 Judith Anne Boonham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space with additional information. fields or co
Opposes th
Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted recreationa
161 Linda Ritchie N Y Oppose Open / Green Space with additional information. of developr
Concerned
163 5 Sue Fountain Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space Decline the plan change. facilities.
Inadequate
Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade i
164 6 Alan Preston Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space with additional information. fields or co
164 6 Alan Preston Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space with additional information. fields or co Revision of clauses regarding open space and Concerned
164 6 Alan Preston Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space with additional information. fields or co Revision of clauses regarding open space and Concerned 166 Mark Watson Rowbotham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space connectivity. Concerned
164 6 Alan Preston Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space with additional information. fields or co Revision of clauses regarding open space and Concerned 166 Mark Watson Rowbotham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space connectivity. Concerned Inadequate
164 6 Alan Preston Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space with additional information. fields or co Revision of clauses regarding open space and Concerned connectivity. Oppose Open / Green Space Connectivity. Inadequate open in the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanaded.
164 6 Alan Preston Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space with additional information. fields or co Revision of clauses regarding open space and Concerned 166 Mark Watson Rowbotham Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space connectivity. Concerned Inadequate
164 6 Alan Preston Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space with additional information. fields or co Revision of clauses regarding open space and Concerned connectivity. Concerned connectivity. Inadequate Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted or concerned connectivity.
164 6 Alan Preston Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space with additional information. fields or co Revision of clauses regarding open space and Concerned Concerned Concerned Concerned Inadequate 167 6 Tony Baker y Y Oppose Open / Green Space with additional information. fields or co Revision of clauses regarding open space and Concerned Concerned Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade with additional information. fields or co Inadequate
164 6 Alan Preston Y Y Oppose Open / Green Space with additional information. fields or co Revision of clauses regarding open space and Concerned connectivity. Concerned connectivity. Inadequate Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted esplanade of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted or concerned connectivity.

		1	1	1	1		In
470	4	l.,			0 40 6		Oppose the reduction in green space and access to the originally
170	1 John Dawson	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Not stated	proposed walking track.
							Inadequate provision for walking and cycling tracks. Refers to
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	esplanade reserve but not part of the proposal nor are parks, playing
171	6 Euan Upston	у	Υ	Oppose	Open / Green Space	with additional information.	fields or courts.
							Need to understand anticipated numbers to properly plan for green
177	4 Graham Bayes	Υ	у	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Request further information.	space and recreation facilities.
							Oppose the replacement of the green network overlay with the new
							natural environment subzone and reduced greenspace. Native bush
178	Richard Smith	У	Υ	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	and wetlands should be protected.
							Concerned about impact on existing Recreation facilities, expansion
179	David & Janet Norris	N	Υ	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Further information and consultation.	of these areas has not been provided for.
				1	1		·
							2) Also rumour has it that the Queen's chain is to be ignored in the
							subdivision. Mangawhai has several examples where this has
183	Trewby & Rosemary Bull	N	v	seek amendment	Open / Green Space	Due consideration to these matters.	happened, detrimental effect on the long term benefit of the town.
103	newby & Rosemary Bun	.,	<u> </u>	Seek differiument	open/ dreen space	Due consideration to these matters.	inappened, detrimental effect on the long term benefit of the town.
							Concerned about the reduction of green space, repressional areas
			1				Concerned about the reduction of green space, recreational areas
							and landscaping. Proposed is not sufficient for the intended
			1				population. Oppose the replacement of green network overlap with
							a new natural environment subzone. Should still be structural
				_			planting and use of large scale species to reinforce overall framework
184	8 Rob & Mary Farmer	Y	Υ	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	of a Parkland Community.
							Concerned about lack of open space and esplanade reserve.
							Questions where the esplanade reserve noted on the development
185	5 Faye & James Shewan	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change and request further information.	is.
186	4 Sally & Richard Wood	N	Υ	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Wants access to the track around the development.
							Concerned about reduction of greenspace and unclear if green
						Keep waterside open to the public, using both sides of the	network will be maintained. Waterway walkway will be essential
187	1 Fiona Simon	N	N	seek amendment	Open / Green Space	road as walkway.	with an increased population.
						Green spaces to be provided, not contribution to	
189	4 Grant Mitchell	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Open / Green Space	reserves fund.	Concerned about lack of green space.
							Structure plan only shows the walk/cycle way reaching the southern
							end of the 'nature vegetation' were it reaches the northern
							boundary. EESP has more than 3 possible connections to the
							Esplanade reserve but this has been reduced with no justification.
							16.8.8.1 - no mention of the formed walk/cycle track within zone 8 -
							will this be preserved? 16.7.1-3 boardwalks have been crossed out
							with no reason, It is noted that car parks etc could be formed, but
							only if it is vested as recreational reserve which means MC divest
			1				themselves of doing anything in terms of recreation etc/ 16.5.1 again
			1				
			1			Logal access over parts of C.L., de cub access di	divest MC from making ANY contributions to any so called 'green
	Mangauhai Bagraati					Legal access over parts of C Lands where gum diggers	network' when on a development of this size and nature would be
ll	Mangawhai Recreational		l,	L		track has ben formed, permanent protection of existing	expected. It is noted new lots will attract reserve contributions, but
191	1 Charitable Trust	У	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	tracks in zone 8.	these don't ensure green space or connectivity.
	.	L.	1	1-		L	<u> </u>
192	3 Elizabeth & Toby Evans	N	n	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Amount of greenspace to be provided needs to be made clear.
	1						Concerned about the lack of open space and esplanade reserve
196	3 David Macpherson	У	Υ	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	resulting in semi privatisation of waterfront areas.
l J							Concerned about the lack of sports facilities and open space.
197	2 Barbara Pengelly	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Waking/cycling track appears to lead to nowhere.
							Inadequate provision for recreational activities, unclear where
198	5 Lisa Marshall	Υ	у	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change and request further information.	esplanade reserve is.
			1			Requests that the zoning of his land is not changed to	
28	3 Geoffrey William Campbell	N	N	Oppose	Other	disadvantage or effect property value.	Concerned about any potential zoning changes.
			1	1		Consideration as to whether there is a need for this size of	
16	5 Thomas Williams	N	N	Oppose	Parking	development.	parking extensions should be included.
				1-00	1	The state of the s	In . O . verment and the management

	1						<u> </u>
							Concerned about where visitors to smaller sections will park.
80	4 Brenda Coleman	N	N	Oppose	Parking	Decline the plan change.	Originally promoted walking and cycling but this has been reduced.
155	9 Christine Basham	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Parking	Decline the plan change.	Concerned with impact on parking, particularly during summer.
158	2 Alister Kim Hamilton	У	У	Oppose	Parking	Decline the plan change.	Landscaping and short term parking is being compromised.
163	Malania Iana Calla			0,000	Darking	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Darking is an issue
162 184	Melanie Jane Gallo 2 Rob & Mary Farmer	Y	Y	Oppose	Parking Parking	with additional information. Decline the plan change.	Parking is an issue. Landscaping and short term parking is being compromised.
164	2 ROD & Wary Farmer	T T	T .	Oppose	Parking	Decline the plan change.	Should be kept at this size to be in keeping with surrounding sections
1	2 Lance Cocker	Υ	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Residential sections should be minimum 1050m2.	and as per the district plan.
-	E Edition Council	T'	·	Оррозс	nesidential / motinent size	Nestacital sections should be immunitized.	Objects to new zoning that allows housing to a minimum size of
							350m2 as not in keeping with character of the surrounding
2	1 Belinda Harman	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	environment.
							Additional housing is outside of the original plan with reduced
							section size. Additional houses will put unspecified demands on
4	1 David James Cunningham	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Council infrastructure.
							Strongly opposed to additional residential housing, especially small
							section size and high density. Unmitgatable adverse effects on the
5	1 Alex Flavell-Johnson	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	character of Mangawhai.
							350m2 sections is too small where will two water tanks fit or
6	2 Samantha Wood	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	individual septic tank systems.
							Residential zoning is too intensive. 1700 residential sites is going to
		l					massively impact the town. Infrastructure cannot handle such
7	1 Jo Lee	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Site should be no less than 600m2.	intensive development.
9	1 Jane Rowe	N	N	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	Questions how many residential properties are proposed.
							Comment of the state of the second of the state of the st
10	1 David Madland Slater	v	V	0,000	Decidential Alletment Cine	Decline the plan change	Concerned by the increase in the number of residential plots and plan for the provision of school premises and retirement homes.
10 12	1 David Medland-Slater 2 Rob Cameron	N N	N N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change. None stated.	None stated.
12	2 Rob Callieron	IN	IN	Oppose	Residential Allotthent Size	Notice Stated.	Does not agree with the amount of houses or units, section sizes are
13	2 Desna Pilcher	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	too small.
13	2 Bestia i ilenei			Оррозс	Residential Allothere size	became the plan change.	Concerned with the number of proposed sections and the need for
16	1 Thomas Williams	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Clear information regarding number of dwellings.	such a large scale subdivision.
10	1 memas vimans	- 1	i i	оррозс	Nesidential / motificité size	crear mornation regarding number of directings.	Already too many houses for the towns infrastructure. Concerned
18	1 Sascha Tschirky	N	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	with the minimal site requirements per section.
	ŕ			7.1.1			Submitter understand the need for medium to high density, but
							infrastructure is limited and thinks Mangawhai residents should be
							the ones benefitting from being able to subdivide to increase
19	5 Corinne Callinan	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Increased density should be rejected.	density, not this developer.
21	4 Raewyn Dodd	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Concerned with 'super high' density.
							Submitter suggest no more houses on small density lots are needed,
							concerned that lots are not large enough to provide water storage
22	2 Ken Marment	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	for fire fighting supply.
23	1 Natalie Bray-Gunn	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	Opposes additional houses.
T						A full review of the proposal to slow down the rate at	Opposes the change to the number of houses able to be built and
24	1 Roger & Megan Kendall	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	which housing is released.	the minimal site requirements.
							Oppose any changes to Viranda's original submission that allow
25	1 Miguel Hamber	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Reject the application for increased housing density.	increased density of housing.
30	3 Sandie Souter	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decreased number of houses.	Opposes increased number of houses.
		l				Change zoning of area 3D from 1000m2 to a rural zoning	
31	1 Ross Hill	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	as per earlier proposal.	Current zoning will relate in to big of a population.
3-	2 Marile Me - d 1 d	N.	N.	Onnese	Desidential Allatonant C	None stated	Questions if the 'incredibly small' lot sizes fit with the vision for
35 36	3 Mark Macdonald	N N	N N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	Mangawhai.
36	1 Grant Renall	IN	IN	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	Opposes the minimum lot size. Concerned about the increase in houses and the pollution impact on
38	1 Adam Minoprio	N	N	Onnoco	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	the estuary.
38	1 Adam Millioprio	IN	IN	Oppose	nesidential Allottilent Size	Decine the plan thange.	Increase in scale of development will change Mangawhai more that
39	1 Sarah Biggs	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	what was intended by the original plan.
39	T Dat att piggs	114	IN .	Оррозе	nesidential Allottilent Size	became the plan change.	what was intended by the original plant.
1							Number of small sections should be capped and designated e.g. how
44	1 Nigel Slight	N	N	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	Limit the number of small sections.	many are reserved for terrace houses and retirement village.
7-7	-100		<u>I.</u>	been rune numeric			,

45	1 Vivienne Martens	N	N	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	The high density of housing is not in keeping with the seaside town.
43	1 Vivienne iviai tens	IN	IN	Seek Amendment	Residential Anothrent Size		Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap,
46	3 John Stephens	v	v	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
40	3 John Stephens	-	· ·	seek Amendment	Residential Anotherit size	Decline the plan change and require the applicant to	330112 IS too Siliali aliu wiii luili character of Mangawilai.
47	2 Anne Robbins	v	v	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	reduce the number of residential allotments.	No minimum size of sections noted.
4/	2 Affile Robbins	T	T T	seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	reduce the number of residential allotments.	
48	A Nieles Constant	.,	l.,	0	Basidantial Allaton ant Cina	Dealine the also shows	housing gin this area should not be increased above the 300-350
50	4 Nicky Crocker	N N	N N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	originally discussed.
50	1 Ali Ajodani	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	Considers the proposed residential sections to be too small. Thinks the original housing plan that was agreed to should be used as
53	1 Ray Crocker	N	N	0,,,,,,,	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	not as dense.
33	1 Ray Clocker	IN	IN	Oppose	Residential Anotherit size	Decline the plan change. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap,
54	3 Robin Hale		v	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
55	2 Gary Cameron	N N	V	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Oppose the decreased lot sizes.
56	2 Elizabeth Cameron	N	v	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Oppose the decreased lot sizes.
58	3 Katie Richards	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	Oppose the decreased for sizes. Oppose the increase in residential unity, lots are too small.
36	3 Ratie Ricilaius	IN	IN	Орроѕе	Residential Anotherit size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap,
63	3 Grant McCarthy	v	v	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
03	3 Grant McCartny	1	ľ	Seek Amendment	Residential Anothrent Size	with additional information.	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap on
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	number of sites , sites are too small to accommodate rain water
64	3 Aaron McConchie	v	v	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	harvest and open space. Should be increased to 500m2.
04	3 Adron McConcine	-	· ·	seek Amendment	Residential Anotherit size	with additional information.	Concerned about the lack of certainty in terms of number of new
65	1 David Grant	v	v	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	Review and change with the community in mind.	houses.
66	1 Gail Williams	N N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	Opposes the number of dwellings proposed.
68	1 Peter Nicholas	V	v	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	Seeks clarity on lot density and total number of lots.
00	I Feter Microras	-	· ·	seek Amendment	Residential Anotherit size	None stated.	Seeks clarity on lot density and total number of lots.
							Maximum number of lots not stated - original proposal included a
							cap, requests this to be clearly stated. Concerned with the densities
							for specific zones and potential yield. Seeks clarification as to what
							density is applied to Integrated Residential Overlay. Potential change
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	in dwelling numbers does not fit well with Mangawhai, or align with
71	4 Rachael Williams	v	v	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	the Mangawhai Community Plan.
/1	4 Racidei Williams	1		Oppose	Residential Anotherit Size	Council to address all issues, protect the harbour and if	Concerned about lot sizes being reduced to 300m2, appeal for
						1.5	
72	1 Alison Baird	NI.	N.	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	the development proceeds - for it to be sympathetic to	Mangawhai is open space and green belts. Population increase Big
/2	1 Alison Ballu	IN	IN	Орроѕе	Residential Anotherit Size	the existing environment. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	impact on community and environment. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap,
73	3 Ross Hinton	v	v	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
/3	3 ROSS HIIILOII	-	· ·	seek Amendment	Residential Anotherit size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap,
74	3 Joy Murray	v	v	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
/4	3 Joy Multay	1	l'	Seek Amendment	Residential Anotherit Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	9
76	3 Phillip Murray	v	v	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size		Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap,
76	3 Fillilip Widitay			Seek Amenament			
		<u> </u>			Residential Anotheric Size	with additional information.	350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
70	2 Donico Stuart	v	v	Onnoco		Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap,
79	3 Denise Stuart	Y	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size		Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
		Y	Y		Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the increase, has changed significantly with little benefit to
80	1 Brenda Coleman	Y	Y N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change.	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the increase, has changed significantly with little benefit to the community.
		Y N N	Y N N		Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change. None stated.	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the increase, has changed significantly with little benefit to the community. Opposes planned residential.
80 81	1 Brenda Coleman 1 David Beattie	Y N N	Y N N	Oppose Oppose	Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change. None stated. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the increase, has changed significantly with little benefit to the community. Opposes planned residential. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap,
80	1 Brenda Coleman	Y N N	Y N N Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change. None stated.	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the increase, has changed significantly with little benefit to the community. Opposes planned residential. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
80 81	1 Brenda Coleman 1 David Beattie	Y N N	Y N N	Oppose Oppose	Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change. None stated. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the increase, has changed significantly with little benefit to the community. Opposes planned residential. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the density of development and concerned that the
80 81 82	1 Brenda Coleman 1 David Beattie 3 Neil Wilson	Y N N	Y N N Y	Oppose Oppose Oppose	Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change. None stated. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the increase, has changed significantly with little benefit to the community. Opposes planned residential. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the density of development and concerned that the maximum number of residential lots isn't stated. High density out of
80 81	1 Brenda Coleman 1 David Beattie	Y N N N	Y N N Y Y	Oppose Oppose	Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change. None stated. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the increase, has changed significantly with little benefit to the community. Opposes planned residential. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the density of development and concerned that the maximum number of residential lots isn't stated. High density out of character.
80 81 82 83	1 Brenda Coleman 1 David Beattie 3 Neil Wilson 3 Graeme White	Y N N N	Y N N Y	Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose	Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change. None stated. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the increase, has changed significantly with little benefit to the community. Opposes planned residential. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the density of development and concerned that the maximum number of residential lots isn't stated. High density out of character. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap,
80 81 82	1 Brenda Coleman 1 David Beattie 3 Neil Wilson	Y N N N V	Y N N Y Y	Oppose Oppose Oppose	Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change. None stated. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the increase, has changed significantly with little benefit to the community. Opposes planned residential. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the density of development and concerned that the maximum number of residential lots isn't stated. High density out of character.
80 81 82 83 84	Brenda Coleman David Beattie Neil Wilson Graeme White Graham & Gloria Drury	Y N N N V	y N N Y Y	Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose	Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change. None stated. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Publicise what has been granted and additional public	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the increase, has changed significantly with little benefit to the community. Opposes planned residential. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the density of development and concerned that the maximum number of residential lots isn't stated. High density out of character. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
80 81 82 83	1 Brenda Coleman 1 David Beattie 3 Neil Wilson 3 Graeme White	Y N N N V Y	Y N N Y Y Y	Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose	Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change. None stated. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the increase, has changed significantly with little benefit to the community. Opposes planned residential. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the density of development and concerned that the maximum number of residential lots isn't stated. High density out of character. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
80 81 82 83 84	Brenda Coleman David Beattie Neil Wilson Graeme White Graham & Gloria Drury	Y N N N Y Y	Y N N Y Y Y	Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose	Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change. None stated. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Publicise what has been granted and additional public	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the increase, has changed significantly with little benefit to the community. Opposes planned residential. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the density of development and concerned that the maximum number of residential lots isn't stated. High density out of character. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. 350m2 too small, multi story buildings should be prohibited. Zone 3A at 350m2 is too small for the rural coastal village and is
80 81 82 83 84	Brenda Coleman David Beattie Neil Wilson Graeme White Graham & Gloria Drury	Y N N N Y Y	Y N N Y Y Y Y	Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose	Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change. None stated. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Publicise what has been granted and additional public	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the increase, has changed significantly with little benefit to the community. Opposes planned residential. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the density of development and concerned that the maximum number of residential lots isn't stated. High density out of character. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. 350m2 too small, multi story buildings should be prohibited. Zone 3A at 350m2 is too small for the rural coastal village and is contrary to the Mangawhai community plan that was developed
80 81 82 83 84	Brenda Coleman David Beattie Neil Wilson Graeme White Graham & Gloria Drury	Y N N N Y Y	Y N N Y Y Y	Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose	Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change. None stated. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Publicise what has been granted and additional public	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the increase, has changed significantly with little benefit to the community. Opposes planned residential. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the density of development and concerned that the maximum number of residential lots isn't stated. High density out of character. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. 350m2 too small, multi story buildings should be prohibited. Zone 3A at 350m2 is too small for the rural coastal village and is contrary to the Mangawhai community plan that was developed with the community. Particularly object to 3A high density zone in
80 81 82 83 84 85	1 Brenda Coleman 1 David Beattie 3 Neil Wilson 3 Graeme White 3 Graham & Gloria Drury 7 Sue Clayton	Y N N N Y Y	Y N N Y Y Y	Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose	Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change. None stated. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Publicise what has been granted and additional public consultation.	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the increase, has changed significantly with little benefit to the community. Opposes planned residential. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the density of development and concerned that the maximum number of residential lots isn't stated. High density out of character. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. 350m2 too small, multi story buildings should be prohibited. Zone 3A at 350m2 is too small for the rural coastal village and is contrary to the Mangawhai community plan that was developed with the community. Particularly object to 3A high density zone in Molesworth causeway and tara creek foreshore - should be open
80 81 82 83 84	Brenda Coleman David Beattie Neil Wilson Graeme White Graham & Gloria Drury	Y N N N Y Y Y	Y N N Y Y Y Y	Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose	Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change. None stated. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Publicise what has been granted and additional public consultation. None stated.	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the increase, has changed significantly with little benefit to the community. Opposes planned residential. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the density of development and concerned that the maximum number of residential lots isn't stated. High density out of character. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. 350m2 too small, multi story buildings should be prohibited. Zone 3A at 350m2 is too small for the rural coastal village and is contrary to the Mangawhai community plan that was developed with the community. Particularly object to 3A high density zone in Molesworth causeway and tara creek foreshore - should be open space/park to augment amenity.
80 81 82 83 84 85	1 Brenda Coleman 1 David Beattie 3 Neil Wilson 3 Graeme White 3 Graham & Gloria Drury 7 Sue Clayton	Y N N N Y Y Y Y	Y N N Y Y Y Y	Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose	Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change. None stated. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Publicise what has been granted and additional public consultation. None stated.	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the increase, has changed significantly with little benefit to the community. Opposes planned residential. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. Opposes the density of development and concerned that the maximum number of residential lots isn't stated. High density out of character. Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai. 350m2 too small, multi story buildings should be prohibited. Zone 3A at 350m2 is too small for the rural coastal village and is contrary to the Mangawhai community plan that was developed with the community. Particularly object to 3A high density zone in Molesworth causeway and tara creek foreshore - should be open

