

Submission #	Sub Point #	Submitter Name	Wants to Heard Y/N	Joint Hearing Y/N	Support/Oppose/Neutral	Topic	Relief Sought	Reasons for Submission
46	9	John Stephens	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the development on the surrounding amenity values.
54	9	Robin Hale	y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the development on the surrounding amenity values.
58	4	Katie Richards	N	N	Oppose	Amenity	None stated.	Small lot size not in keeping with special character of the area.
60	3	Jan Colhoun	Y	Y	Not stated	Amenity	None stated.	Mangawhai character will be adversely affected.
63	9	Grant McCarthy	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the development on the surrounding amenity values.
64	8	Aaron McConchie	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	High density proposed not in keeping with the surrounding amenity values and does not attempt to fit in.
73	9	Ross Hinton	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the development on the surrounding amenity values.
79	9	Denise Stuart	Y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the development on the surrounding amenity values.
85	6	Sue Clayton	Y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Publicise what has been granted and additional public consultation.	Mangawhai is a coastal rural community and want to keep it that way.
86	4	Paul Hendrickx	Y	Y	seeks amendment	Amenity	None stated.	Urban design assessment does not consider the Mangawhai Community Development Plan and the desires of that plan regarding housing typology.
89	5	Gainor & Graham Kerrigan	N	Y	Oppose	Amenity	None stated.	Residential density is not in keeping with the open space and amenity of Mangawhai.
90	4	Doug Lloyd	N	N	Seek Amendment	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Number of lost will not fit with Mangawhai's special nature.
93	5	Maylene Lai	Y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	None stated.	Proposal misses the opportunity to develop a sustainable and unique town centre that reflects the character of the surrounding environment, 350m2 is too small.
94	2	Douglas V Moores	N	N	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Density is detrimental to rural character of Mangawhai.
94	7	Douglas V Moores	N	N	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	High density urban development is visually incongruent with the rural landscape and detracts from the character of Mangawhai and the natural areas.
98	6	Martina Tschirky	Y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	None stated.	Inadequate in the rural setting.
101	2	Madara Vilde	Y	y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline application in current form.	Concerned about the impact of proposal on landscape values.
103	2	Gerard Wooters	N	N	Seek Amendment	Amenity	Decline application until a revised housing density is provided.	This plan change imposes a high density urban solution to a rural/beach town environment.
112	9	Andrew Paul	N	N	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the development on the surrounding amenity values.
125	9	Nick Carre	N	N	Seek Amendment	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the development on the surrounding amenity values.
127	9	Georgina Carre	N	N	seeks amendment	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the development on the surrounding amenity values.
130	1	Mike Ferguson	Y	N	Oppose	Amenity	Decline plan change and retain the current provisions.	High density and lack of greenspace not in keeping with the rural environment of the area.
133	3	Francesca von Wurzbach-Purcell	N	N	Oppose	Amenity	None stated.	This will completely ruin n the feel and affect the beautiful environment for financial gain.

134	11	Belinda Vernon	Y	N	Oppose	Amenity	Seek amendment.	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 development of this important area in the future.
138	9	John Dickie	Y	N	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change.	Landscape report gives a more favourable assessment that what is likely to occur e.g. reference to two story commercial/ retail development yet the proposal infers greater heights.
151	2	Francis & Michael Hookings	Y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about the increase in housing and impact on character of Mangawhai.
152	9	Carla Hood	Y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the development on the surrounding amenity values.
153	9	Philippa Muller	N	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the development on the surrounding amenity values.
154	2	Philip James McDermott	Y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Seek amendment.	Concerned about the revised mix of housing and the relationship with the Mangawhai settlement and the character defined by modest density and extensive vegetation cover.
155	8	Christine Basham	Y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about impact of lighting on night sky.
156	6	Clive Boonham	Y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned that the high density development will affect the special character of Mangawhai.
158	9	Alister Kim Hamilton	y	y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change.	greenspace and landscaping will not provide adequate amenity, Pedestrian links to amenities and open spaces are insufficient.
159	1	Anne Hollier	Y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change.	The proposal does not preserve the rural village character of Mangawhai as discussed.
160	6	Judith Anne Boonham	Y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned that the high density development will affect the special character of Mangawhai.
161		Linda Ritchie	N	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Minimum size of 350m2 is too small and will change the special character of Mangawhai.
162		Melanie Jane Gallo	Y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about impact on amenity and environment.
163	4	Sue Fountain	Y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change.	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the development on the surrounding amenity values.
164	9	Alan Preston	Y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the development on the surrounding amenity values.
165	3	Alex and Linley Galbraith	n	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	High density will ruin the character of Mangawhai. Density is better than spawl but the application understate the effect on character, natural features of the land.
167	9	Tony Baker	y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the development on the surrounding amenity values.
169	9	Jedda Kelly	y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the development on the surrounding amenity values.
171	9	Euan Upston	y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Does not adequately take into account the impact of the development on the surrounding amenity values.
179		David & Janet Norris	N	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Further information and consultation.	Residential intensity will adversely effects character of Mangawhai.