88	1 Cameron Shaw	lv	lv	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	350m2 'way too small' aesthetically .
	1 cameron snaw			Оррозс	Residential Allotinent Size	None Stated.	Object to 600m2 property size, not in keeping with the open space of
89	2 Gainor & Graham Kerrigan	N	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	Mangawhai.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Number of lost will not fit with Mangawhai special nature and no
90	5 Doug Lloyd	N	N	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	mention of total number to be developed.
				i		Address concerns about increased number of permitted	·
91	3 Jonathan Drucker	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	dwellings.	None stated.
1						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	
94	1 Douglas V Moores	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	Opposes the number of dwellings proposed.
							Maximum number of lots not stated - original proposal included a
							cap, requests this to be clearly stated. Concerned with the densities
							for specific zones and potential yield. Seeks clarification as to what
							density is applied to Integrated Residential Overlay. Potential change
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	in dwelling numbers does not fit well with Mangawhai, or align with
95	2 Ella Grant	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	the Mangawhai Community Plan.
96	2 S & G Hockenhull	N	У	seek amendment	Residential Allotment Size	Restrictions regarding block size.	Blocks need to be bigger.
100	2 Johanna Klaastanhaar	v	v	Onness	Decidential Alletment Cine	None stated	Concerned about the number of houses and the impact on nature,
100	2 Johanna Kloostenboer	T	T .	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	concerned about character of Mangawhai getting lost.
							Considers that a better environmental outcome could be achieved if
							residential density remains reduced and includes integrated design
101	3 Madara Vilde	γ	v	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline application in current form.	including vegetated buffers and water course rehabilitation.
101	5 Maddid Mac		,	оррозс	nesidential / motificité size	became application in current forms	more to gettered buriers and water course rendamentations
						Decline application until a revised housing density is	Concerned that the infrastructure is not inline with residential
103	1 Gerard Wooters	N	N	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	provided.	housing. High density will make Mangawhai unbearable.
							There are far too many houses go back to the original. This is not
104	1 Gillian Cottrell	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	what the community initially supported
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap,
111	3 Myra Squire	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap,
112	3 Andrew Paul	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
							The lot sizes are too small and will negatively affect the special
115	3 Debra Searchfield	Υ	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	character.
	-1. 1. 144.5	.,	L.		B . I I A		The beach school is spilling at the seams - by increasing residential
116	2 John White	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	lots - this will not help.
							Highly disagree with house sites being 300-350sm when we live in a
117	2 Lukas Kendall	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	rural town. Highly disagree with over 1000+ houses getting jammed into such a small area.
117	2 Lukas Keridali	IN	IN	Орроѕе	Residential Anothient Size	Decline the plan change.	oppose the plan change provision regarding residential lots because
							the maximum number of residential lots is not stated. Rule 16.8.2.2
						Requests further information , certainty and clarity	currently sets limit at 500 residential units. But there is talk of up to
						including independent engineering report on capacity and	1000 dwellings or ore. This high density does not fit with rural
118	2 Mary Hurley Brown	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	life span of wastewater plant.	location of Mangawhai.
	·						Maintain current character of Mangawhai and surrounds, current
							limit of 500 on allowable number of residential units (Chapter
119	1 Mike Taylor	N	N	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	Seek amendment.	16.8.2.2. should be retained.
							Number of residential allotments not stated. Chapter 16 states no
120	3 Sherryll Burke	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Seek amendment.	more that 500 but this is being removed. Needs to be a cap.
]]			L .			L	Concerned about housing density and impacts on the community
121	1 Kara Stones	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	and environment.
405	2011				B . I I A	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap,
125	3 Nick Carre	N	N	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
							Concerned about the density questions what effect that will have on
							'Magical Mangawhai'. Concerned that maximum density controls do
							not apply to integrated development and queries what will be
							applied instead. Concerned that the cap has been removed (16.8.3.3)
126	4 Joby Beretta	N	Y	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	Request further information.	and what the new proposed cap is?
120	. poor seretta	1.,	1.	Jeen / mienament	nesidential Allotificht Size	I	and the new proposed cap is:

						T	T
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap,
127	3 Georgina Carre	N	N	seeks amendment	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
	5 Georgina Garre	- ` 		Seeks amenament	nesidential i motine il size	With dealtonal information.	SSOME IS too Small and Will rail character of Mangamian
							Density will adversely effect landscape, no covenants preserving the
							unique environment or allowing for the type of housing required
130	8 Mike Ferguson	v	N	Onnese	Residential Allotment Size	Decline plan change and retain the current provisions.	resulting in potential low cost slum housing. No minimum standards.
130	8 IVIIKE FEI gusoii	- 1	IN	Oppose	Residential Anotherit Size	Decline plan change and retain the current provisions.	resulting in potential low cost significating. No minimum standards.
							CURRORT lles let eines eles et et le contribie en le contribie et
							SUPPORT smaller lot sizes close to the 'retail' or business precinct
							enabling easy walking for residents; but without strict design rules
							for house types 350m2 is too small for the minimum site size in an
							enlarged sub zone footprint. 400m2 (as in the existing Chapter)
							should be the minimum. I SUPPORT a mix of site sizes as one moves
134	3 Belinda Vernon	Υ	N	Support	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	away from the 'town centre' of Mangawhai Central.
							SUPPORT smaller lot sizes close to the 'retail' or business precinct
				1			enabling easy walking for residents; but without strict design rules
				1			for house types 350m2 is too small for the minimum site size in an
]				1			enlarged sub zone footprint. 400m2 (as in the existing Chapter)
134	4 Belinda Vernon	Υ	N	Support	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	should be the minimum.
							16.8.2.2 Residential Density OPPOSE the deletion of the maximum
							number of sites to be available.
							I believe the maximum number of sites should be identified in the
							Chapter so that there is transparency on the scope of the potential
							development. This in turn can inform Council on the potential impact
							of the development on Council services including as wastewater and
							water services.
							I SUPPORT an increase in density but OPPOSE the densities provided
							for, except for 3D.
							The proposed Sub Zone 3A appears to be the largest zone within
							Mangawhai Central. Density at 350m2 will result in a solid block of
							housing with little potential for amenity value or privacy.
							Consideration needs to be given to the overall 'look and feel' of not
							=
							only the overall Mangawhai Central area, but the sub zones therein.
							There needs to be more provision for open, green, or common area
							spaces WITHIN the sub zones to avoid the 'block' feel that results
							from small and intensive lot sizes. The 'maximum' number of
							'minimum' lot sizes should be specified to ensure that there is
							variety of sizes within the subzones, not just a carpet of lots of the
134	9 Belinda Vernon	Y	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Seek amendment.	minimum size. This will add to character and appeal.
							16.15.2.1 Residential Lot Layout While I SUPPORT rectangle-shaped
					1		sites I also SUPPORT provision of 'offsetting' such sites so that they
134	12 Belinda Vernon	Υ	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Seek amendment.	don't directly back onto each other (rectangle on rectangle) but
1							
							16.14 and 16.8.22 density tables set limits at 500 however the
				1			changes could result in 1000-1400. Minimum section size should be
							no lower than 500m2 except for retirement village which should be
							surrounded by plenty of green space. Requests amendment to
137	Susan Rowbotham	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Seek amendment.	density table 16.8.22 especially subzone 3A.
							Concerned about the number of houses, 1000 . Should be no more
140	3 Stephanie Gibson	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	than 300-500 houses with larger sections.
							Number of houses is too high, concerned with size of sections, must
142	3 Abby Meagher	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	have room for water tanks.
							KDC has not given effects to the relevant objectives of the NPS UDC
				1			in the way it has approached community consultation because it has
							separated the consultation facts and figures about infrastructure
144	5 Joel Cayford	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	capacity, costs and who and how those matters will be provided for.
	- p			1 - 1-1		1	

1		1	1				1
				_			
145	2 Julie Blanchard	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Require further information and confirmation of servicing.	Opposes the increase of properties as will harm the environment. Concerned with size and number of sections, should not be more
147	1 David Goold	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Seek amendment.	than 500.
147	1 David Goold	IN	IN	Оррозе	Residential Allottilent Size	seek amenument.	Proposed density will have impact on infrastructure, requests that
148	7 Grant O'Malley	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	seek amendment to residential intensity.	the development be scaled back significantly.
150	1 William Keith Draper	N	v	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about the number of residential sections.
151	1 Francis & Michael Hookings	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about the increase in housing.
				- PP-000		Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap,
152	3 Carla Hood	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap,
153	3 Philippa Muller	N	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
							-
							Requests a market based rational for revised mix of housing given
							the census evidence o a wider range of age and family groups in the
154	1 Philip James McDermott	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Seek amendment.	growth mix, and the physical character of the site.
							High density housing undesirable in Mangawhai and could result in
155	2 Christine Basham	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	reverse sensitivity where right next to farms.
							Concerned with the size and density of development proposed,
							effects on the environment and village atmosphere. Need
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	certainty/cap on the number of lots. Should be 500. Concerned with
156	2 Clive Boonham	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	lot size, 350m2 too small as cant accommodate water tanks.
							Density is a significant increase and will have significant effects on
158	3 Alister Kim Hamilton	У	У	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Mangawhai.
							Oppose the change to policy 16.3.6.1 as provides for 1000 units or
							more, will present infrastructure issues particularly over summer.
							Oppose change to 16.8.2.2 350m2 and 500m2 are too small for
159	2 Anne Hollier	Υ	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Mangawhai and not in character.
							C
							Concerned with the size and density of development proposed,
						Destination of a second constitution is to be used to be a	effects on the environment and village atmosphere. Need
160	2 Judith Anne Boonham	.,	L,	0	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	certainty/cap on the number of lots. Should be 500. Concerned with
160	2 Judith Anne Boonnam	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	lot size, 350m2 too small as cant accommodate water tanks.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Concerned that the maximum number of lost is not stated, and that
161	Linda Ritchie	N	v	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	it has increased. Minimum size of 350m2 is too small.
101	Linda Kitcine	IN	'	Оррозе	Residential Allottilent Size	with additional information.	it has increased. Willimidin size of 330Hz is too shall.
							Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap,
163	3 Sue Fountain	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap,
164	3 Alan Preston	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
j							Oppose the number of residential lots, maximum number is not
							stated 16.8.2.2 currently sets the limit at 5000, 1000 dwellings ais
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	too many in a concentrated area. Minimum size of 350m2 is too
165	2 Alex and Linley Galbraith	n	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	small.
166	Mark Watson Rowbotham	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Reduction ins density, especially subzone 3A.	16.8.2.2 is not appropriate density level.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap,
167	3 Tony Baker	У	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
Т						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Oppose the new revised smaller allowance, have not been given
168	3 James Bremner	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	public approval.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap,
169	3 Jedda Kelly	У	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
							Oppose as this is the third planned increase in number of residential
170	2 John Dawson	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Not stated	units.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap,
171	3 Euan Upston	У	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	with additional information.	350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.

		1		I			In 45000
							Oppose 16.8.2.2 especially regarding zone 3D and the increase in
							density of Lots and 16.8.2.5 max height allowable, concerned about
							impact on their property - much higher than what was originally
172	1 Kevin Platt	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	anticipated.
						Grant the application on the condition that sufficient	
173	1 Peggyann Colville	N	Υ	Seek amendment	Residential Allotment Size	greenspace is included.	Concerned with the additional housing on smaller sections.
						8	6
							Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap,
175	2 John Southward	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Not stated	350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
							Proposed density is not consistent with District Plan, 350m2 not
							consistent with the existing development in Mangawhai and is not
176	1 Peter Rothwell	у	У	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Not stated	what residents have asked for.
							Oppose residential policy 16.3.6.1 increase residential units.
178	Richard Smith	y	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about lack of cap and potential strain on infrastructure.
		ľ				· •	No certainty in total number of lots. Concerned about increase.
179	David & Janet Norris	N	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Further information and consultation.	Minimum size of 350m2 is too small.
17.5				Оррозс			Density is a significant increase and will have significant effects on
184	3 Rob & Mary Farmer	v	v	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Mangawhai.
104	3 Nob & Ivial y Farmer		<u>'</u>	Оррозе	Residential Anotherit Size	Decline the plan change.	Oppose number of houses, not in keeping with Mangawhai, should
405	4 Faur & James Chause	.,			Desidential Allahurant Cias	Dealing the plan shows and assess to the single control of	be limited to what was originally proposed with a mix of section size.
185	4 Faye & James Shewan	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and request further information.	350m2 too small.
		L.					
186	2 Sally & Richard Wood	N	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	Concerned with the extra housing.
188	1 Cheryl Mitchell	N	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Reduced density of housing.	Oppose scale of housing with lack of green space.
193	3 Kathy Gordon	n	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Oppose proposal as no cap on number of residential units.
							reduce the number of residential allotments to control effluent into
195	2 David Ainley	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	the estuary and impact on existing infrastructure.
							High density development not suitable for Mangawhai. Concerned
							with increased housing as a result of the deletion of subzones 2, 4, 5
197	3 Barbara Pengelly	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	confirmation of number and size of residential allotments.	and 6. Concerned with restriction of lot size and effect on character.
							Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap,
198	6 Lisa Marshall	Υ	у	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and request further information.	350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
						† · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Ĭ .
							Oppose increase in density in zone 3D not what was original y
						Reduce lot size on the common boundary to what was	anticipated ad will have a detrimental effect on K Platts property
						originally proposed. Have a no complaints consent notice	16.8.2.5 max height allowable, concerned about impact on their
						registered on titles that fall within 100m of the common	property - much higher than what was originally anticipated. Don't
100	1 Shane Cullen	v	v	Onnoco	Residential Allotment Size	boundary.	
199	1 Stratte Cullett	+'		Oppose	nesidential Anotherit Size	boundary.	believe effects on this property have been properly addressed.
							The increased around a section of the contract
							The increased number of houses above the original (approximate)
							500 is not acceptable. That level of growth is too much and too fast
							for such a small town, particularly with the serious concerns about
							local infrastructure and issues with water supply. The increased
							density of sections to 350-500sm is not in keeping with the special
200		N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and request further information.	character of Mangawhai.
200	1 Ella Rickit				1		
200	1 Ella Rickit						
200	1 Ella Rickit						Section sizes are too small and not consistent with a community like
206	1 Ella Rickit 1 Julie Monaghan	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Section sizes are too small and not consistent with a community like Mangawhai. It will end up looking like Hobsonville Point.
		N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	
		N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change. Seeks a fence along he walkway not at his expense for	
		N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Seeks a fence along he walkway not at his expense for	
		N	N	Oppose Oppose	Residential Allotment Size		