184	9	Rob & Mary Farmer	Y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change.	greenspace and landscaping will not provide adequate amenity, Pedestrian links to amenities and open spaces are insufficient.
185	1	Faye & James Shewan	Y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and request further information.	What is proposed does not reflect Mangawhai.
185	5	Faye & James Shewan	Y	Y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and request further information.	Concerned about intensity and impact on character of Mangawhai.
189	3	Grant Mitchell	Y	Y	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	Y	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.
198	1	Lisa Marshall	Y	y	Oppose	Amenity	Decline the plan change and request further information.	High density will ruin the character of Mangawhai. Density is better than spawl but the application understate the effect on character, natural features of the land
198	2	Lisa Marshall	Y	y	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.
18	7	Sascha Tschirky	N	Y	Oppose	Community Facilities	Decline the plan change.	Concerned that the community facilities have been removed from the proposal.
21	3	Raewyn Dodd	N	N	Oppose	Community Facilities	Decline the plan change.	Questions what has happened to the retirement home, supermarket and college.
22	5	Ken Marment	N	N	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	The development should be required to provide things that are currently lacking such as commercial centre, parks, schools, medical centre, shops and services. Not put more strain on existing.
35	1	Mark Macdonald	N	N	Oppose	Community facilities	None stated.	Questions where the community facilities have gone, and considered that the application is no longer what was supported by the community.
55	6	Gary Cameron	N	Y	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	Concerned that the proposal no longer includes pool or recreation facilities. Also concerned about size of retirement village - 135 beds is too small and will be too expensive for locals.
55	7	Gary Cameron	N	Y	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	Concerned that the proposal no longer includes pool or recreation facilities. Also concerned about size of retirement village - 135 beds is too small and will be too expensive for locals.
56	6	Elizabeth Cameron	N	Y	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	Concerned that the proposal no longer includes pool or recreation facilities. Also concerned about size of retirement village - 135 beds is too small and will be too expensive for locals.
56	7	Elizabeth Cameron	N	Y	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	Concerned that the proposal no longer includes pool or recreation facilities. Also concerned about size of retirement village - 135 beds is too small and will be too expensive for locals.
71	8	Rachael Williams	Y	Y	Oppose	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.
80	6	Brenda Coleman	N	N	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	Mangawhai needs a new school.
95	3	Ella Grant	N	N	Oppose	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.
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.

120	2	Sherrill Burke	N	N	Oppose	Community facilities	Seek amendment.	By enabling flexibility in the sub zone provisions so as to respond to changes I the community needs for recreation and leisure trends.
126	6	Joby Beretta	N	Y	Seek Amendment	Community facilities	Request further information.	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 been removed.
130	6	Mike Ferguson	Y	N	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline plan change and retain the current provisions.	Concerned about the cancelling of community facilities, particularly schools, shows lack of future proofing. Proposal no longer provides any community good.
134	6	Belinda Vernon	Y	N	Oppose	Community facilities	Seek amendment.	16.3.5 Deletion of Community Objective Existing clause: To create a community focal point in the Estuary
138	3	John Dickie	Y	N	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	No justification for the removal of education facilities from chapter 16.
140	4	Stephanie Gibson	N	N	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	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 cope.
142	7	Abby Meagher	N	N	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about lack of school capacity.
147	5	David Goid	N	N	Oppose	Community facilities	Seek amendment.	Concerned that Mangawhai doesn't have the facilities to accommodate the increase in population, particularly concerned about medical services.
155	4	Christine Basham	Y	Y	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	Community loses out with the removal if community facilities. Existing facilities wont be able to cope.
158	4	Alister Kim Hamilton	y	y	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	Increased density will have significant effect on facilities and result in higher and faster transmission of diseases. Health facilities are all ready under pressure.
162		Melanie Jane Gallo	Y	Y	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about impact on schools due to inadequate provision. Should be a pool and entertainment facilities. The proposal fails to provide consensus position in line with local community needs.
164	10	Alan Preston	Y	Y	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Needs to be provision for education facilities given the significant increase in population the proposal will result in.
177	2	Graham Bayes	Y	y	Oppose	Community facilities	Request further information.	Questions what community facilities will be provided, especially in regards to schools. What conversations have been had with central government.
179		David & Janet Norris	N	Y	Oppose	Community facilities	Further information and consultation.	Development will exacerbate existing issues, particularly in terms of capacity of schools.
184	4	Rob & Mary Farmer	Y	Y	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	Increased density will have significant effect on facilities and result in higher and faster transmission of diseases. Health facilities are all ready under pressure.
193	5	Kathy Gordon	n	N	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about school capacity.
198	3	Lisa Marshall	Y	y	Oppose	Community facilities	Decline the plan change and request further information.	Concerned about lack of provision for education needs given the increase in population.
28	1	Geoffrey William Campbell	N	N	Oppose	Construction effects	Assurance from Kaipara Council that his property wont be adversely affected and that monitoring will be undertaken during construction to ensure compliance.	Concerned about dust, vermin and pests, land slumping/movement, pooling of water due to construction works .