			1				T
2	3 Belinda Harman	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	Do not allow stormwater run-off into the Tara Creek.	There are a range of beautiful birds that live in Tara creek which are endangered. Additional stormwater will affect water quality.
2	3 Delinida Harman	14	IN .	Оррозе	Storniwater	Bo not allow stormwater run-on into the rara creek.	Concerned regarding increased stormwater which when released
4	2 David James Cunningham	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	into the harbour will impact on natural resources, in particular natural wildlife.
							Concerned regarding additional stormwater runoff into the harbour
5	3 Alex Flavell-Johnson	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	and any sediment pollution entering the estuary as a result of construction.
6	5 Samantha Wood	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	Increased residential sections (1000+/- houses) will consistently flood and pollute surrounding waterways with runoff.
						Changes made to protect Mangawhai Harbour water	Mangawhai is a treasure and needs to be developed in a way that
12	1 Rob Cameron	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	quality.	looks after the environment and keeps it a special place. Concerned with stormwater from har surfaces being piped into the
13	4 Desna Pilcher	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	estuary
14	1 Ryan Vujcich	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	Application should be declined due to ongoing issues with stormwater.
						Clear information regarding where stormwater is being	Concerned about where all of the stormwater generated from the
16	4 Thomas Williams	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	directed and the expected volumes.	planned area of build will be directed. Concerned that the stormwater will be piped into the harbour with
18	3 Sascha Tschirky	N	Υ	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	no treatment. Should be stormwater ponds.
18	4 Sascha Tschirky	N	V	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	Concerned that the stormwater will be piped into the harbour with no treatment. Should be stormwater ponds.
19	3 Corinne Callinan	Y	v v	Oppose	Stormwater	None stated.	Concerned that stormwater to be piped into harbour.
21	1 Raewyn Dodd	N N	N N	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	Concerned with the adverse effects on the estuary.
21	1 Nacwyn Dodd	- 1		Оррозе	Stormwater	became the plan change.	Opposes the increased stormwater and it being piped into the
24	3 Roger & Megan Kendall	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Stormwater	None stated.	harbour with no retention of pollution.
26	1 Simon Hardley	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	Changes should not be allowed until consultation is made and community support achieved.	Concerned with pollution of the estuary from stormwater run off.
						Amend application to require Roof collection for water	Roof top catchment will help to relieve the volume of stormwater
29	3 Wendy Sheffield	Υ	Y	Seek Amendment	Stormwater	supply.	entering the estuary.
32	1 Emma Mallock	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	None stated.	Concerned about stormwater run off contaminating the water ways.
							Requests that Council ensures stormwater is treated before entering any waterways including during the earthmoving and construction
34	2 Suzanne Cameron	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Stormwater	Amend to require treatment of stormwater.	phase.
36	4 Grant Renall	N	N	Seek Amendment	Stormwater	None stated.	Suggest that stormwater be captured and treated onsite and used.
45	3 Vivienne Martens	N	N	Seek Amendment	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about stormwater run of into the estuary.
43	3 VIVIETITIE IVIAI CETIS	14	IN .	Jeek Amendment	Stormwater	becline the plan change.	concerned about stormwater run or into the estuary.
46	5 John Stephens	V	v	Seek Amendment	Stormwater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about the discharge of sediment into the harbour, considered there to be inadequate provisions to manage this.
40	3 John Stephens	'	1	Seek Amendment	Storniwater	with additional morniation.	considered there to be madequate provisions to manage this.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Concerned about the discharge of sediment into the harbour,
54	5 Robin Hale	У	Y	Oppose	Stormwater	with additional information.	considered there to be inadequate provisions to manage this. Concerned about untreated stormwater running into estuary and
							impact on the fairy turns and bittern and potential additional costs to
62	2 Paul David Rae	N	Υ	Oppose	Stormwater	None stated.	ratepayers.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Concerned about the discharge of sediment into the harbour,
63	5 Grant McCarthy	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Stormwater	with additional information.	considered there to be inadequate provisions to manage this.
							Oppose the discharge of stormwater to the estuary, general swale
64	4 Aaron McConchie	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Stormwater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	drains not adequate. Concerned about lack of mitigation e.g. retention ponds.
68	3 Peter Nicholas	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Stormwater	None stated.	Seeks clarity on stormwater run off.
69	5 Helen Current	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	Very concerned about stormwater run off into harbour.
				- 1:1			Opposes stormwater proposal and any other activity in the wetland
							area. Reliance of wetland for and stream network for stormwater
							discharge is outdated engineering. Stormwater activity must not be
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	detrimental to the wetlands. Concerned with change in activity
71	3 Rachael Williams	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Stormwater	with additional information.	status.

				T		Council to address all issues, protect the harbour and if	T
						the development proceeds - for it to be sympathetic to	Concerned about the lack of soakage and the 'massive' amount of
72	3 Alison Baird	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	the existing environment.	stormwater.
72	3 Alison Baird	- IN	14	Оррозе	Stormwater	the existing environment.	storniwater.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Concerned about the discharge of sediment into the harbour,
73	5 Ross Hinton	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Stormwater	with additional information.	considered there to be inadequate provisions to manage this.
			T T				1
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Concerned about the discharge of sediment into the harbour,
74	5 Joy Murray	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Stormwater	with additional information.	considered there to be inadequate provisions to manage this.
		Ť	Ť				
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Concerned about the discharge of sediment into the harbour,
76	5 Phillip Murray	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Stormwater	with additional information.	considered there to be inadequate provisions to manage this.
						Council rejects application and requires further supporting	Opposes discharge of stormwater to harbour, inadequate provision
78	3 Ian Fish	Υ	Υ	seeks amendment	Stormwater	evidence.	for stormwater an notes submission on these points 15 years ago.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Concerned about the discharge of sediment into the harbour,
79	5 Denise Stuart	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Stormwater	with additional information.	considered there to be inadequate provisions to manage this.
							· · · ·
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Concerned about the discharge of sediment into the harbour,
82	5 Neil Wilson	N	Υ	Oppose	Stormwater	with additional information.	considered there to be inadequate provisions to manage this.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	
83	5 Graeme White	N	Υ	Oppose	Stormwater	with additional information.	Opposes discharge to harbour, inadequate provisions for treatment.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Concerned about the discharge of sediment into the harbour,
84	5 Graham & Gloria Drury	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Stormwater	with additional information.	considered there to be inadequate provisions to manage this.
							Development is close to harbour and estuary, should be no discharge
						Publicise what has been granted and additional public	from construction and consider adequate must be protection from
85	5 Sue Clayton	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Stormwater	consultation.	flooding.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Provisions for stormwater are not adequate, concerned about
87	4 Dianne Glucina	N	Υ	Oppose	Stormwater	with additional information.	sediment discharge.
							Kaipara harbour overlay is 40% residential sections. Questions where
88	2 Cameron Shaw	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Stormwater	None stated.	stormwater will go and how it will effects estuary.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Concerned about quality of water discharged and effect of volume
90	1 Doug Lloyd	N	N	Seek Amendment	Stormwater	with additional information.	on salinity. Not sufficiently addressed.
91	2 Jonathan Drucker	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	stormwater	Address concerns about stormwater run off.	None stated.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Concerned with sediment from earthworks and untreated
94	4 Douglas V Moores	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	with additional information.	stormwater flowing into the harbour.
							Opposes stormwater proposal and any other activity in the wetland
							area. Reliance of wetland for and stream network for stormwater
							discharge is outdated engineering. Stormwater activity must not be
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	detrimental to the wetlands. Concerned with change in activity
95	6 Ella Grant	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	with additional information.	status.
98	4 Martina Tschirky	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Stormwater	None stated.	Concerned with stormwater.
						Dealton the plan shapes of the State of the	Command through the distance of the control of the
	E Annaharan S. J.			0	Chamman	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Concerned about the discharge of sediment into the harbour,
112	5 Andrew Paul	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	with additional information.	considered there to be inadequate provisions to manage this.
		l		l _a			I highly disagree storm water and excess run off to drain directly into
117	1 Lukas Kendall	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	the estuary.
	E Ware Sterre	M	NI.	0	Charmy	Nonestated	Developer must pay for any necessary upgrades, cost should not fall
121	5 Kara Stones	N	IN	Oppose	Stormwater	None stated.	on ratepayers.
	Mangawhai Harbay					Encurs adaquate enfoquences in place during a constant to	Concerned about sediment discharge int the harbour, requests that
122	Mangawhai Harbour	v	.,	Onnoco	Stormwistor	Ensure adequate safeguards in place during construction phase.	it be monitored by a third party to ensure water quality not impacted.
123 124	1 Restoration Society 5 Arnie & Yvette Leeder	N N	y N	Oppose	Stormwater Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	
124	5 Arrile & TVELLE LEEGER	IN	IN	Oppose	Stormwater	Decime the plan change.	water runoff has not been appropriately addressed.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be so submitted	Concerned about the discharge of codiment into the harbour
125	5 Nick Carro	N	N	Saak Amandmont	Stormwater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about the discharge of sediment into the harbour,
125	5 Nick Carre	IN	IN	Seek Amendment	Stormwater	with additional information.	considered there to be inadequate provisions to manage this.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be so submitted	Concerned about the discharge of codiment into the harbour
127	5 Georgina Carre	N	N	seeks amendment	Stormwater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about the discharge of sediment into the harbour, considered there to be inadequate provisions to manage this.
127	3 Ocorgina Carre	I N	li.	seeks amenument	Stormwater	with additional information.	considered there to be madequate provisions to manage tills.

		1		1			In 111 111 11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
130	3 Mike Ferguson	Υ	N	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline plan change and retain the current provisions.	Concerned that the harbour will be adversely effected by stormwater runoff particularly due to lack of riparian areas.
							Does not consider swales to be effective management for sediment,
							suggest retention and sediment basins. Recent history of site raises
138	6 John Dickie	Y	N	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	concern re: sediment control during construction.
							100m3/day available under the existing consent not adequate for
							1000 households proposed and commercial/industrial use. Already
138	7 John Dickie	Υ	N	Oppose	stormwater	Decline the plan change.	pressure on water supply, particularly in drought.
152	5 Carla Hood	.,		0	Chamana tan	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about the discharge of sediment into the harbour,
152	3 Caria Hood	T	T	Oppose	Stormwater	with additional information.	considered there to be inadequate provisions to manage this.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Concerned about the discharge of sediment into the harbour,
153	5 Philippa Muller	N	Υ	Oppose	Stormwater	with additional information.	considered there to be inadequate provisions to manage this.
	··						Concerned about stormwater impact on the estuary and the impact
155	6 Christine Basham	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	on recreation and wildlife values.
		.,	.,			Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Concerned about the discharge of sediment into the harbour,
156	7 Clive Boonham	Y	Y	Oppose	Stormwater	with additional information.	considered there to be inadequate provisions to manage this.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Concerned about the discharge of sediment into the harbour,
160	7 Judith Anne Boonham	v	v	Oppose	Stormwater	with additional information.	considered there to be inadequate provisions to manage this.
100	7 Judicii Aime Boomani	· ·	'	Оррозе	Stormwater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	considered there to be inadequate provisions to manage this.
161	Linda Ritchie	N	Υ	Oppose	Stormwater	with additional information.	Concerned about run off into harbour during construction.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Concerned about the discharge of sediment into the harbour,
164	5 Alan Preston	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Stormwater	with additional information.	considered there to be inadequate provisions to manage this.
4.67	5 Tana Palan			0	C+	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Concerned about the discharge of sediment into the harbour,
167	5 Tony Baker	У	Y	Oppose	Stormwater	with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	considered there to be inadequate provisions to manage this. Concerned about the discharge of sediment into the harbour,
169	5 Jedda Kelly	V	v	Oppose	Stormwater	with additional information.	considered there to be inadequate provisions to manage this
103	5 Seada Keny	,	1	Оррозс	Stormwater	With additional miletination.	considered there to be induceduate provisions to manage this
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Concerned about the discharge of sediment into the harbour,
171	5 Euan Upston	У	Υ	Oppose	Stormwater	with additional information.	considered there to be inadequate provisions to manage this.
						Provisions to be reviewed and greater margins provided	Concerned with proposed stormwater management, considers it
174	5 Neil Torrie	N	Y	Oppose	Stormwater	for extreme events.	inadequate. Concerned about fun off and siltation of harbour.
176	2 Peter Rothwell	У	У	Oppose	Stormwater	Not stated	Sites do not allow for stormwater soakage due to small size.
							oppose the change in the storm water management in the plan
							change there is no details to suggest how the stormwater will be
178	Richard Smith	v	Υ	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	successfully managed, particularly given low lying flood prone area.
-:0		1					Concerned about stormwater and increased siltation and
194	5 Raewyn Torrie	N	Υ	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	contamination of the harbour.
							Oppose discharge into harbour, inadequate provisions of treatment
198	7 Lisa Marshall	Υ	У	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change and request further information.	provided.
	11		.,		Chamana	Dealine the also shows	Concerned about runoff and damage this may cause on waterways.
1	1 Lance Cocker	Y	Y	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	The estuary must be protected. 16.10 Subdivision Provisions
							16.10.10.1 Lot Sizes I OPPOSE the minimum vacant freehold lot sizes
							for 3A. 3B. 3C
							Note the Table shows Sub-zone 3C minimum size as 700m2 but is
134	10 Belinda Vernon	Υ	N	Oppose	Subdivision	Seek amendment.	shown as 750m2 in the Table in 16.8.2.2.
							POLICIES16.3.11.1 to include the mandatory catchment of all rain
						_ ,, , ,	water off every roof within the subdivision (both business and
178	Richard Smith	У	Υ	Oppose	Subdivision	Decline the plan change.	residential). This would also reduce stormwater.
40	3 David Medland-Slater	v	v	Onness	Traffic / Panding	Decline the plan change	Concerned about increase in general traffic at peak times once development is completed.
10	3 David iviediand-Stater	T	ĭ	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	Decline the plan change.	uevelopment is completed.

1		-	1	1	1		Managauhai Danda ara tao parrous tha amount of shans and light
13	7 Desna Pilcher	N	N	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	Decline the plan change.	Mangawhai Roads are too narrow, the amount of shops and light industrial has disappeared in favour of tiny house sites.
13	7 Desila Flicilei	IN	IN	Орроѕе	Traffic / Roading	Decline the plan change.	Concerned with incremental traffic increases. Roading is insufficient
							to cope with 1000 more houses, causeway could divide the
			l	_			community unless developers pay for works to improve the
19	1 Corinne Callinan	Y	Y	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	None stated.	causeway and roundabout.
						Amend application to require second road access on the	
						western boundary towards Old Waipu Road to allow for	
						Auckland (via new Te Hana motorway extension) and	
						Mangawhai North traffic without having to use	Concerned with impact on traffic between Mangawhai Village and
29	1 Wendy Sheffield	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Traffic / Roading	Molesworth Drive.	Mangawhai Heads.
							Concerned potential traffic flow problems arising from entrance and
30	5 Sandie Souter	N	N	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	None stated.	exit onto Molesworth Drive, not cleared what is being proposed.
				• •	, ,		Concerned about the impact of increased traffic on the existing
						Decline the plan change and require the applicant to	network and considers the increase not to have been appropriately
47	3 Anne Robbins	v	v	Seek Amendment	Traffic / Roading	reduce the number of residential allotments.	mitigated.
69	4 Helen Current	N N	N N	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about impact on roading.
03	4 Heleli Current	IN .	in .	Оррозе	Traffic / Roading	Decline the plan change.	
90	F Branda Coloman	N	N	0,000	Traffic / Roading	Decline the plan change	Need more pedestrian friendly walkways and cycle ways to reduce
80	5 Brenda Coleman	IN	IN	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	Decline the plan change.	congestion.
							Oppose the North South Main street orientation with the
							predominant wind, will result in cold 'dismal' shopping centre.
							Estuary Estate plan had East/west argument proposed that this
							would be too shady is not convincing. Concerned with general
86	3 Paul Hendrickx	Υ	Υ	seeks amendment	Traffic / Roading	None stated.	roading layout.
96	4 S & G Hockenhull	N	У	seek amendment	Traffic / Roading	Restrictions regarding roading.	Roading can't sustain development - needs looking into.
							Disappointed that the developer has reneged on making Molesworth
98	2 Martina Tschirky	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	None stated.	into a slow street.
							Concerned about adverse effects on Old Waipu Road Connection and
100	1 Johanna Kloostenboer	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	None stated.	amount of traffic in the village, especially in summer.
					, , , , ,		Request that adequate provision be made for several outlets to the
							Heads and Village area rather than being focused on Molesworth
							Drive, specific residential intensity neds to be provided to enable
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	
111	4 Mura Squiro	N	N	0,,,,,,	Traffic / Roading	with additional information.	impact on emergency vehicles.
111	4 Myra Squire	IN	IN	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	with additional information.	
404	614 61		l		- cc /p /:		Concerned about traffic congestion on ring road and impact on
121	6 Kara Stones	N	N	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	None stated.	access to local amenities.
							Concerned about traffic on Molesworth Drive, questions if traffic
126	1 Joby Beretta	N	Y	Seek Amendment	Traffic / Roading	Request further information.	impact study has been undertaken.
							Concerned with the increased traffic and the effects on the
139	3 Renata Blair	Υ	N	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	Decline the plan change.	environment.
			1				
			1				Considers technical documents provided in regards to traffic to be
144	3 Joel Cayford	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	None stated.	deficient particularly how it deals with effects on Molesworth Drive.
148	5 Grant O'Malley	N	N	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	seek amendment to residential intensity.	Concerned about effect on traffic.
							Concerned that the proposal hasn't considered the capacity of the
			1				bridge on Molesworth Drive, concerned with the increased use
							resulting form the proposal. Would like to see this addressed
							appropriately to include consideration of holiday and supermarket
							traffic and comment from NTA. Concerned that no arterial routes
							through Old Waou into the Cove have been proposed given the
						Seek amendment to include arterial road and further	increased traffic. One way in and out proposed - this should be re-
149	1 Sharon Martin	v	V	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	consideration of increased traffic to be generated.	addressed.
149	T SHALOH MALIN	T	T .	Oppose	ITATIIC / ROAUING	consideration of increased traffic to be generated.	
			1				Requests a review of traffic impacts on the wider network including
	- a	l,	L		- 60 /- "		comprehensive review ITA taking into account future impact on and
154	3 Philip James McDermott	Υ	Y	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	Seek amendment.	around Molesworth Drive.
155	3 Christine Basham	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	Decline the plan change.	Roading cannot support additional housing development.
			1				Road scape amenity as provided in the DP and Structure pan is being
158	1 Alister Kim Hamilton	У	У	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	Decline the plan change.	diminished.