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

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.
138	10	John Dickie	Y	N	Oppose	Contamination	Decline the plan change.	Two sites are identified as contaminated, only one is shown on the maps, not clearly identified what will happen with soil.
139	1	Renata Blair	Y	N	Oppose	Cultural	Decline the plan change.	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 the sacredness of Mangawhai.
5	6	Alex Flavell-Johnson	N	N	Oppose	Ecology	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about impacts of residential pests such as cats and dogs 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.
31	2	Ross Hill	N	N	Oppose	Ecology	Change zoning of area 3D from 1000m2 to a rural zoning as per earlier proposal and protect wetland area.	Concerned about impact on wetland area which are habitat to 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.
34	1	Suzanne Cameron	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Ecology	Amend to increase protection and require monitoring of the estuary.	Requests protection of the Tara estuary by ensuring the existing protections remain and increasing the protections under section 16.3, requests ongoing monitoring to ensure estuary is safe for recreation activities, wildlife and harvesting of kai.
39	2	Sarah Biggs	N	N	Oppose	Ecology	Decline the plan change.	Increase in scale of development will have adverse effects on the beach and estuary.
41	3	Clive Currie	Y	N	Oppose	Ecology	Decline the plan change.	Impact on the environment will be significant.
58	6	Katie Richards	N	N	Oppose	Ecology	None stated.	Wetland protection area should be 31ha and shows stormwater ponds in subzone 8 area which should be protected. Stormwater and 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	Y	Y	Oppose	Ecology	Decline the plan change unless applicant pays for own water supply and wastewater disposal.	Concerned about pollution of the estuary.
81	3	David Beattie	N	N	Oppose	Ecology	None stated.	Natural resource including wetland will be impacted.
88	4	Cameron Shaw	Y	Y	Oppose	Ecology	None stated.	Ecological survey needs updating and unique flora and fauna preserved (bittern, fern birds, cabbage tree forest, tidal interface and wetland areas). Need pest control.
91	5	Jonathan Drucker	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Ecology	Amend the application.	Concerned about impact on endangered species.
93	3	Maylene Lai	Y	Y	Oppose	Ecology	None stated.	Questions how thoroughly the environment impacts on the estuarine environment and wetlands have been considered.
96	1	S & G Hockenhill	N	y	seek amendment	Ecology	Increase wetland requirements.	Wetland needs huge consideration. I back onto the central, I have beautiful covenant wetlands where I have eel and bitten and no native.
101	1	Madara Vilde	Y	y	Oppose	Ecology	Decline application in current form.	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 actual effects from cumulative impacts.
130	7	Mike Ferguson	Y	N	Oppose	Ecology	Decline plan change and retain the current provisions.	Removal/lack of buffer areas contradicts the communities push on predator control.

								16.3.1 Natural Environment Objective: Amendment and replacement 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 an important statement of intent.
134	5	Belinda Vernon	Y	N	Oppose	Ecology	Seek amendment.	
134	7	Belinda Vernon	Y	N	Oppose	Ecology	Seek amendment.	removal of the Natural Environment Objective ONLY if its inclusion at 16.3 Objectives and Policies has equal weight and influence to being
134	8	Belinda Vernon	Y	N	Oppose	Ecology	Seek amendment.	removal of the Natural Environment Objective ONLY if its inclusion at
135	2	Lawrence Lowe	N	N	Oppose	Ecology	Decline the plan change.	Considers there will be significant negative impact on critical ecological and environmental issues.
138	8	John Dickie	Y	N	Oppose	Ecology	Decline the plan change.	Some recommendations of the ecologist report have not been followed with no reason or analysis as to why.
140	6	Stephanie Gibson	N	N	Oppose	Ecology	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about impact on estuary from run off with development being so close. Requests comprehensive plan as to how impacts on the environment will be reduced.
141	3	Karl Kadlec	N	N	Oppose	Ecology	Decline the plan change.	Wetlands need to be protected.
142	5	Abby Meagher	N	N	Oppose	Ecology	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about discharge into harbour, impact on wildlife including shore birds.
147	4	David Goold	N	N	Oppose	Ecology	Seek amendment.	Concerned about the impact the development will have on the environment.
157	1	NZ Fairytern trust	Y	Y	Oppose	Ecology	Decline the plan change.	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 the NZ fairy Turn - NZ's rarest endemic breeding bird. Mangawhai is its most significant breeding area.
159	5	Anne Hollier	Y	Y	Oppose	Ecology	Decline the plan change.	existing natives and wetlands should be protected.
161		Linda Ritchie	N	Y	Oppose	Ecology	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about proximity of development to estuary and environmental effects.
176	3	Peter Rothwell	y	y	Oppose	Ecology	Not stated	30m setback from spring tide has not been applied and will leave to ecological effects which have not been adequately considered.
183		Trewby & Rosemary Bull	N	Y	seek amendment	Ecology	Due consideration to these matters.	Of particular concern is the proposal to abandon the wetlands for soakage between the developed areas and the estuary so water can flow straight through to the harbour.
6	4	Samantha Wood	N	N	Oppose	Electricity Supply	Decline the plan change.	Questioning where the developer intends to get power for the proposed development if not from Maungaturoto.
148	4	Grant O'Malley	N	N	Oppose	Estuary	seek amendment to residential intensity.	Concerned about effects on the estuary.
13	9	Desna Pilcher	N	N	Oppose	Industrial / Commercial Land	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about the pressure on existing shops and that the light industrial land has disappeared in favour of tiny house sites.
35	6	Mark Macdonald	N	N	Oppose	Industrial / Commercial Land	None stated.	Identifies lack of industrial land and questions if this will be supplied by KDC elsewhere.
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.
55	4	Gary Cameron	N	Y	Oppose	Industrial / Commercial Land	Decline the plan change.	Opposes the reductions of shopping and business areas.
56	4	Elizabeth Cameron	N	Y	Oppose	Industrial / Commercial Land	Decline the plan change.	Opposes the reductions of shopping and business areas.
71	6	Rachael Williams	Y	Y	Oppose	Industrial / Commercial Land	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Requires more information pertaining to business and service zones and how education facilities are provided for. Provision needs to be made for schools as current ones are at capacity.
81	2	David Beattie	N	N	Oppose	Industrial / Commercial Land	None stated.	Commercial development is over ambitious.