		1			1		
							How is traffic circulation going to be handled including pedestrian
177	3 Graham Bayes	Υ	v	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	Request further information.	movement and integration with existing road and cycle networks.
1,,	5 Granam Bayes	1	,	Оррозс	Trainer Heading	nequest farther information.	Road scape amenity as provided in the DP and Structure pan is being
184	1 Rob & Mary Farmer	Υ	Y	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	Decline the plan change.	diminished.
	, , , , ,				,		
						Ensure allotments have their own septic system and do	Objects to the existing wastewater treatment plant being used for an
2	2 Belinda Harman	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	not use the existing one.	additional 1000 homes. Concerned about odour and capacity.
							Oppose the use of the waste water treatment plant which could
5	5 Alex Flavell-Johnson	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	reduce its capacity to service the rest of Mangawhai.
							Concerned about putting more strain on the wastewater system that
6	3 Samantha Wood	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	is already near capacity.
							Concerned by inadequate details about how the developer will deal
10	2 David Medland-Slater	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	with wastewater.
12	3 Rob Cameron	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	None stated.
							Concerned about putting more strain on the wastewater system that
13	5 Desna Pilcher	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	is already near capacity.
							Application should be declined due to ongoing issues with
14	2 Ryan Vujcich	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	wastewater.
							Submitters property is located next to Lincoln Downs Councils
							Effluent Farm. Concerned about the impact extra wastewater
15	1 Allan Dowson	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	irrigation from new development will have on their property .
						Clear information regarding where wastewater will be	
						treated, who is paying for the extra processing costs or	Concerned about where wastewater will be treated as the existing
16	2 Thomas Williams	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	are they proposing a new wastewater system?	wastewater treatment plant is at capacity.
							Concerned in regards to the impact 1700 houses will have on the
20	1 Andrew Rae	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	wastewater facilities, and how this will effect ratepayers.
				_			Wastewater system will need to be increased to cope, this cost must
22	1 Ken Marment	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	be covered by the developer.
	a Natalia Bassa Coma	l.,	l.,		14/	Name about a	Concerned sewage system wont handle the additional loading. The
23	3 Natalie Bray-Gunn	IN	N N	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	community should not have to pay for new pump stations.
24	5 Roger & Megan Kendall	v	v	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	Concerned with 1500+ waste going into already maxed wastewater plant.
24	5 Roger & Wegari Keridan		<u>'</u>	Орроѕе	wastewater	None stateu.	plant.
						Council to assess the costs of scaling up the current	
						sewerage system to meet the needs of the development	Oppose any changes to Viranda's original submission that allow
25	3 Miguel Hamber	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	and any necessary upgrades to charged to Viranda.	disproportionate use of the aquifer.
2.5	5 Wilguer Hamber	- '`		Оррозс	waste water	and any necessary approacs to charge a to viranaa.	Existing sewage infrastructure is insufficient to cop with this number
						Changes should not be allowed until consultation is made	
26	2 Simon Hardley	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	and community support achieved.	increased to cover this.
20	z omion maraicy		.,	Оррозс	Waste water	and community support demotes.	Concerned with impact on recreational uses, not clear what is being
30	2 Sandie Souter	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Council to protect estuary from wastewater.	proposed.
				- FF		р	Concerned about Mangawhai sewerage system capacity and any
32	2 Emma Mallock	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	potential cost for ratepayers.
							i i
		1					Identifies water supply as a key concern that needs to be focused
							not, the proposal should have to source its own water particularly
							given the community already experiences drought issues. Questions
35	5 Mark Macdonald	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	whether climate change has been considered.
36	3 Grant Renall	N	N	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	None stated.	Suggests that sewerage be dealt with on site.
40	1 Dion Pilmer	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	Concerned that the proposal will overload the wastewater system.
		1				Provide further technical independent studies on the	Concerned that the existing wastewater system cannot
42	1 Johanna Baylis	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	sustainability of existing services they want to use.	accommodate the additional loading and potential impact on rates.
		1					Concerned about wastewater system capacity and questions if
45	3 Vivienne Martens	N	N	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	developers will be contributing to an upgrade.

							Oppose connection to KDC treatment plan, applicant should have to
							supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of
							connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater
46	1 John Stephens	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	with additional information.	treatment.
48	3 Nicky Crocker	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	Infrastructure cannot cope.
49	2 Paul Walyon	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	Opposes wastewater supply.
							Want to know what the impact on the wastewater system will be as
50	1 Ali Ajodani	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Confirmation of impact on residents.	a result of the ne residential dwellings.
						·	
							Lives across road from the pump station, 'overpowering' odour is
							currently generated at peak times. Also concerned it will overflow
							into the estuary, wants to understand what study there has been
51	1 Maralynne Latu	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Guarantee that increased odour will not be generated.	done into potential effects on the wildlife.
				- FF-000			Oppose connection to KDC treatment plan, applicant should have to
							supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of
							connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater
54	1 Robin Hale	v	v	Oppose	Wastewater	with additional information.	treatment.
3-	1 Robin Haic	У	<u> </u>	Оррозс	waste water	With additional information.	a camena
							Opposes the connection to the wastewater system and concerned
							about additional costs to ratepayers, to deal with additional load,
55	3 Gary Cameron	N	v	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	questions if applicant are still going to pay to upgrade.
33	5 daily cameron	- 11	<u> </u>	Оррозс	waste water	became the plan change.	questions in applicant are still going to pay to approac.
							Opposes the connection to the wastewater system and concerned
							about additional costs to ratepayers, to deal with additional load,
56	3 Elizabeth Cameron	N	v	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	questions if applicant are still going to pay to upgrade.
30	5 Elizabeth Cameron	IN .	'	Оррозе	Wastewater	becline the plan change.	questions il applicant are still going to pay to apgrade.
							Oppose connection to wastewater system, and concerned with
							potential costs to ratepayers. Development should provide their own
го	1 Katio Bishards	N	N	Onness	Mastowator	None stated	
58	1 Katie Richards	IN	IN	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	system. Not clear how may connections are required. Lack of clarity around wastewater, independent assessment
59	1 Gary Colhoun	v	V	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	required. Concerned about potential cost to ratepayers.
39	1 Gary Comoun	'	-	Орроѕе	wastewater	None stated.	Not enough information about the sewerage, existing system wont
60	1 Jan Colhoun	v	v	Not stated	Wastewater	None stated.	cope.
00	1 Jan Comoun	- '		Not stated	Wastewater	None stated.	Oppose connection to KDC treatment plan, applicant should have to
							supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of
							connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be
						Decline the plan shapes and require it to be required	= '
62	1 Crant McCarthy	v	V	Cools Association and	Mastauatar	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater treatment.
63	1 Grant McCarthy	T T	T	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	with additional information.	
							Oppose connection to KDC treatment plan, applicant should have to
							supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of
						Dealine the plan shapes and association in the	connections and volume of discharge, further assessment needed, if
	1	v	v	Santa Amara I	14/	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	development will result in near capacity - developer should be
64	1 Aaron McConchie	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	with additional information.	required to fund.
							Concerned about the lack of certainty in terms of number of new
	alposid C	v	v	Santa Amara I	14/	Devices and change with the	connections to wastewater, and who will pay for any required
65	2 David Grant	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	Review and change with the community in mind.	upgrades.
	2 C-il Milli	.,		0	14/	Name about d	Wants to understand the existing capacity of the wastewater
66	2 Gail Williams	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	system and whether it can support the increase.
		1	1.		L	Decline the plan change unless applicant pays for own	Concerned about impact on wastewater system and potential costs
67	2 Allanna Pendleton	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	water supply and wastewater disposal.	for ratepayers.
68	2 Peter Nicholas	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	None stated.	Seeks clarity on wastewater.
69	2 Helen Current	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about lack of viable wastewater provision.
							Oppose connection to KDC treatment plan, applicant should have to
		1	1				supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of
							connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater
70	1 Glen Real	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	with additional information.	treatment.

		1	1		T		
							Oppose connection to KDC treatment plant, concerned with lack of detail re number of connections and volume of discharge, no
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	evidence to suggest the system has capacity. Requires more detail
71	1 Rachael Williams	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	with additional information.	and further consultation with ratepayers.
						Council to address all issues, protect the harbour and if	
		<u> </u>				the development proceeds - for it to be sympathetic to	Concerned about impact on wastewater system and potential costs
72	4 Alison Baird	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	the existing environment.	for ratepayers - developer should pay for own system.
							Oppose connection to KDC treatment plan, applicant should have to supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of
							connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater
73	1 Ross Hinton	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	with additional information.	treatment.
							Oppose connection to KDC treatment plan, applicant should have to supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of
							connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be
74	1 lov Murrov	v	V	Sook Amondment	Wastawatar	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater
/4	1 Joy Murray	'		Seek Amendment	Wastewater	with additional information.	treatment. Oppose connection to KDC treatment plan, applicant should have to
							supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of
							connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater
76	1 Phillip Murray	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	with additional information.	treatment.
							Opposes connection to wastewater system due to already stretched
						Applicant should provide own independent treatment	capacity. Number of connections have not been stated and value of
77	1 Alan S Mauraan Hunt	N	V	Seek Amendment	Mastawatar	facility for the development. If not feasible, council to obtain report on condition lifespan of current system.	discharge not quantified, further information and consultation with
- ''	1 Alan & Maureen Hunt	IN	T	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	obtain report on condition mespan of current system.	ratepayers required before decision made.
							Opposes connection to wastewater system due to already stretched
							capacity. Number of connections have not been stated and value of
							discharge not quantified, further information and consultation with
							ratepayers required before decision made. Concerned about
78	2 lan Fish	Y	Y	seeks amendment	Wastewater	evidence.	discharge to harbour. Oppose connection to KDC treatment plan, applicant should have to
							supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of
							connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater
79	1 Denise Stuart	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	with additional information.	treatment.
							System is already under strain not designed to cope with this level of
							development. Applicant should contribute and not burden
80	3 Brenda Coleman	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	ratepayers.
			L				Concerned that wastewater system will be overloaded if
81	4 David Beattie	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	development proceeds to the planned level.

							Oppose connection to KDC treatment plan, applicant should have to
							supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of
							connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater
82	1 Neil Wilson	N	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	with additional information.	treatment.
							Oppose connection to wastewater system, no evidence to suggest it
							can cope with additional demand, lack of clarity in terms of number
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	of connections. Applicant should provide their own. Concerned
83	1 Graeme White	N	v	Oppose	Wastewater	with additional information.	about additional costs to ratepayers.
63	1 Graeme White	IN		Орроѕе	wastewater	with additional information.	Oppose connection to KDC treatment plan, applicant should have to
							1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
							supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of
							connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater
84	1 Graham & Gloria Drury	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	with additional information.	treatment.
						Publicise what has been granted and additional public	servicing should be undertaken by the developer, need to ensure no
85	1 Sue Clayton	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	consultation.	run off into harbour.
							Detailed independent report needs t be commissioned to
							understand capacity. Applicant must be accountable for any
86	6 Paul Hendrickx	v	v	seeks amendment	Wastewater	None stated.	additional costs, not the ratepayers.
80	JI dai Herianeka	+	T'	Seeks differentieffe	waste water	none stateu.	Oppose connection to KDC treatment plan, applicant should have to
l							supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of
							connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater
87	1 Dianne Glucina	N	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	with additional information.	treatment.
							Questions why there is no upgrade proposed and concerned about
88	3 Cameron Shaw	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	capacity.
							Oppose connection to current system; lacks capacity. The developer
							could offer to extend plant. Concerned about smell and cost for
89	1 Gainor & Graham Kerrigan	N	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	ratepayers. Need further research on the sustainability of the plant.
- 55		-		Оррозс			Developer should provide their own system as current one couldn't
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	cope. Need further independent information on capacity and further
90	3 Parral Land		.,	Seek Amendment	14/	with additional information.	
90	2 Doug Lloyd	IN	IN	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	with additional information.	consultation with community.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Oppose - the applicant should provide their own independent system
94	3 Douglas V Moores	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	with additional information.	as the existing could not cope. Need hydrological assessment.
							Oppose connection to KDC treatment plant, concerned with lack of
							detail re number of connections and volume of discharge, no
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	evidence to suggest the system has capacity. Requires more detail
95	7 Ella Grant	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	with additional information.	and further consultation with ratepayers.
							· <i>'</i>
						Decline he application. Council should be held account for	
						granting resource consents illegally before the necessary	1 has the (Ecocare) sowage system the canacity to cone with
400	40.0	.,	.,				1. has the (Ecocare) sewage system the capacity to cope with
102	1 Bruce Rogan	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	district plan changes were approved.	projected demand been validated by an independent expert.
l l							L
	.1.			I		Decline application until a revised housing density is	No reliable evidence presented to establish adequate capacity,
103	3 Gerard Wooters	N	N	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	provided.	Council neds to decide if applicant should supply own system.
							There are already water problems and allowing a new commercial
							development and residential development to tap into existing
l	Janne Rowe linked to 1st						infrastructure is not on, initial proposal was that the developer
105	1 submission	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Developer should build own infrastructure.	provides their own.
	1	1		1 "			Low lying development, and should not be connected to already
106	1 Grainne Taylor	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	overloaded system
100	2 Grannie rayion	T,			Tradection.		
							oppose the plan change provisions in respect of wastewater
						Requests further information, containty and algorithm	
l						Requests further information , certainty and clarity	treatment, number of connection not stated. No reliable evidence to
				L		including independent engineering report on capacity and	_ ==
107	2 Jeannette Reid	Y	У	Oppose	Wastewater	life span of wastewater plant.	No provision for capital cost of any works to upgrade the system.
							Low lying development, and should not be connected to already
108	1 Tim Taylor	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	overloaded system.
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