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

61	1	Jane Geldenhuys	N	N	Not stated	Infrastructure (General)	That the applicant be responsible for providing infrastructure.	Concerned about the increased pressure on infrastructure that is already strained (particularly in summer) and potential costs for ratepayers.
63	7	Grant McCarthy	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	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.
64	6	Aaron McConchie	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	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.
65	3	David Grant	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Infrastructure (General)	Review and change with the community in mind.	Concerned about the impact on infrastructure including schools water supply and stormwater.
66	4	Gail Williams	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	None stated.	Concerned about the impact on existing services that are already inadequate including parking, shops and roads.
73	7	Ross Hinton	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	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.
74	7	Joy Murray	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	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.
76	7	Phillip Murray	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	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.
79	7	Denise Stuart	Y	Y	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.
82	7	Neil Wilson	N	Y	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.
84	7	Graham & Gloria Drury	Y	Y	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.
88	6	Cameron Shaw	Y	Y	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	None stated.	Questions what is proposed for lighting.
89	4	Gáinor & Graham Kerrigan	N	Y	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	None stated.	Residential density puts too much pressure on infrastructure.
91	4	Jonathan Drucker	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Infrastructure (General)	Amend the application.	Concerned about lack of infrastructure upgrades and ability to for infrastructure to cope.
93	4	Maylene Lai	Y	Y	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	None stated.	Questions where the detailed solutions are for infrastructure and the resulting pressures on the community by this development.
112	7	Andrew Paul	N	N	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.
116	3	John White	Y	Y	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change.	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 are issues that have not been addressed.
120	4	Sherryl Burke	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Seek amendment.	Number of residential allotments not stated. Chapter 16 states no more that 500 but this is being removed. Needs to be a cap.
125	7	Nick Carre	N	N	Seek Amendment	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.
126	2	Joby Beretta	N	Y	Seek Amendment	Infrastructure (General)	Request further information.	Concerned about impact on current facilities such as schools doctors and the beach.
127	7	Georgina Carre	N	N	seeks amendment	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.
130	5	Mike Ferguson	Y	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline plan change and retain the current provisions.	Increased level of development overburden existing infrastructure the cost of this will no only costs existing ratepayers but not be fairly distributed through Kaipara.
133	2	Francesca von Wurzbach-Purcell	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	None stated.	Consideration has not been given to correct infrastructure.
135	1	Lawrence Lowe	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change.	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, waste management, sewage management and public green space.
136	1	Catherine Arnault	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change.	proposed development will adversely impact the current infrastructure of the Village and the Heads. Water storage, wastewater, run off and public green space have not been addressed.
143	1	Peter Bankers	Y	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about impact on infrastructure and future requirements.

144	1	Joel Cayford	Y	Y	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	None stated.	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, particularly traffic is deficient.
145	3	Julie Blanchard	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Require further information and confirmation of servicing.	development of this size - will the developer be required to pay for any upgrade needed.
152	7	Carla Hood	Y	Y	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.
153	7	Philippa Muller	N	Y	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.
154	4	Philip James McDermott	Y	Y	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Seek amendment.	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 assessment of the development on infrastructure and incorporation into asset management and long term plans.
156	9	Clive Boonham	Y	Y	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.
160	9	Judith Anne Boonham	Y	Y	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.
164	7	Alan Preston	Y	Y	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.
165	4	Alex and Linley Galbraith	n	Y	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.
167	7	Tony Baker	y	Y	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.
169	7	Jedda Kelly	y	Y	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.
170	3	John Dawson	Y	Y	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Not stated	Concerned about impact of increased residential development on infrastructure and the environment.
171	7	Euan Upston	y	Y	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.
175	3	John Southward	Y	Y	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Not stated	Oppose the removal Solar energy network as was originally proposed.
176	4	Peter Rothwell	y	y	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Not stated	Light pollution has not been adequately addressed.
177	6	Graham Bayes	Y	y	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Request further information.	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 settling tanks, comms, data, any gas requirements.
198	4	Lisa Marshall	Y	y	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change and request further information.	Concerned that there is no provision for solar power.
203	1	Katherine Ballantyne	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change.	Main concerns are to do with water and waste water.
204	1	Katherine Ballantyne	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (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 not have the capacity for that many new connections.
205	1	Lisa Steiner	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change.	Concerned that sewerage and water supply infrastructure cannot cope. Also concerned about odour from chemicals for effluent dam.
206	2	Julie Monaghan	N	N	Oppose	Infrastructure (General)	Decline the plan change and revisit the original vision.	Get the town infrastructure right first before thinking about expanding residential unnecessarily. The proposal takes more water and puts pressure on sewerage system that has caused the town so much anguish over capacity previously.
14	3	Ryan Vujcich	N	N	Oppose	Natural Hazards	Decline the plan change.	Application should be declined due to the Tsunami zone and the proximity to the Mangawhai Estuary.
19	4	Corinne Callinan	Y	Y	Oppose	Natural Hazards	None stated.	Concerned that infill will result in increased flooding, questions how will this be managed.
24	6	Roger & Megan Kendall	Y	Y	Oppose	Natural Hazards	None stated.	Concerned with increased flooding into the harbour.

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	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.
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	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	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	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	Ian 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	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	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	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	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	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	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.

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	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.
169	4	Jedda Kelly	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.
171	4	Euan Upston	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.
174	4	Neil Torrie	N	Y	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.
4	4	David James Cunningham	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	There is a significant reduction in some green spaces and the total 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	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Concerned that green spaces have been removed and no 'Queens Chain' proposed.
21	2	Raewyn Dodd	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Concerned with the limited green/open spaces and lack of Queens Chain. Questions how Reserves, beaches and parks will cope with 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.