110 Secretario Research 111 Objecto 112 Objecto 113 Objecto 114 Objecto 115 Objecto 115 Objecto 116 Objecto 117 Objecto 117 Objecto 118 Objecto 118 Objecto 119 Ob	$\overline{}$			1			1		Low lying development, and should not be connected to already
Oppose Waterwater and Section in Control of the Span change of register in to be re-submitted in the Section of the Span change of register in to be re-submitted in the Section of the Span change of the Section of the Span change of register in to be re-submitted in the Span change of the Section of the Span change of the Section of t	11	0 1	Benjamin Finney	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	
Description to be re-admitted on connections and volume of discharge, further constitution doubted with additional information. In American Information of the properties of		-	. Derijanim i miley			оррозс	- Trade Water	Trone stated.	Oppose connection to KDC treatment plan, applicant should have to
131 1 Marie Squite N Doppse Wistewater with additional information, undertaken with rangement public agreement or wastewater and provided the provided of the									supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of
Oppose commentation to Kill treatment plant, applicant should have supply own fine (comment with but of detail no more detail								Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be
Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted to the control of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted to the control of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted to the control of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted to the plan change. 115	11	1 1	Myra Squire	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	with additional information.	undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater
Define the plan change and require it to be in esubmitted of the plan change and require it to be in esubmitted of the plan change. 15 1 Obbas searchfield V V O Oppose Watewater Obdine the plan change. 16 1 V O Oppose Watewater Obdine the plan change. 17 2 I Alais Roddell N N N O Oppose Watewater Obdine the plan change. 18 2 Watewater Obdine the plan change. 18 3 Watewater Obdine the plan change. 18 4 Watewater Obdine the plan change. 18 5 V O Oppose Watewater Obdine the plan change. 18 5 V O Oppose Watewater Obdine the plan change. 18 6 V V O Oppose Watewater Obdine the plan change. 18 6 V V V Oppose Watewater Obdine the plan change. 18 6 V V V Oppose Watewater Obdine the plan change. 19 6 V V V Oppose Watewater Obdine the plan change of the plan cha									Oppose connection to KDC treatment plan, applicant should have to
Decide the plan change and require it to be re-submitted 115 Debra Searchfield V Oppose Wastewater Occident the plan change Internation The applicant should supply their own facility for wastewater Occident the plan change. Internation								supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of	
317 3 Andrew Paul N Oppose Wastewater Oesline the galant change The applicant founds upply their our facility for wastewater Oesline the galant change The applicant founds upply their our facility for wastewater Oesline the galant change The applicant founds upply their our facility for wastewater Oesline the galant change The applicant founds upply their our facility for wastewater Oesline the galant change The applicant founds upply their our facility for wastewater Oesline the galant change The applicant founds upply their our facility of wastewater Oesline the galant change The applicant founds upply their our facility of wastewater Oesline the galant change The applicant founds upply their our facility of wastewater Oesline the galant change The applicant founds upply their our facility of wastewater The applicant founds upply their our facility of wastewater Oesline the galant change The applicant founds upply their our facility of wastewater The applicant founds upply their our facility of wastewater The applicant founds upply their our facility of wastewater The applicant founds upply their our facility of wastewater The applicant founds upply their our facility of wastewater The applicant founds upply their our facility of wastewater The applicant founds upply their our facility of wastewater The applicant founds upply their our facility of wastewater The applicant founds upply their our facility of wastewater The applicant founds upply their our facility of wastewater The applicant founds upply their our facility of wastewater The applicant founds upply their our facility of wastewater The applicant founds upply their our facility of wastewater The applicant founds upply their our facility of wastewater The applicant founds upply their our facility of wastewater The applicant founds upply their our facility of wastewater The applicant founds upply the applicant founds upply their our facility of wastewater The applic									connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be
110 1 Debra Searchfield Y Y Oppose Waterwater Oscilare the plan change the plan change the control facility for subservater 117 4 stakes Kendall N I N Oppose Waterwater Oscilare the plan change the plan change in the Policy of the plan change provision regarding the waterwater plan change in the Policy of the								Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater
130 Debro Sandhield V V Oppose Wastewater Oscilire the glan change. 137 Judius Fandall V V Oppose Wastewater Oscilire the glan change. 138 Judius Fandall V V Oppose Wastewater Oscilire the glan change of the general programment of the wastewater statement of the proper the glan change provision regularing the wastewater statement or capacity and carry including independent or general programment or capacity and carry including independent or general programment or capacity and carry including independent or general programment or capacity and carry including independent or general programment or capacity and carry including independent or general programment or capacity and carry including independent or general programment or capacity and carry including independent or general programment or capacity and carry including independent or general programment or capacity and carry including independent or general programment or capacity and carry including independent or capacity and carry including including and capacity including	11	2 1	Andrew Paul	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	with additional information.	treatment.
117 a Lukas Kendalt N N N Oppose Wastewater Decline the plan change. Inhibity disagree that they want to book into our overstrained wastewater system. 128 a Many Hurley Brown Y Y Oppose Wastewater If ea pain of wastewater appears on capacity and cluttly including independent registering register to capacity and cluttly including independent registering register to a capacity and provide our facility. No indication of number of countries and cluttly including independent registering register to a capacity and provide our facility. No indication of number of countries and countries and countries and countries and countries and countries. An independent (from Council and the Applicant) assessment is required to validate the assumptions and understaining relative to a particular should growle our facility. So indication of number of countries are considered in the countries of the capacity of the capacity of any receivable of personal countries. An independent (from Council and the Applicant) assessment is required to validate the assumptions and understaining relative to a provide many of any receivable or required to validate the assumptions and understaining relative to the particular should provide the some integration and understaining relative to a provide so that make a form of any facility of any receivable or consistent and provide to some integrations. An independent seasonal provide is some independent seasonal provide and some integrations and on a stage page. 125 1 Nick Carre N N N Seek Amendment Wastewater Wastewater Provided from the page of the capacity of relative objects to the Capacity of the capacity									The applicant should supply their own facility for wastewater
117 4 Lukas Kendall N N Oppose Westewater Obetine the plan change. westewater system. 1 oppose the plan change in the plan chan	11	.5 1	Debra Searchfield	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	treatment for the development.
Requests further information, certainty and clarity including independent engineering report on capacity and surprise information. Namy Murley Brown V Oppose Wostewater 119									I highly disagree that they want to hook into our overstrained
Requests further information, cretarity and cistry, including independent engineering ergor concapacity and including information of mumber of connections so no way of innoving volume or if the system care to connections and including information. It is a proper or compact of the system care of t	11	7 4	Lukas Kendall	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	wastewater system.
Requests further information, certainty and clarify including independent employering report on capacity and iffe span of wastewater plant. 138								-	
Requests further information, certainty and clarify including independent employering report on capacity and iffe span of wastewater plant. 138									I oppose the plan change provision regarding the wastewater
118 1 Vary Hurley Brown V V Oppose Wastewater life span of wastewater plant. connections on no way of knowing volume or if the system can consider the summitted of the system can consider the consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the syst								Requests further information , certainty and clarity	treatment by connecting with the KDC's existing treatment system,
118 1 Vary Hurley Brown V V Oppose Wastewater life span of wastewater plant. connections on no way of knowing volume or if the system can consider the summitted of the system can consider the consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the system can consider the syst								including independent engineering report on capacity and	applicant should provide own facility. No indication of number of
An independent (from Council and the Applicant) assessment is required to validate the assumptions and undertakings relative to wastewater contained in Sec 6.714-72. 22. 122 d Kars Stones N N N Oppose Wastewater Decline the plan change. 124 J Arma & Yvitte Leeder N N Oppose Wastewater Decline the plan change. 125 J Nick Carre N N N Seek Amendment Wastewater with additional information. 126 J Nick Carre N N N Seek Amendment Wastewater with additional information. 127 J Georgina Carre N N Seek Amendment Wastewater Request further information. 128 J James Hislop N N N Oppose Wastewater with additional information. 129 J James Hislop N N N Oppose Wastewater with additional information. 120 Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted to existent the relative to some connections in the proposed development has not been stated volume of slockings cannot therefore be quantified, No relative to some connections in the proposed development wastewater treatment the number of some connections in the proposed development wastewater treatment the number of some connections in the proposed development wastewater variety and provide its own independent variety and the capital costs of the capital costs of the capital costs of the capital costs of the capital costs of the capital costs of the capital costs of the capital costs of the capital costs of the capital costs of the capital costs of the capital costs of the capital costs of the capital cost of the capital costs of the capital costs of the capital cost of the capital costs of the capital cost of t	11	8 1	Mary Hurley Brown	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater		connections so no way of knowing volume or if the system can cope.
2 Mike Taylor N N Seek Amendment Wastewater Seek amendment. 122 4 Kara Stones N N N Oppose Wastewater None stated. 124 5 James & Yvette Leeder N N N Oppose Wastewater Decline the plan change. 125 1 NkC Carre N N Seek Amendment Wastewater with additional information. 126 3 Joby Beretta N Y Seek Amendment Wastewater Wastewater with additional information. 127 1 Georgina Carre N N Seek amendment Wastewater Wastewater with additional information. 128 1 Lames Hislop N N N Oppose Wastewater with additional information. 129 1 Georgina Carre N N N seeks amendment Wastewater with additional information. 129 1 Lames Hislop N N N Seek amendment Wastewater with additional information. 120 1 Lames Hislop N N N seeks amendment Wastewater with additional information. 120 2 Lames Hislop N N N seeks amendment Wastewater with additional information. 120 3 Joby Beretta N Y Seek Amendment Wastewater Wastewater Bequire to be re-submitted with additional information. 120 4 Georgina Carre N N N seeks amendment Wastewater Bequire the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. 120 5 Lames Hislop N N N seeks amendment Wastewater Wastewater with additional information. 120 6 Oppose commonction to EXC system, the applicant Viranda should provide its own independent wastewater treatment the number connections in the proposed development has not been stated volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified to volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified to volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified to volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified to volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified to volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified to volume			, , , , ,						,
2 Mike Taylor N N Seek Amendment Wastewater Seek amendment. 122 4 Kara Stones N N N Oppose Wastewater None stated. 124 5 James & Yvette Leeder N N N Oppose Wastewater Decline the plan change. 125 1 NkC Carre N N Seek Amendment Wastewater with additional information. 126 3 Joby Beretta N Y Seek Amendment Wastewater Wastewater with additional information. 127 1 Georgina Carre N N Seek amendment Wastewater Wastewater with additional information. 128 1 Lames Hislop N N N Oppose Wastewater with additional information. 129 1 Georgina Carre N N N seeks amendment Wastewater with additional information. 129 1 Lames Hislop N N N Seek amendment Wastewater with additional information. 120 1 Lames Hislop N N N seeks amendment Wastewater with additional information. 120 2 Lames Hislop N N N seeks amendment Wastewater with additional information. 120 3 Joby Beretta N Y Seek Amendment Wastewater Wastewater Bequire to be re-submitted with additional information. 120 4 Georgina Carre N N N seeks amendment Wastewater Bequire the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. 120 5 Lames Hislop N N N seeks amendment Wastewater Wastewater with additional information. 120 6 Oppose commonction to EXC system, the applicant Viranda should provide its own independent wastewater treatment the number connections in the proposed development has not been stated volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified to volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified to volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified to volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified to volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified to volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified to volume									An independent (from Council and the Applicant) assessment is
2 Mike Taylor N									
221 4 Kara Stones N N Oppose Wastewater None stated. On releapers.	11	9 2	Mike Taylor	N	N	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	Seek amendment.	
121						Sec. v. menament			
3 Armie & Yvette Leeder	12	1 4	Kara Stones	N	N	Onnose	Wastewater	None stated	
Oppose connection to KC system, the applicant Viranda should provide its own independent vastewater treatment the number connections in the proposed development has not been stated volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No flex adequates of a pagality. There are no provisions relating to the capital coals of a pagality. There are no provisions relating to the capital coals of a pagality. There are no provisions relating to the capital coals of a works required to connect Mangawhai Central to the current virth additional information. 25 3 Joby Beretta N Y Seek Amendment Wastewater Request further information. Concerned about impact on existing system, question if a capacity system. Concerned about impact on existing system, question if a capacity study has been done and who will be paying costs if upgrade is a required. Oppose connections in the proposed development has not been stated volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, to relation the treatment the number connections in the proposed development has not been stated volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, to relation the state of the subject of connections in the proposed development has not been stated volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, to relation the current system. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Wastewater with additional information. Wastewater should be provided by developer at their cost alone, due to insufficient evidence from XDC that there is adequate capacity in ratepayers. Transparency in decision and no additional cost to works required to connect Mangawhai Central to the current system. Wastewater ratepayers. Transparency in decision and no additional cost to usual manufaction of residential allotments and further reporting required to confirm five advances from XDC that there is adequate capacity in ratepayers. Transparency in decision and no additional cost to confirm if wastewater system can cope with increase. If and N				N					
provide its own independent wastewater treatment the number connections in the proposed edvelopment has not been stated volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable evidence has been presented to establish if there is a dequate capacity. There are no provisions relating to the capital costs of a connection in the proposed edvelopment has not been stated volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable evidence has been presented to establish if there is a dequate capacity. There are no provisions relating to the capital costs of a connection in the capital costs of a connection in the capital costs of a connection in the capital costs of a connection in the proposed edvelopment has not been stated volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable evidence has been presented to establish if there is a dequate capacity. There are no provisions relating to the capital costs of a connection in the proposed edvelopment has not been stated volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable evidence has been presented to establish if there is a dequate capacity. There are no provisions relating to the capital costs of a connection in the proposed edvelopment has not been stated volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable evidence has been presented to establish if there is a dequate capacity. There are no provisions relating to the capital costs of a connection and the proposed edvelopment has not been stated volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable evidence has been presented to establish if there is a dequate capacity. There are no provisions relating to the capital costs of a connection and the proposed edvelopment has not been stated volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable evidence has been presented to establish if there is a dequate capacity in the proposed edvelopment has not been stated volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified. 127 1 Georgina Carre N N N Seeks amendment Was			7 time a recte feeder			оррозс	- Trade Water	became the plan change.	** * * *
connections in the proposed development has not been stated volume of discharge cannot freeforce be quarified, no relable evidence has been presented to establish if there is adequate capacity. There are no provisions relating to the capital costs of a capacity. There are no provisions relating to the capital costs of a capacity. There are no provisions relating to the current of subject to the current of the capacity. There are no provisions relating to the current of the current									
Volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable evidence has been presented to establish if there is adequate acquarity. There are no provisions relating to the capital correct with additional information. Value									
evidence has been presented to establish if there is adequate capacity. There are no provisions relating to the capalloc story of the capacity									
Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Concerned about impact on existing system, question if a capacity study has been done and who will be paying costs if upgrade is required. Request further information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional control to KDC system, the applicant Viranda should provide its own independent wastewater treatment the number of connections in the proposed development has not been stated volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable evidence has been presented to establish if there is adequate capacity. There are no provisions relating to the current system. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted wolume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable evidence has been presented to establish if there is adequate capacity. There are no provisions relating to the current system. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted wolume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable evidence has been presented to establish if there is adequate capacity. There are no provisions relating to the capital costs of an own for several reading control of the capital costs of a capacity. There are no provisions relating to the capital costs of a capacity in system. Transparency in decision and no additional cost to ratepayers. That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the developer. Concerned that the infrastructure does not have the capacity. Confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required to confirm it wastewater system can cope with increase. No indication as to whether the proposal will result in increased find and how this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs for any other capacity. Confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required to the confirmation of quantity of concerned about potential c									=
Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted works required to connect Mangawhai Central to the current system. Concerned about impact on existing system, question if a capacity study has been done and who will be paying costs if upgrade is required. A Joby Beretta N Y Seek Amendment Wastewater Request further information. Page 2 Page 2 Page 2 Page 3 Joby Beretta N Y Y Seek Amendment Wastewater Request further information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted works required to connection so the page is required. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted works required to connection so the page is required. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted works required to extablish in the represented to establish for the resist adequate evidence has been presented to establish for the resist adequate expancity. There are no provisions relating to the current system. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted works required to connect Mangawhai Central to the current system. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted works required to connect Mangawhai Central to the current system. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted works required to connect Mangawhai Central to the current system. That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the developer and the provided by developer at their cost alone, due to insufficient information of quantity of connections, volume of discharge cannot reviewed from KDC that there is adequate capacity in present plant. That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the developer. Confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required to confirm if wastewater system can cope with increase. No indication as to whether the proposal will result in increase of and how this wastewater the proposal will result in increase of and how this wastewater.									
125 1 Nick Carre N N Seek Amendment Wastewater with additional information. System. 126 3 Joby Beretta N Y Seek Amendment Wastewater Request further information. 127 1 Georgina Carre N N N seeks amendment Wastewater Wastewater with additional information. 128 1 James Hislop N N N Oppose Wastewater Wastewater Transparency in decision and no additional cost to ratepayers. 138 1 James Hislop N N N Oppose Wastewater Wastewater Acquater of the infrastructure does not have the capacity. 139 1 Susan Rowbotham Y Y Oppose Wastewater Seek amendment. 120 1 Susan Rowbotham Y Y Oppose Wastewater Seek amendment. 121 2 Susan Rowbotham Y Y Oppose Wastewater Seek amendment. 122 3 Susan Rowbotham Y Y Y Oppose Wastewater Seek amendment. 123 3 Susan Rowbotham Y Y Y Oppose Wastewater Seek amendment. 124 5 Susan Rowbotham Y Y Y Oppose Wastewater Seek amendment. 125 6 Concerned that the infrastructure does not have the capacity. 126 Concerned that the infrastructure does not have the capacity. 127 Confirmation or residential allotments and further reporting required to confirm five wastewater system can see with increased five and now this will be managed. Concerned about inipact on existing system. 128 Confirmation or residential allotments and further reporting required to the confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required to the confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required to confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required to confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required to confirmation and the proposal will recased five and now this will be managed. Concerned about the proposal will recased five and now this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs for and now this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs for and now this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs for and now this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs for and now this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs for and								Decline the plan change and require it to be re submitted	
Concerned about impact on existing system, question if a capacity study has been done and who will be paying costs if upgrade is required. Suppose Connection to XDC system, the applicant Virtuals should provide its own independent wastew, the applicant Virtuals should provide its own independent wastew, the applicant Virtuals should provide its own independent wastew, the applicant Virtuals should provide its own independent wastew, the applicant Virtuals should provide its own independent wastew, the applicant Virtuals should provide its own independent wastew, the applicant Virtuals should provide its own independent wastew, the applicant Virtuals should provide its own independent wastew, the applicant Virtuals should provide its own independent wastew, the applicant Virtuals should provide its own independent wastew, the applicant Virtuals should provide its own independent wastew, the applicant Virtuals should be provided by development than on the number connections in the proposed development has not been stated volume of discharge cannot there is adequate capacity. There are no provisions relating to the capital costs of an one of the plan change and require it to be re-submitted works required to one connect Manage and require it to be re-submitted volume of applicant Virtuals and information. 127	1-		Niels Corre	N.	NI.	Faak Amandmant	Mastawatar		=
Study has been done and who will be paying costs if upgrade is required. Study has been done and who will be paying costs if upgrade is required. Oppose connection to KDC system, the applicant Viranda should provide its own independent wastewater treatment the number connections in the proposed development has not been stated volume of abscharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable evidence has been sented to establish if there is adequate capacity. There are no provisions relating to the capital costs of a works required to connect Managawha Central to the current system.	12	.5 1	Nick Carre	IN	IN	Seek Amendment	wastewater	with additional information.	
126 3 Joby Beretta N Y Seek Amendment Wastewater Request further information. required.									
Oppose connection to KDC system, the applicant Viranda should provide its own independent wastewater treatment the number connections in the proposed development has not been stated volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable evidence floss have the capacity. There are no provisions relating to the capital costs of are opposed for the plan change and require it to be re-submitted works required to establish if there is adequate capacity. There are no provisions relating to the capital costs of an own works required to connect Mangawhai Central to the current system. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted works required to connect Mangawhai Central to the current system. Waste water should be provided by developer at their cost alone, due to insufficient evidence from KDC that there is adequate capacity in present plant. 128	4.5		Labar Baranta	l.,	.,	Cook Assessment)	D	
provide its own independent wastewater treatment the number of connections in the proposed development has not been stated volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable evidence has been presented to establish if there is adequate capacity. There are no provisions relating to the capital costs of a works required to connect Mangawhai Central to the current with additional information. 127	12	.6 3	з Јору Вегетта	N	Y	Seek Amendment	wastewater	Request further information.	
connections in the proposed development has not been stated volume of discharge cannot therefore be quartified, No reliable evidence has been presented to establish if there is adequate capacity. There are no provisions relating to the capital costs of an own of more discharge cannot therefore be quartified, No reliable evidence has been presented to establish if there is adequate capacity. There are no provisions relating to the capital costs of an own of the									
volume of discharge cannot therefore be quantified, No reliable evidence has been presented to establish if there is adequate capacity. There are no provisions relating to the capital costs of a capacity in the reliable appropriate to provide the plan change and require it to be re-submitted works required to connect Mangawhai Central to the current system. 127									
evidence has been presented to establish if there is adequate capacity. There are no provisions relating to the capital costs of ar works required to connect Mangawhai Central to the current system. 127									
Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted works required to connect Mangawhai Central to the capital costs of ar works required to connect Mangawhai Central to the current system. Waste water should be provided by developer at their cost alone, due to insufficient information of quantity of connections, volume insufficient evidence from KDC that there is adequate capacity in 1 are present plant. 131 3 Moira Jackson Y Y Y seek amendment Wastewater developer. Concerned that the infrastructure does not have the capacity. Confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required to concerned about potential costs for a positive formation. Wastewater system can cope with increased fland how this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs for a positive formation of the capital costs of an approach works required to concerned about potential costs for a positive formation of residential allotments and further reporting required to concerned about potential costs for a positive formation. Wastewater Seek amendment. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted works required to connect Mangawhai Central to the current system. Wastewater system. Wastewater system can cope with increased fland how this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs for any positive fraction of the capital costs for a positive fraction of the capital costs for a positive fraction of the capital costs for a positive fraction of the capital costs for a positive fraction of the capital costs for a positive fraction of the capital cost of a positive fraction of the capital cost of a positive fraction of the capital cost of a positive fraction of the capital cost of a positive fraction of the capital cost of a positive fraction of the capital cost of a positive fraction of the capital cost of a positive fraction of the capital cost of a positive fraction of the capital cost of a positive fraction of the capital cost of a positive fraction of the capital cost of a positive fraction of th									=
Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Waste water should be provided by developer at their cost alone, due to insufficient information of quantity of connections, volume insufficient evidence from KDC that there is adequate capacity in the present plant. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Waste water should be provided by developer at their cost alone, due to insufficient information of quantity of connections, volume insufficient evidence from KDC that there is adequate capacity in present plant. That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the developer. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Waste water should be provided by developer at their cost alone, due to insufficient information of quantity of connections, volume insufficient evidence from KDC that there is adequate capacity in present plant. That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the developer. Concerned that the infrastructure does not have the capacity. Confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required to confirm if wastewater system can cope with increase. No indication as to whether the proposal will result in increased fland how this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs for the proposal will result in increased fland how this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs for the proposal will result in increased fland how this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs for the proposal will result in increase fland how this will be managed.									
127 1 Georgina Carre N N N seeks amendment Wastewater with additional information. System. Waste water should be provided by developer at their cost alone, due to insufficient information of quantity of connections, volume insufficient evidence from KDC that there is adequate capacity in the present plant. 131 3 Moira Jackson Y Y Seek amendment Wastewater That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the developer. Concerned that the infrastructure does not have the capacity. Confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required in the confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required in the confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required in the confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required in the confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required in the confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required in the confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required in the confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required in the confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required in the confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required in the confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required in the confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required in the confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required in the confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required in the confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required in the confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required in the confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required in the confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required in the confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required in the confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required in the confirmation of reside									
Waste water should be provided by developer at their cost alone, due to insufficient information of quantity of connections, volume insufficient evidence from KDC that there is adequate capacity in ratepayers. 131									=
due to insufficient information of quantity of connections, volume insufficient information of quantity of connections, volume insufficient information of quantity of connections, volume insufficient evidence from KDC that there is adequate capacity in present plant. 131	12	7 1	Georgina Carre	N	N	seeks amendment	Wastewater	with additional information.	,
Transparency in decision and no additional cost to insufficient evidence from KDC that there is adequate capacity in present plant. That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the developer. Concerned that the infrastructure does not have the capacity. Confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required to confirm if wastewater system can cope with increase. No indication as to whether the proposal will result in increased fland how this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs for									
128 1 James Hislop N N N Oppose Wastewater ratepayers. present plant. 131 3 Moira Jackson Y Y seek amendment Wastewater developer. Concerned that the infrastructure does not have the capacity. 137 Susan Rowbotham Y Y Oppose Wastewater Seek amendment. 138 Seek amendment Wastewater Seek amendment. 139 No indication as to whether the proposal will result in increased fland how this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs for									
That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the developer. Concerned that the infrastructure does not have the capacity. Confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required to confirm if wastewater system can cope with increase. No indication as to whether the proposal will result in increased fland how this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs for				L	L.		L.,		
131 3 Moira Jackson Y Y seek amendment Wastewater developer. Concerned that the infrastructure does not have the capacity. Confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required to confirm if wastewater system can cope with increase. No indication as to whether the proposal will result in increased fland how this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs for	12	8 1	James Hislop	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater		present plant.
Confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required to confirm if wastewater system can cope with increase. No indication as to whether the proposal will result in increased fland how this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs for	1								
137 Susan Rowbotham Y Y Oppose Wastewater Seek amendment. to confirm if wastewater system can cope with increase. No indication as to whether the proposal will result in increased fland how this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs for	13	1 3	Moira Jackson	Υ	Υ	seek amendment	Wastewater	developer.	Concerned that the infrastructure does not have the capacity.
137 Susan Rowbotham Y Y Oppose Wastewater Seek amendment. to confirm if wastewater system can cope with increase. No indication as to whether the proposal will result in increased fland how this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs for									
No indication as to whether the proposal will result in increased fl and how this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs fo									Confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required
and how this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs for	13	7	Susan Rowbotham	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	Seek amendment.	to confirm if wastewater system can cope with increase.
and how this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs for									
									No indication as to whether the proposal will result in increased flow
1 138 Allohn Dickie IV IN Oppose Wastewater Decline the plan change I ratenavors and what that the development contribution will be for	1	1			1				and how this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs for
	1								
139 2 Renata Blair Y N Oppose Wastewater Decline the plan change. Increase in wastewater will have huge effect on the taiao.	13		John Dickie	Υ	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	ratepayers and what that the development contribution will be fair.

		1	ı	1		1	
							Opposes connection to current wastewater system as the system
							doesn't have capacity. Should be depending on on-site disposal.
140	1 Stephanie Gibson	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about costs to ratepayers.
							Need to provide their own wastewater system, KDC scheme already
141 142	1 Karl Kadlec 2 Abby Meagher	N N	N N	Oppose Oppose	Wastewater Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	at capacity.
142	2 Abby Weagner	IN	IN	Oppose	wastewater	Decline the plan change.	Wastewater system is inadequate and lacking maintenance. Concerned with lack of information, and how wastewater needs for
144	2 Joel Cayford	v	v	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	the development will be met and paid for.
144	2 Joer Caylord		1	Орроѕе	Wastewater	Notice Stated.	the development will be met and paid for.
							Concerned about limits of wastewater system that is already over
1							loaded, and septic water evacuation. Requests further information
147	2 David Goold	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Seek amendment.	and that the developer provides their own system.
				- PP			
							Concerned about impact on wastewater system , assumptions made
148	8 Grant O'Malley	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	seek amendment to residential intensity.	need to be tested and verified so as to avoid costs on ratepayers.
							concerned that the wastewater system is inadequate to cope with
150	2 William Keith Draper	N	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	increased housing.
							Concerned about how the wastewater system will manage and
1							potential costs to ratepayers, Applicant should provide its own
							system - if not feasible, council should require report to confirm
							capacity and condition of system. No agreement should be entered
151	3 Francis & Michael Hookings	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	into without further consultation.
1							Oppose connection to KDC treatment plan, applicant should have to
							supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of
1							connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater
152	1 Carla Hood	Υ	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	with additional information.	treatment.
							Oppose connection to KDC treatment plan, applicant should have to
							supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater
153	1 Philippa Muller	N	v	Oppose	Wastewater	with additional information.	treatment.
155	I Fillippa Mullel	iv .	1	Оррозе	wastewater	with additional information.	treatment.
155	5 Christine Basham	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	Community looses out with lack of independent wastewater system.
							Oppose proposed connection to council system, application should
							pay for their own scheme. If connection is required, further
1							information is needed as to how it will cope with capacity - as
							currently the residents have been advised there is not capacity. A
1						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	development agreement is required to address any costs so that this
156	3 Clive Boonham	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	with additional information.	does not fall on the residents.
							Existing system doesn't have capacity . The area covered by the
							structure plan should provide sufficient treatment. Each title should
							be required to pay the same connection fee to wastewater - no
	c Aliston Kim		L		14/	Dealine the also shows	exemption. Water quality od discharged wastewater should comply
158	6 Alister Kim Hamilton	У	У	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	with the National Policy Statement. oppose connection to council wastewater system. Recent
159	4 Anne Hollier	Y	l _Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	information suggest it doesn't have capacity now, let alone with
	- Tame Home:		ľ				Oppose proposed connection to council system, application should
							pay for their own scheme. If connection is required, further
							information is needed as to how it will cope with capacity - as
							currently the residents have been advised there is not capacity. A
1						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	development agreement is required to address any costs so that this
160	3 Judith Anne Boonham	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	with additional information.	does not fall on the residents.
							Oppose connection to KDC treatment plan, applicant should have to
							supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of
							connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be
1			1	1			undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater
163	1 Sue Fountain				Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	treatment.

							Oppose connection to KDC treatment plan, applicant should have to supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of
164	1 Alan Preston	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater treatment.
101			T T	Оррозс		Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of
165	6 Alex and Linley Galbraith	n	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	with additional information.	connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be
						Confirmation that the wastewater system has capacity for	
						residential and commercial area, and re-evaluation of	Insufficient investigation. Calculation in 6.1.19 of the AEE do not
166	Mark Watson Rowbotham	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	calculations for volumes.	reflect the possible yields as per table 16.8.2.2.
							Oppose connection to KDC treatment plan, applicant should have to supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of
							connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater
167	1 Tony Baker	у	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	with additional information.	treatment.
							Oppose the changes due to proposed wastewater connections and
168	1 James Bremner	v	v	Oppose	Wastewater	with additional information.	potential implications on ratepayers. The design of the plant may be undersized and the development load unknown.
108	1 James Brennier	1	<u>'</u>	Орроѕе	wastewater	with additional information.	oppose connection to not a carment plan, applicant should have to
						Desline the plan share and according to the least on health of	supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of
169	1 Jedda Kelly	l,	v	Onnoco	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater
109	i Jedda Kelly	У	T T	Oppose	wastewater	with additional information.	undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater
							Concerned about the factual deficit between KDC statement that
							plant has capacity to cope with the additional households and
170	4 John Dawson	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	Not stated	previous statement that it doesn't.
							Oppose connection to KDC treatment plan, applicant should have to
							supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater
171	1 Euan Upston	v	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	with additional information.	treatment.
		1		- P.P		Grant the application on the condition that a proper and	
						full investigation is carried out re capacity, and ensure no	
173	2 Peggyann Colville	N	Υ	Seek amendment	Wastewater	additional costs to ratepayers.	Concerned with the additional load on wastewater system.
							Oppose connection to the wastewater system, existing system is already near capacity, development details not yet finalised and
							could place huge demand on system. Must be considered in creation
							to the size for impact to the existing system. Any upgrade should not
174	2 Neil Torrie	N	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	Applicant provides their own scheme.	cost the development. More evidence required.
							Oppose connection to KDC treatment plan, applicant should have to
							supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of
							connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be
175	1 John Southward	Y	v	Oppose	Wastewater	Not stated	undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater treatment.
1/3	1 John Southward	'	'	Оррозе	wastewater	Not stated	d eathert.
							I oppose policies 16.3.9.14 The policy that required that all
							wastewater system be connected to the councils existing waste
							water. Treatment system. Current system is at capacity, concerned
178	Richard Smith	У	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	community will have to foot the bill. Applicant should provide it.
179	David & Janet Norris	N	v	Oppose	Wastewater	Further information and consultation.	Applicants should provide our facility. Volume of dis-1
1/9	David & Janet Norris	IN	T	Oppose	wastewater	rui tiiei iiiiOiiiiatiOii aliu tolisultatioii.	Applicants should provide own facility. Volume of discharge unclear. Oppose connection to wastewater system. Concerned about
							capacity. Lack of information re: discharge volume and capacity. No
							reliable evidence to suggest the current system is adequate.
180	Josie Gritten	у	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	Applicant should provide own system.
							Existing system doesn't have capacity . The area covered by the
							structure plan should provide sufficient treatment. Each title should be required to pay the same connection fee to wastewater - no
							exemption. Water quality od discharged wastewater should comply
184	6 Rob & Mary Farmer	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	with the National Policy Statement.
	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-1.		1 - 1-1	1		

			1		<u> </u>		T
							Oppose the connection to the wastewater system, concerned about
							capacity and unfairly disadvantages people who purchased property
							for the future to be advised that there was no capacity for
185	2 Faye & James Shewan	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and request further information.	connection.
							Concerned that the applicant is connecting to existing system.
							Ratepayers had been assured by Andrew Guest that they would be
186	1 Sally & Richard Wood	N	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	More discussion with ratepayers.	providing their own.
			·				F
188	3 Cheryl Mitchell	N	v	Oppose	Wastewater	Require developer to build and maintain own system.	Oppose developer latching onto wastewater system.
100	5 enery miterien		<u> </u>	Оррозс	Waste Wate.	nequire developer to band and maintain own system.	Concerned about capacity and expenditure required to extend
189	1 Grant Mitchell	v	v	Oppose	Wastewater	Provide own wastewater system.	facility to accommodate the development.
103	1 Grant Witterien		<u></u> '	Оррозе	wastewater	Frovide own wastewater system.	lacinty to accommodate the development.
							Concerned that connection to the wastewater system will overload
400	4 8 8 - 11	.,	.,		14/	Dealine the also shows	it, applicant should provide their own system. Lack of detail re
190	1 Roger Bull	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	number of connection and no provision for capital costs.
							Concerned that connection to the wastewater system will overload
							it, applicant should provide their own system. Lack of detail re
192	1 Elizabeth & Toby Evans	N	n	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	number of connection and no provision for capital costs.
							Oppose connection to wastewater system, applicant should provide
							their own. No evidence to suggest capacity. Told by Andrew Guest
193	1 Kathy Gordon	n	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	applicant would provide wastewater.
							Concerned about demand on wastewater system and potential costs
		1	1				to ratepayers. Lack of evidence to confirm the system has capacity.
194	2 Raewyn Torrie	N	lγ	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	Applicant should provide own scheme.
	2,	-	<u> </u>	Оррозс			Concerned about capacity of wastewater system and potential costs
						Assurance that any further costs will not come back to	to ratepayers, no evidence to suggest the scheme can support 1000
197	4 Barbara Pengelly	v	v	Oppose	Wastewater	ratepayers and hydrological report.	new residential dwellings.
137	4 Barbara Ferigelly	- '	<u>'</u>	Орроѕе	wastewater	ratepayers and nydrological report.	Ü
							Oppose connection to KDC treatment plan, applicant should have to
							supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of
							connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be
							undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater
198	8 Lisa Marshall	Υ	У	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and request further information.	treatment.
							Concerned about the effect of water extraction on the water table.
							Concerned about effects on the water supply they currently use for
199	2 Shane Cullen	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Wastewater	Review total water take from groundwater.	stock.
		1	1				There are serious concerns that the current waste water
		1	1				infrastructure cannot accommodate this huge increase in residential
		1	1				and commercial development. We need an independent report on
		1	1				the plant, the reticulation, the pumping system, and the discharge
		1	1				system - which tell us how much capacity it has and it's projected
		1	1				longevity. The existing community has grave concerns that the
						That the Council will not enter into any agreement in	increased strain on the system could mean another huge expense fo
		1	1			, 9	,
		1	1			respect of wastewater treatment for Mangawhai Central	ratepayers which we cannot afford. In other words - we worry that
		1	1			without full and open consultation with ratepayers	the property developer and council are externalising the true cost of
	1	1	1			including proving rateapyers with a copy of the	the new development by getting ratepayers to pay for wastewater
200	3 Ella Rickit	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	engineering report.	upgrades.
I		1	1				Oppose extraction of groundwater resources from Mangawhai
5	2 Alex Flavell-Johnson	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	aquifers, especially with climate change.
[1	1				Access to the local aquifer will not cope with the 2019/20 drought
		1	1				and will not be able to support the commercial / residential
		1	1				development in the plan change. Breaching sandstone in
		1	1				development of drainage systems could contaminate water source
6	1 Samantha Wood	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	for this development and surrounding properties.
 	1 33	- -		оррозс	Trace: Supp.,	sire plan energer	Mangawhai already has water supply issues. Increasing housing will
۰	1 Gill Wharfe	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	No increase in housing.	impact residents as water is already scarce.
	I Gill Wildlife	IN .	- IN	Оррозе	vvacei Suppiy	ivo increase in nousing.	
13	C Danna Bilahan	l	l.,	0	Water County	Dealine the plan shapes	Does not agree with the use of aquifer water as opposed to tank
	6 Desna Pilcher	N	IN	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	water like everyone else.

		1				Clear information regarding where water cumply will be	1
						Clear information regarding where water supply will be	Concerned about how reticulated water will be supplied and what
16	2 Thomas Williams	NI NI	N.	Onness	Motor Cumply	sourced from, expected volumes and back up plans to	
16	3 Thomas Williams	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	cater for climate change.	back up is proposed given the likely hood of increased droughts.
							Concerned that the water dams have been removed and that the
18	5 Sascha Tschirky	N	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	bore will run out.
						Further information as to how the water allocation was	
						calculated, how much was paid for access and if RC has	Concerned how the bore allowance has been calculated for
19	6 Corinne Callinan	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	been granted.	Mangawhai Central.
21	5 Raewyn Dodd	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Concerned that local aquifer will be over-taxed.
							Concerned that water supply will 'grossly' effect the aquifer,
							Mangawhai water supply is already inadequate and affected by
							drought. Another development should not be allowed until water
22	7 Ken Marment	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	storage in place.
	, item marriere	<u> </u>		оррозс	rrace: Supply	became the plan change.	Opposes water being taken from aquifer that supplies the
23	2 Natalie Bray-Gunn	N	N	Oppose	Water supply	None stated.	community.
23	2 Ivacane Bray-Guilli	- I'V	14	Оррозе	water suppry	None stated.	Concerned with up to 100,000L a day being taken from the aqueduct
] 34	4 Roger & Megan Kendall	V	V	Onness	Water Supply	None stated.	given that it was nearly dry in 2020.
24	4 Roger & Wiegan Kendan	T .	T T	Oppose	Water Supply		given that it was fieldly dry in 2020.
						Council to engage an independent consultant (and	
			1			Viranda to fund) to carry out a full new investigation on	
						the current capacity of the aquifer and the long term	Oppose any changes to Viranda's original submission that allow
25	2 Miguel Hamber	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	effects of the proposal.	disproportionate use of the aquifer.
						Changes should not be allowed until consultation is made	Concerned that there are insufficient water resources to cope with
26	3 Simon Hardley	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	and community support achieved.	this number of additional residential dwellings.
						Assurance from Kaipara Council that his property wont be	Concerned about slumping of land /land movement or liquid pooling
28	4 Geoffrey William Campbell	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	adversely affected as a result of the bore.	on his property.
						Amend application to require Roof collection for water	
29	2 Wendy Sheffield	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Water Supply	supply.	Concerned with impact om water supply.
							Concerned with impact on underground water supply and effects on
30	1 Sandie Souter	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Applicant to supply own water storage supply.	current users.
40	2 Dion Pilmer	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	Concerned that the proposal could overload the aquifer.
							Concerned about the proposed waster supply given the limited
42	1 Johanna Baylis	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Require roof top water collection.	availability particularly in drought.
							Opposes the reliance on underground natural water supply instead
							of water tanks for each property, concerned about droughts
45	2 Vivienne Martens	N	N	Seek Amendment	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	becoming more common.
+3	2 Vivienne Wartens	-	- 1	Seek Amenament	water supply	became the plan change.	becoming more common.
							Oppose reliance on aquifer, properties should have rainwater tanks,
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	further information required that considered effects of climate
46	2 John Stephens	V	V	Seek Amendment	Water Supply	with additional information.	change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
48	2 Nicky Crocker	N N	N N	Oppose		Decline the plan change.	Infrastructure cannot cope.
48	2 Nicky Crocker	IN	IN .	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Infrastructure cannot cope.
			1				
49	1 Paul Walyon	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	Opposes water supply.
							Oppose reliance on aquifer, properties should have rainwater tanks,
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	further information required that considered effects of climate
54	2 Robin Hale	у	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	with additional information.	change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
55	8 Gary Cameron	N	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Opposes use of aquifer for water supply.
56	8 Elizabeth Cameron	N	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Opposes use of aquifer for water supply
				1.		· ·	Oppose the change to water supply, residential units should have
							tanks. Research required into reservoir capacity and effects of
58	2 Katie Richards	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	climate change e.g. drought.
38	_ natic monards	+	— i'	оррозс	Trace, supp.,		
59	2 Gary Colhoun	v	v	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	Lack of clarity re water supply, independent assessment required.
60	2 Jan Colhoun	v	v	Not stated	Water Supply Water Supply	None stated.	Not enough information about the water supply.
OU	z pan comoun	i	lı lı	NOL Stateu	vvater Suppry	inoile stateu.	ivot enough information about the water supply.

					T		1
							Oppose reliance on aquifer, properties should have rainwater tanks,
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	further information required that considered effects of climate
63	2 Grant McCarthy	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Water Supply	with additional information.	change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
							Oppose reliance on aquifer, properties should have rainwater tanks,
							further hydrological assessment required that considered effects of
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	climate change on aquifer . Roof water harvesting should be
64	2 Aaron McConchie	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Water Supply	with additional information.	mandated. Need solid policies re wate storage.
							Concerned that NRC has approved he water draw from the
							Mangawhai bore, particularly given the water shortage in the region.
66	3 Gail Williams	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	Notes that the lot sizes are too small to support water tanks.
69	3 Helen Current	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about lack of viable waste supply provision.
							Oppose reliance on aquifer, properties should have rainwater tanks,
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	
70	2 Glen Real	Y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	with additional information.	change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
							for freshwater further information required that considered effects
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	
71	2 Rachael Williams	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	with additional information.	understood. NRC need more robust before granting consent for
						Council to address all issues, protect the harbour and if	
						the development proceeds - for it to be sympathetic to	Houses should be collecting rainwater, water should not be taken
72	2 Alison Baird	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	the existing environment.	from aquifer. Concerned about low water table.
						Desline the also shows and associate the beauty of health and	Oppose reliance on aquifer, properties should have rainwater tanks,
72	2 Page History	v		Carlo Amazandaran	Water County	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	further information required that considered effects of climate
73	2 Ross Hinton	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Water Supply	with additional information.	change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
							Oppose reliance on aquifer, properties should have rainwater tanks,
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	further information required that considered effects of climate
74	2 Joy Murray	Y	v	Seek Amendment	Water Supply	with additional information.	change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
,-	2 Joy Murray		<u> </u>	Seek Americanen	vvater supply	with additional information.	change on aquiter so effects on existing users can be understood.
							Oppose reliance on aquifer, properties should have rainwater tanks,
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	further information required that considered effects of climate
76	2 Phillip Murray	Υ	Υ	Seek Amendment	Water Supply	with additional information.	change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
						Council rejects application and requires further supporting	Opposes water being taken from aquifer with no hydrological
78	4 Ian Fish	Υ	Υ	seeks amendment	Water Supply	evidence.	assessment, no consideration of effects of climate change.
							Oppose reliance on aquifer, properties should have rainwater tanks,
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	further information required that considered effects of climate
79	2 Denise Stuart	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	with additional information.	change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
							Concerned with lack of consideration given to alternative water
							supplied. Aquifer is being depleted. Should harvest rainwater. NRC
80	2 Brenda Coleman	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	granted extraction unlikely to be sufficient.
						Dedicaths also shows the first terms of the second	Oppose reliance on aquifer, properties should have rainwater tanks,
22	2 Noti Miles		L,	0	Martin County	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	further information required that considered effects of climate
82	2 Neil Wilson	IN	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	with additional information.	change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
							Opposes proposed water supply connection no evidence accorded to
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Opposes proposed water supply connection no evidence provided to suggest there is capacity. Original proposal was supposed to draw
83	2 Graeme White	N	v	Oppose	Water Supply	with additional information.	from a damn in the Brynderwyns - why was this not followed.
- 55	2 Gracine Wille	1.4	- ľ	Oppose	vvacci Supply		with a same in the bryingerwyns with was this not followed.
							Oppose reliance on aquifer, properties should have rainwater tanks,
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	further information required that considered effects of climate
84	2 Graham & Gloria Drury	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	with additional information.	change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
<u> </u>				- 1/1		Publicise what has been granted and additional public	Aquifer is not infinite, needs to be another source such as rainwater
85	4 Sue Clayton	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	consultation.	harvest.
			•			•	

				1		1	T
87	2 Dianne Glucina	N	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Oppose reliance on aquifer, properties should have rainwater tanks, further information required that considered effects of climate change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
							Questions where potable water will come from and if the aquifer can
88	5 Cameron Shaw	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	handle it.
89	3 Gainor & Graham Kerrigan	N	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	Object to aquifer for main water supply, questions where the supporting research is and if NRC has already issued consent, questions if the bore has capacity on top of being emergency water supply for Mangawhai? Questions if climate change has been taken into account. Suggests that rainwater harvesting should be required.
							Concerned that aquifer can support the volume of water required,
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	and potential cost for ratepayers. Need independent hydrological
90	3 Doug Lloyd	N	N	Seek Amendment	Water Supply	with additional information.	assessment.
91	1 Jonathan Drucker	Y	Υ	Seek Amendment	Water Supply	Address concerns about drinking water.	None stated.
94	5 Douglas V Moores	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about impact on the aquifer, drought and climate change.
95	8 Ella Grant	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Oppose reliance on aquifer, proposal does not adequately provide for freshwater further information required that considered effects of climate change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood. NRC need more robust before granting consent for additional usage. Concerned about fire waster supply and impacts of drought. Ground water should not be relied upon, tanks should be required.
96	3 S & G Hockenhull	N	у	seek amendment	Water Supply	Restrictions regarding water.	Water can't sustain the development - needs looking into.
98	3 Martina Tschirky	Y	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	Concerned with proposed use of bore water instead of water tanks.
102	2 Bruce Rogan	Υ	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline he application. Council should be held account for granting resource consents illegally before the necessary district plan changes were approved. Decline application until a revised housing density is	Does the aquifer from which water will be extracted to support the commercial and domestic activities and have capacity to sustainably support demand. Where is the proof? Council should require an independent hydro geological assessment
103	4 Gerard Wooters	N	N	Seek Amendment	Water Supply	provided.	to understand implications for groundwater.
103	5 Gerard Wooters	N	N	Seek Amendment	Water Supply	Decline application until a revised housing density is provided.	Council should require an independent hydro geological assessment to understand implications for groundwater.
105	Janne Rowe linked to 1st 2 submission	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Developer should build own infrastructure.	There are already water problems and allowing a new commercial development and residential development to tap into existing infrastructure is not on, initial proposal was that the developer provides their own.
106	2 Grainne Taylor	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	No provision for additional water supply
108	2 Tim Taylor	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	No provision for additional water supply.
110	2 Benjamin Finney 2 Myra Squire	N	N	Oppose Oppose	Water Supply Water Supply	None stated. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	No provision for additional water supply Oppose reliance on aquifer, properties should have rainwater tanks, further information required that considered effects of climate change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
111	2 Andrew Paul	N	N		Water Supply	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Oppose reliance on aquifer, properties should have rainwater tanks, further information required that considered effects of climate change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
112	2 Anulew r dui	IN .	IN .	Oppose	water supply	with additional information.	With possible future droughts the aquifers will not have enough
115	2 Debra Searchfield	Y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	capacity.
120	4 Sherryll Burke	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Seek amendment.	High density housing is not suitable for community water supply, impact on other users not considered, especially during drought.
121	2 Kara Stones	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	Concerned about use of groundwater in drought prone environment, aquifer is limited sections should be large enough to accommodate water tanks. Water related costs must not fall on ratepayers.

			1	1			<u> </u>
124	4 Arnie & Yvette Leeder	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Water supply has not been appropriately addressed.
							Oppose reliance on aquifer, properties should have rainwater tanks,
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	further information required that considered effects of climate
125	2 Nick Carre	N	N	Seek Amendment	Water Supply	with additional information.	change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
							Questions why a sustainable water source hasn't been proposed e.g.
126	7 Joby Beretta	N	Υ	Seek Amendment	Water Supply	Request further information.	tanks instead of bore which is already low.
							Oppose reliance on aquifer, properties should have rainwater tanks,
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	further information required that considered effects of climate
127	2 Georgina Carre	N	N	seeks amendment	Water Supply	with additional information.	change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
						Transparency in decision and no additional cost to	Concerned that the aquifer is being used to this extent, more
128	2 James Hislop	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	ratepayers.	evidence and figures needed to backup decision.
							The proposed plan change and implementation of the Master Plan
						A. Retain the fire safety emergency provisions as outlined	should take into account the operational requirements of Fire and
						in the body of the submission and: B Other consequential	Emergency, makes reference to specific provisions and to ensure
						relief necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the	when the site is developed there is adequate provision for fire
129	1 Beca Ltd	Υ	Y	Neutral	Water Supply	submission	fighting activities.
							Concerned about the change in the water table and the effect on the
							community and any ability to draw from the aquifer for the greater
130	4 Mike Ferguson	Y	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline plan change and retain the current provisions.	needs of the community in drought.
							Concerned about impact on aquifer and consideration of drought
		L				That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the	impacts. Questions if there has been any data modelling and
131	2 Moira Jackson	Y	Y	seek amendment	Water Supply	developer.	concerned about impact on current users.
							100-3/d
							100m3/day available under the existing consent not adequate for
138	5 John Dickie	v	N	0,,,,,,	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	1000 households proposed and commercial/industrial use. Already
136	3 John Dickle		IN	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	pressure on water supply, particularly in drought. Opposes water take from bore, already under pressure especially in
140	2 Stephanie Gibson	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	drought. Houses should have their own tanks.
141	2 Karl Kadlec	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Water needs to be addressed.
142	1 Abby Meagher	N	N N	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Water collection provisions inadequate.
	,				, , ,		Concerned about proposed water supply, wants further information.
							Concerned about impact of weather conditions on water supply if
147	3 David Goold	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Seek amendment.	developers don't provide own supply.
							Concerned about the sustainability of aquifer and impact on times of
148	3 Grant O'Malley	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	seek amendment to residential intensity.	drought given it is the only local source of water.
150	3 William Keith Draper	N	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Considers that there is inadequate provision of water supply.
							Oppose reliance on aquifer, properties should have rainwater tanks,
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	further information required that considered effects of climate
152	2 Carla Hood	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	with additional information.	change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
		1					
[1					Oppose reliance on aquifer, properties should have rainwater tanks,
		1				Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	further information required that considered effects of climate
153	2 Philippa Muller	N	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	with additional information.	change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
133	- P.F. (1995)	1					Considers water supply to be inadequate. No evidence to suggest
		1					that the bore has capacity to provide the volume of water for the
[1					development, as well as existing users particularly considering the
		1					effects of drought. No hydrological report has been provided.
[1				Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Rainwater harvesting should be required for water supply and fire
156	4 Clive Boonham	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	with additional information.	fighting supply.
							acceptable. The bore is insufficient to provide demand. The applicant
		1					should provide a reticulated supply that is sufficient throughout the
158	7 Alister Kim Hamilton	У	У	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	year. Requiring sprinkles for residential buildings would reduce the
							Oppose use of aquifer, this should be amended to include mandatory
159	3 Anne Hollier	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	catchment of all roof water.

		1	1		1		Considers water supply to be inadequate. No evidence to suggest
							that the bore has capacity to provide the volume of water for the
							development, as well as existing users particularly considering the
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	effects of drought. No hydrological report has been provided.
160	4 Judith Anne Boonham	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	with additional information.	Rainwater harvesting should be required for water supply and fire
							Oppose the proposed water supply as will be inadequate. Minimal
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	detail provided on water supply network and how it will be managed,
162	Melanie Jane Gallo	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	with additional information.	who will pay?
							Oppose reliance on aquifer, properties should have rainwater tanks,
						_ ,, ,, ,	further information required that considered effects of climate
163	2 Sue Fountain	Υ	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
							Oppose reliance on aquifer, properties should have rainwater tanks,
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	further information required that considered effects of climate
164	2 Alan Preston	v	v	Oppose	Water Supply	with additional information.	change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
104	2 Alaii Freston	-		Оррозе	vvater Suppry	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	extended high use. Further information including hydrological
165	1 Alex and Linley Galbraith	n	v	Oppose	Water Supply	with additional information.	assessment required.
103	T Alex and Linley Galbraith	"	'	Оррозе	vvater Suppry	with additional information.	assessment required.
						A review of total water available and in comparison to	review of water quality talked about in AEE 6.7.24 will show
						total yield in table 16.8.2.2 and investigation into using	suggested water treatment to be insufficient. 6.7.26 water calc don't
166	Mark Watson Rowbotham	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	some of the treated water from the wastewater plant	reflect total achievable yield.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	further information required that considered effects of climate
167	2 Tony Baker	у	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	with additional information.	change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Concerned with the absence of overall design information, and total
168	2 James Bremner	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	with additional information.	users not being defined.
							Oppose reliance on aquifer, properties should have rainwater tanks,
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	further information required that considered effects of climate
169	2 Jedda Kelly	У	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	with additional information.	change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
							Onness reliance on aguifer properties should have reinvester tonks
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	Oppose reliance on aquifer, properties should have rainwater tanks, further information required that considered effects of climate
171	2 Euan Upston	v	v	Oppose	Water Supply	with additional information.	change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
1/1	z zadn opston	,		Оррозс	rrate: supply	With daditional information.	Concerned about the effect of water extraction on the water table.
							Concerned about effects on the water supply they currently use for
172	2 Kevin Platt	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	stock.
							Oppose the changes in terms of water provision. NRC consent is for a
							finite amount of aquifer water but there is no indication of predicted
							usage. Rainwater harvesting in tanks is not reliable nor quantifiable
						Feasibility of proposed water supply quantified in greater	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
174	3 Neil Torrie	N	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	detail.	emergency source for community.
476	E Data a Dathwall	1	[0	Water Swant	Not stated	Supply of water not adequately addressed, existing aquifer wont
176	5 Peter Rothwell	У	У	Oppose	Water Supply	Not stated	cope. Oppose the use of the aquifer, concerned about capacity and effects
178	Richard Smith	V	v	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	on existing users.
1/8	iniciiai a Sillitti	У	- '	Оррозе	water suppry	became the plan change.	Oppose the provision, no responsibility to harvest water. Concerned
179	David & Janet Norris	N	lγ	Oppose	Water Supply	Further information and consultation.	about drought implications and cost to residents.
1/3		1	1				0 · p · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
							Concerned about water shortages and drought. Opposes use of
							aquifer and concerned that sufficient water for the development is
							not being proposed. Lack of information including effect on consent
180	Josie Gritten	У	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	holders and consideration of drought and climate change.
							Concerned about water shortages and drought. Opposes use of
		1					aquifer and concerned that sufficient water for the development is
		1	L	_	h.,		not being proposed. Lack of information including effect on consent
180	Josie Gritten	У	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	holders and consideration of drought and climate change.

i .		1	1		1	1	
							Water supply is a critical issue, the existing proposal is not acceptable. The bore is insufficient to provide demand. The applicant should provide a reticulated supply that is sufficient throughout the year. Requiring sprinkles for residential buildings would reduce the
184	7 Rob & Mary Farmer	Y	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	amount of water required to be set aside for fire fighting supply.
185	3 Faye & James Shewan	Y	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change and request further information.	Oppose proposed water supply - what is opposed will not be sufficient , and will be an eyesore. Want further detail on exactly what is proposed and how drought and water shortage will be taken into consideration.
186	3 Sally & Richard Wood	N	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	Concerned where the additional water supply will be coming from.
188	2 Cheryl Mitchell	N	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	Require water tanks.	oppose the development being allowed to use the aquifer droughts will continue and worsen. Must be requirement for water tanks.
189	2 Grant Mitchell	Υ	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Require Rain water tanks.	Concerned about the use of the aquifer - it is a critical resource that needs to be protected. All development should require rain water tanks. Consideration should be given to drought and climate change.
190	2 Roger Bull	Y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Oppose the changes to provision of water, not sufficient. In respect of the aquifer, figures provided don't take into account drought. Concerned about effects on consent holders and minimum detail provided.
192	2 Elizabeth & Toby Evans	N	n	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Oppose the changes to provision of wastewater, not sufficient. In respect of the aquifer, figures provided don't take into account drought, NIWA predicts Northland will experience around 10% more time in drought by 2040. Concerned about effects on consent holders and minimum detail provided.
132	Elizabeth & roby Evans	<u> </u>		Оррозс	тисст зарргу	beame the plan change.	Oppose proposed water supply, does not consider it adequate
193	2 Kathy Gordon	n	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	particularly during drought.
194	3 Raewyn Torrie	N	Υ	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Oppose the change to water supply provision. NRC consent is for a finite amount of water and no predicted usage for development. Rainwater harvesting not reliable and susceptible to drought. Concerned about impact on emergency supply for Mangawhai.
	·					. 3	. 5,,
197	5 Barbara Pengelly	Y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	Oppose the reliance on the aquifer supplemented by rain water tanks storage. Concerned about emergency use of aquifer.
198	9 Lisa Marshall	Y	у	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change and request further information.	Oppose the change to water supply provision. NRC consent is for a finite amount of water and no predicted usage for development. Rainwater harvesting not reliable and susceptible to drought. Concerned about impact on emergency supply for Mangawhai.
						The applicant should be required to obtain an independent Hydrogeological Assessment of the water capacity in the aquifer beneath the subject land, and the viability of the proposals in respect of rainwater	Concerned about the water supply for the new development. Is this new development going to drain the water table at the expense of all the current residents? What happens when that water is dangerously low or we have drought after drought each summer? What are they paying for access to this precious water? Conversations with water suppliers in the are say it is very difficult to get water and they are always looking for new sources. There was a 4 week wait for water at the height of summer and we are still
200	2 Ella Rickit	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	harvesting.	officially in drought at the end of May.
3	1 Richard Percy	N	N	Support	Whole Plan Change	Approve the plan change.	The proposal supports conflicts between a growing town needs and providing economic opportunities which will benefit the overall community.
11	1 Scott Wightman	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	None stated.
13	1 Desna Pilcher	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	Parts need amended, should stick with the original.
16	6 Thomas Williams	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Further information.	Need further information to measure the benefits against the negative outcomes.

		•					
							Oppose the plan change as a number of things are being withdrawn
							that are the only reason the development was accepted in the first
							instance putting even more environmental stress on Mangawhai if
18	6 Sascha Tschirky	N	Υ	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	accepted.
							The development was supposed to be sustainable and managed to
							ensure minimal impact. As proposed, the development would be sub
22	6 Ken Marment	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	standard development.
				Орросо			Council to stop treating Mangawhai like a cash cow and consider
							long-term future effects to be a higher priority than short-term gains
25	3 Miguel Hamber	NI.	N.	0	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan shange	through increased rates.
25	- 0	N N	N	Oppose		Decline the plan change.	<u> </u>
33	Charlotte Scott	IN		Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	None stated.
37		N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	None stated.
38	4 Adam Minoprio	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	Community supports the original plan.
l	4 Clive County	,,	.	0	Mile de Bleve Cherrer	Dealine the also shows	Diamaian abanda bana bana arat afaba DNAC
41	1 Clive Currie	Y	IN	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	Planning should have been part of the RMC.
43	1 David & Marion Pilmer	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	Suggest sticking with the original plan.
							Opposes the proposed plan change, in respect of the proposed
							changes to the consenting process. Blance must be maintained so
							that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules
							and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	to ensure that there is a balance between the desire to simplify
46	8 John Stephens	v	v	Seek Amendment	Whole Plan Change	with additional information.	consent costs and the ned for KDC to provide oversight.
	o som stephens	· ·	<u> </u>	SCER AMENUMENT	Whole Hall change	with duditional information.	Does not think it will be good for Mangawhai community, changes
40	4 Nieles Constant		.	0	Mile de Bleve Cherrer	Dealine the also shows	, , ,
48	1 Nicky Crocker	IN	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	have not been discussed with ratepayers.
							l
							Opposes plan change due to overall adverse effects, considers it
							'erodes' key provision of the previous Estuary Estates Structure Plan.
							Key elements to include from the EESP include the Green network
							provisions, provisions related to walking and cycling linkage, natural
						Decline the plan change unless significant amendments	environment objectives, and Transport Network and Access Strategy
52	1 Garrett Hall	Υ	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	are made to address submitters concerns.	(to be enhances with cycling provisions).
		- 1		оррозс			(1
							Opposes the proposed plan change, in respect of the proposed
							changes to the consenting process. Balance must be maintained so
							that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules
							and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	1
54	8 Robin Hale	У	Υ	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	with additional information.	consent costs and the ned for KDC to provide oversight.
							Opposes the application as the applicant have said that the plan
							change is similar to original application and it isn't. No timeline
55	1 Gary Cameron	N	Υ	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	provided for development
					1	· -	Opposes the application as the applicant have said that the plan
							change is similar to original application and it isn't. No timeline
56	1 Elizabeth Cameron	N	v	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	provided for development.
30	1 Elizabeth Cameroff	IN		Oppuse	whole Flatt Charige	became the plan thange.	provided for development.
1							There is in a decrease information as
							There is inadequate information on water use age and supply plus
1							the impact of waste water on the local natural environment. Also the
							change doesn't allow for the impact on road users of the additional
1							residential dwellings. The traffic management plan is inadequate for
57	1 David Cunningham	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	the environmental increased flow.
							Disappointing that KDC are supporting the changes, they will
58	7 Katie Richards	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	damage the character and environment, and cost ratepayers.
				rr · · · ·			

63	8 Grant McCarthy 7 Aaron McConchie	Y	Y	Seek Amendment Seek Amendment	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Opposes the proposed plan change, in respect of the proposed changes to the consenting process. Balance must be maintained so that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert to ensure that there is a balance between the desire to simplify consent costs and the ned for KDC to provide oversight. Further technical information required and needs to consider accumulative effects.
64	/ Aaron McConcnie	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Whole plan change	with additional information.	accumulative effects.
67 68	4 Allanna Pendleton 5 Peter Nicholas	Y	Y	Oppose Seek Amendment	Whole Plan Change Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change unless applicant pays for own water supply and wastewater disposal. None stated.	Nothing proposed to improve the area, tax payers should not have to pay to service the subdivision, questions what happened to all the nice features of the original plan. The developer bought the land knowing the rules, and now want to do their own thing. Questions variance In 'up front payments' and what the proposal varies from the Mangawhai Plan.
							Opposed the original Estuary Estates proposal and its inclusion in the
69	1 Helen Current	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	District Plan and considered that it seeks to avoid all conditions of
71	7 Rachael Williams	Y	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Staging and financial development contributions need to ensure co- ordinated development and that contribution is made for the share of growth related infrastructure costs. Asks that 16.3.10 be retained to protect ratepayers. Wants confirmation that development contributions will be paid by applicant.
73	8 Ross Hinton	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Opposes the proposed plan change, in respect of the proposed changes to the consenting process. Balance must be maintained so that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert to ensure that there is a balance between the desire to simplify consent costs and the ned for KDC to provide oversight.
74	8 Joy Murray	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Whole Plan Change	with additional information.	Opposes the proposed plan change, in respect of the proposed changes to the consenting process. Balance must be maintained so that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert to ensure that there is a balance between the desire to simplify consent costs and the ned for KDC to provide oversight.
75	1 Robin Walters	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	None stated.
76	8 Phillip Murray	Υ	Y	Seek Amendment	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	changes to the consenting process. Balance must be maintained so that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert Concerned with dependency on cars, and concerned about timing of
78	6 lan Fish	Y	Y	seeks amendment	Whole Plan Change	Council rejects application and requires further supporting evidence.	plan change when construction has already begun under existing consent.
79	8 Denise Stuart 8 Brenda Coleman	Y	Y	Oppose Oppose	Whole Plan Change Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Decline the plan change.	Opposes the proposed plan change, in respect of the proposed changes to the consenting process. Balance must be maintained so that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert to ensure that there is a balance between the desire to simplify consent costs and the ned for KDC to provide oversight. Plan change removes the developer responsibility to meet the needs of the new community.
	o brenda coreman				Trible Flair Grange		
81	5 David Beattie	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	More detail is required including who is behind the development.

				1			1
82	8 Neil Wilson	N	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Opposes the proposed plan change, in respect of the proposed changes to the consenting process. Balance must be maintained so that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert to ensure that there is a balance between the desire to simplify consent costs and the ned for KDC to provide oversight.
							Opposes the proposed plan change, in respect of the proposed changes to the consenting process. Balance must be maintained so
							that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules
							and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	to ensure that there is a balance between the desire to simplify
84	8 Graham & Gloria Drury	Y	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	with additional information.	consent costs and the ned for KDC to provide oversight. Supports the current estuary estate plan with zone of permitted
							activities with application of resource consent to pursue
86	1 Paul Hendrickx	Υ	Y	seeks amendment	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	discretionary activities.
			l.,		ud l al al		Get some professional independent planning help and consider the
92	1 Florian Primbs	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	long term effects on the people and environment The merits of the earlier plan deserves careful reconsideration.
							Queries how increased density and smaller retail can be more
93	1 Maylene Lai	Υ	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	viable.
	·						
							Staging and financial development contributions need to ensure co-
							ordinated development and that contribution is made for the share
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	of growth related infrastructure costs. Asks that 16.3.10 be retained to protect ratepayers. Wants confirmation that development
95	1 Ella Grant	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	with additional information.	contributions will be paid by applicant.
33	I Elia Grane	- 1	<u> </u>	Оррозс	Whole Hall change	With additional morniation	The undue strain that will be place on the community through The
							over burdening of its water aquifers and sewage systems together
							with excess drainage and stormwater created from the proposed
97	1 John Brown	N	N	seek amendment	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	development.
98	1 Martina Tschirky	Y	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	extremely disappointed' with the development. Does not support application, not the development that it was
							supposed to be. Questions where the spatial plan for Mangawhai is
99	1 Paul Wightman	N	Υ	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline and undertake proper consultation.	and if this would be aligned.
							Lack of strategic approach for Mangawhai need to maintain the
							identity and take holistic approach. KDC is not representing
106	4 Grainne Taylor	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	Mangawhai interests.
							Lack of strategic approach for Mangawhai need to maintain the identity and take holistic approach. KDC is not representing
108	4 Tim Taylor	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	Mangawhai interests.
109	1 Daniel Taylor	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Do not let them buy the land.	None stated.
							Lack of strategic approach for Mangawhai need to maintain the
			l.,				identity and take holistic approach. KDC is not representing
110	4 Benjamin Finney	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	Mangawhai interests.
							Opposes the proposed plan change, in respect of the proposed
							changes to the consenting process. Balance must be maintained so
							that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules
							and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert
			l		ud l al al	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	to ensure that there is a balance between the desire to simplify
112	8 Andrew Paul	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	with additional information.	consent costs and the ned for KDC to provide oversight.
							Mangawhai needs a proper, up to date structure plan that clearly
							projects relevant improvements to the current infrastructure that
							the increase in population from such a large development will present. No evidence or clear drat showing the need for additional
113	1 Jo Lewin	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	housing.
		1					· -

		1	1				
114	1 Prasado Struab	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	None stated.
							L
							This has been a total marketing job where the developers have sold
							the community a concept and plan and vision and are now looking to cash in. Kaipara does not seem to be objective. Need responsible
116	1 John White	v	v	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	town/ regional/ environmental planning.
110	1 John White	'	'	Оррозе	Whole Flan Change	becline the plan change.	I highly disagree with every thing this subdivision stands for. This is
							not the Mangawhai way and will change the character and way of
117	5 Lukas Kendall	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	life.
							There is no benefit to the existing community simply a money
							making venture for Viranda and the council not acting in the best
122	1 Juliet Pendleton	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	interest of the community.
							The development will destroy the existing infrastructure of the
							Village and the Heads and will have an enormous adverse
							environmental effects. wastewater, water supply and water runoff
124	1 Arnie & Yvette Leeder	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	are issues that have not been addressed.
							Opposes the proposed plan change, in respect of the proposed
							changes to the consenting process. Balance must be maintained so
							that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules
							and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert
	-l					Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	to ensure that there is a balance between the desire to simplify
125	8 Nick Carre	N	N	Seek Amendment	Whole Plan Change	with additional information.	consent costs and the ned for KDC to provide oversight.
							Questions why the cumulative effects have been removed from consideration in Table 16.7.4-1. Requests updated concept plans.
							Questions why protection has been deleted in 16.14 and 16.15 and
126	5 Joby Beretta	N	v	Seek Amendment	Whole Plan Change	Request further information.	asks what is proposed instead.
120	5 Joby Beretta	- I'V		Seek Amendment	Whole Flan Change	Request further information.	asks what is proposed instead.
							Opposes the proposed plan change, in respect of the proposed
							changes to the consenting process. Balance must be maintained so
							that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules
							and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	to ensure that there is a balance between the desire to simplify
127	8 Georgina Carre	N	N	seeks amendment	Whole Plan Change	with additional information.	consent costs and the ned for KDC to provide oversight.
							Concerned with lack of environmental planning for the sustainability
							of Mangawhai communities unique landscape and heritage.
							Requests an independent commission . Wants assurance that any
							future costs resulting from Council decision will be spread amongst
130	9 Mike Ferguson	Υ	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline plan change and retain the current provisions.	all rate payers not just Mangawhai.
						TI . 1700 I	Feels as though the proposed changes are major and the land is in a
	4 84-1 1- 1	.,	l,		Whale B' C'	That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the	strategic location with issues relating to infrastructure, and
131	4 Moira Jackson	Y	Y	seek amendment	Whole Plan Change	developer.	environmental concerns. Further community input is needed.
							Command should be used to see a second of the second of th
							Concerned about the major changes, potential for 1400 residential
132	1 Heather Crosbie	N	N	Onnoco	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	sites, way too much for our beach town. No provisions for Tank water - Nor bores! No increase in rates.
132	T Learner Crospie	IN	IN	Oppose	whole Plan Change	ivone stateu.	
							development, as outlined at various public meetings in recent years.
434	1 Politado Marros	.,	ļ.,	0	Whale Black Chair	Cook and an and	I acknowledge that Chapter 16 of the District Plan is outdated and
134	1 Belinda Vernon	ĮΥ	IN	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Seek amendment.	not fit for purpose. I SUPPORT its revision. However, I OPPOSE the

		_					
							Due to its size, the development will result in significant implications
							which have nor been addresses. The application provides no
							assessment of alternatives, or assessment of how the plan change
							will affect Mangawhai and wider Kaipara District. Public comment
							indicates that a significant section of the community does not favour
138	1 John Dickie	Υ	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	what is proposed.
							Concerned about lack of development strategy for Mangawhai,
							requests supporting infrastructure and financing plans organised in
							accordance with NPS UDC prepared with the community and
							stakeholder engagement. Requests inclusion for triggers staging the
							development implementation, linked with staged provision of
144	6 Joel Cayford	Y	v	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	infrastructure to avoid risk of uncontrolled growth.
146	1 Melissa Hunt	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	Proposed amendments will not work in the community.
							Opposes the proposed plan change, in respect of the proposed
							changes to the consenting process. Balance must be maintained so
							that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules
							and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	to ensure that there is a balance between the desire to simplify
152	8 Carla Hood	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	with additional information.	consent costs and the ned for KDC to provide oversight.
							Opposes the proposed plan change, in respect of the proposed
							changes to the consenting process. Balance must be maintained so
							that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules
							and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	to ensure that there is a balance between the desire to simplify
153	8 Philippa Muller	N	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	with additional information.	consent costs and the ned for KDC to provide oversight.
							Preferred the original plan with max 500 residential units, green
							space and staging of community facilities, larger lots around wetland
							areas. Provision of queens chain and retention of gum diggers track
155	1 Christine Basham	Υ	Υ	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	for public access.
							Supports many aspects of the proposal and understands that the
							existing Estuary Estate Plan has significant deficiencies however is
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	concerned with the vague and general information provided,
156	1 Clive Boonham	v	v	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	with additional information.	particularly in regards to the provision of infrastructure.
150	1 Cive Boomam	T	T	Орроѕе	Whole Plan Change	with additional information.	particularly in regards to the provision of infrastructure.
							Opposes the proposed plan change, in respect of the proposed
							changes to the consenting process. Balance must be maintained so
							that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules
							and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert
							to ensure that there is a balance between the desire to simplify
							consent costs and the ned for KDC to provide oversight. Application
							must have particular regard to s32(1)(a), (b) and (c). Application fails
							to appropriately assess environmental, economic, social and cultural
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	effects specifically on amenity values and special nature of
156 158	10 Clive Boonham	Y	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	with additional information.	Mangawhai.
158	10 Alister Kim Hamilton	У	У	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	Not in keeping with the District Plan Engineering Standards.
							Supports many aspects of the proposal and understands that the existing Estuary Estate Plan has significant deficiencies however is
						Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted	concerned with the vague and general information provided,
160	1 Judith Anne Boonham	v	v	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	with additional information.	particularly in regards to the provision of infrastructure.
100	1 Juditil Alline Boolinalli	1.	1.	oppose	ore i iun change	men additional information.	paradam, regards to the provision of illinostracture.

160	10 Judith Anne Boonham	Y	у Ор	pose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Opposes the proposed plan change, in respect of the proposed changes to the consenting process. Balance must be maintained so that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert to ensure that there is a balance between the desire to simplify consent costs and the ned for KDC to provide oversight. Application must have particular regard to s32(1)(a), (b) and (c). Application fails to appropriately assess environmental, economic, social and cultural effects specifically on amenity values and special nature of Mangawhai.
162	Melanie Jane Gallo	Y	′ Ор	pose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about lack of information and quantification. No incentive for developers, council or government to deliver on community infrastructure as it has been presented on Mangawhai Central website. Promises but no requirement to make good.
164	8 Alan Preston Mark Watson Rowbotham	Y		pose	Whole Plan Change Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information. Relief is sought to give effect to this submission.	Opposes the proposed plan change, in respect of the proposed changes to the consenting process. Balance must be maintained so that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert to ensure that there is a balance between the desire to simplify consent costs and the ned for KDC to provide oversight. AEE talks about aims and objectives etc of NRC and NZCPS but have removed obligations in Chapter 16 to met any of the responsibilities. AEE incorrectly states no protection order over zone 8. Agree with conclusion in AEE in 3.2.3 - 3.2.6.
							changes to the consenting process. Balance must be maintained so
167	8 Tony Baker	y	Y Op	pose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert
169	8 Jedda Kelly	у	у Ор	pose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Opposes the proposed plan change, in respect of the proposed changes to the consenting process. Balance must be maintained so that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert to ensure that there is a balance between the desire to simplify consent costs and the ned for KDC to provide oversight. Opposes the proposed plan change, in respect of the proposed
171	8 Euan Upston	у	ү Ор	pose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	changes to the consenting process. Balance must be maintained so that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert to ensure that there is a balance between the desire to simplify consent costs and the ned for KDC to provide oversight.
174	1 Neil Torrie	N Y	у Ор	pose	Whole Plan Change	Not stated	Oppose the proposed plan change in respect of the proposed changes to the consenting process on the grounds that this will reduce the number of consents need and ability for council to effectively manage the development.
175	4 John Southward	Y		pose	Whole Plan Change	Not stated	Oppose the proposed plan change in respect of the proposed changes to the consenting process on the grounds that this will reduce the number of consents need and ability for council to effectively manage the development. Need to understand what the completed development will look like - need layout, plans, elevations and perspectives. Requests review of
177	1 Graham Bayes	Y	/Ор	pose	Whole Plan Change	Request further information.	reports.
	•						

		1	1			T	
							Opposes the proposed plan change, in respect of the proposed changes to the consenting process. Balance must be maintained so that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert
179	David & Janet Norris	N	V	Onness	Whole Plan Change	Further information and consultation.	to ensure that there is a balance between the desire to simplify consent costs and the ned for KDC to provide oversight.
1/9	David & Janet Norris	IN	ı	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Further information and consultation.	not in keeping with the District plan , policies, policy statements,
							strategies, Regional Plans, Structure Plans or Engineering Standards
181	1 Alister Hamilton	Υ	У	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	of the District Plan. not in keeping with the District plan , policies, policy statements,
							strategies, Regional Plans, Structure Plans or Engineering Standards
181	1 Alister Hamilton	Υ	у	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	of the District Plan.
400	Manager de la Company de la co	v			Mhala Blan Chana	Plan change be approved subject to consequential	Submitter seeks a number of consequential amendments to various
182	Mangawhai Central Limited	Y	У	Support	Whole Plan Change	amendments outlined in submission.	chapters. encouraging to see and hear the proposals which have been
183	Trewby & Rosemary Bull	N	Υ	seek amendment	Whole Plan Change	Due consideration to these matters.	announced for the development of this area.
104	1 Danuar Tarria		V	00000	Whole Dies Change	Desline the sleep shares	Opposes the proposed plan change, in respect of the proposed changes to the consenting process. Balance must be maintained so that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert to ensure that there is a balance between the desire to simplify
194 195	1 Raewyn Torrie 1 David Ainley	Y	Y	Oppose Oppose	Whole Plan Change Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change. Decline the plan change.	consent costs and the ned for KDC to provide oversight. To maintain the status quo as it currently stand.
196	2 David Macpherson	У	Υ	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	Proposal seeks a less prescriptive approach and will result in poor urban and planning outcomes. Current provisions result in better outcomes and 'checks and balances. Concerned that the proposal is not giving appropriate effect to Part 2 of the RMA and the proposal doesn't not represent the most appropriate means of exercising councils functions in terms of efficiency and effectiveness.
198	10 Lisa Marshall	Y	v	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change and request further information.	Opposes the proposed plan change, in respect of the proposed changes to the consenting process. Balance must be maintained so that standards of construction and not prejudiced. Th relevant rules and proposed changes should be assessed by an independent expert to ensure that there is a balance between the desire to simplify consent costs and the ned for KDC to provide oversight.
201	1 Adam Gaston	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	Don't do it. It'll be a financial flop.
202	1 Alycia Chapman	N	l.	00000	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	Business can't cope with the mass influx of people.
202	т Агусіа Спартпап	IN	IN	Oppose	whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	business can ccope with the mass innux of people.
207	1 Donna Flavell	N	N	Орроѕе	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	There is no up-to-date structure plan for Mangawhai. There has been on proper sequencing for provision of infrastructure. Inadequate assessment of need and demand for additional housing the area. Loss of green space. Mangawhai not set up to cope with increase in population, Ie, schools, libraries, medical etc.
208	1 Sandy Morrison	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	There is no up-to-date structure plan for Mangawhai. There has been on proper sequencing for provision of infrastructure. Inadequate assessment of need and demand for additional housing the area. Loss of green space. Mangawhai not set up to cope with increase in population, Ie, schools, libraries, medical etc.