24	2	Roger & Megan Kendall	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Opposes the reduction of proposed green space, and lack of riparian reserve/queens chain.
27	2	Janet Jacob	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Inadequate green space.
28	5	Geoffrey William Campbell	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Assurance from Kaipara Council that any Council Owned Land between his property and the subdivision does not 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.
35	2	Mark Macdonald	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Concerned about the lack of green space so as to provide for quality of life, particularly where such small lot sizes are proposed.
36	2	Grant Renall	N	N	Seek Amendment	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Opposes the loss of green space including public access along the 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.
45	4	Vivienne Martens	N	N	Seek Amendment	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Questions if there will be walking tracks around the estuary as there was one until gum diggers track was closed.
46	6	John Stephens	Y	Y	Seek 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.
47	1	Anne Robbins	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change and require the applicant to reduce the number of residential allotments.	Opposes the reduction in public spaces.
54	6	Robin Hale	Y	Y	Oppose	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.
55	5	Gary Cameron	N	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Opposes the reduction of open and green space.
56	5	Elizabeth Cameron	N	Y	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.
59	3	Gary Colhoun	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Lack of recreation space not acceptable, contributions to reserves fund will get absorbed into general KDC Funding.
63	6	Grant McCarthy	Y	Y	Seek 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.
64	5	Aaron McConchie	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Oppose plan change as inadequate recreation space, no large open spaces for increase in residents.
68	4	Peter Nicholas	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Seeks clarity on reserve contribution.
71	5	Rachael Williams	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Opposes the change to greenspace - inadequate provision for recreation. More needs to be allocated.
72	5	Alison Baird	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	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 environment.	Would like to see Gum diggers track re-opened, believes it was gifted to the community and is part of queens chain.
73	6	Ross Hinton	Y	Y	Seek 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.
74	6	Joy Murray	Y	Y	Seek 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.
76	6	Phillip Murray	Y	Y	Seek 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.
78	5	Ian Fish	Y	Y	seeks amendment	Open / Green Space	Council rejects application and requires further supporting evidence.	Does not agree with reserves contribution, plenty of area to provide for open space as part of the development and should be provided.
79	6	Denise Stuart	Y	Y	Oppose	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.
80	7	Brenda Coleman	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Lack of open space is disappointing, existing spaces can't cope - need more publicly accessible green space.
82	6	Neil Wilson	N	Y	Oppose	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.

84	6	Graham & Gloria Drury	Y	Y	Oppose	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.
85	3	Sue Clayton	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Publicise what has been granted and additional public consultation.	Must be adequate parks and facilities other than cycle and walkways to support the community.
86	5	Paul Hendrickx	Y	Y	seeks amendment	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Wants council to require land parcels for open space not financial contribution so that it can be properly planned e.g. sports field on the flat.
88	7	Cameron Shaw	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Questions where walkways will go and timeframes.
94	6	Douglas V Moores	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Opposes the lack of provision for open space, particularly along the inner harbour and the older gum diggers track; has amenity value as well.
95	5	Ella Grant	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Opposes the change to greenspace - inadequate provision for recreation. More needs to be allocated.
98	5	Martina Tschirky	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	concerned with loss of recreation and green space.
102	3	Bruce Rogan	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the application. Council should be held account for granting resource consents illegally before the necessary district plan changes were approved.	Loss of green spaces total absence of forward planning.
104	2	Gillian Cottrell	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Not enough green spaces/recreational areas. This is not what the community initially supported.
106	3	Grainne Taylor	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Loss of riparian areas is not supported.
107	1	Jeannette Reid	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Requests further information , certainty and clarity including independent engineering report on capacity and life span of wastewater plant.	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 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.
112	6	Andrew Paul	N	N	Oppose	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.
116	3	John White	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	The loss of green spaces, total absence of forward planning for critical resources.
117	3	Lukas Kendall	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	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 housing
120	1	Sherryl Burke	N	N	Oppose	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.
121	3	Kara Stones	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Questions what the developers obligations are to provide greenspace and 'community projects' . Greenspaces must be retained including Gum diggers track and other open space along the estuary.
124	2	Arnie & Yvette Leeder	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about loss of green space.
125	6	Nick Carre	N	N	Seek 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.
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.
130	2	Mike Ferguson	Y	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline plan change and retain the current provisions.	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 take away historic rights.

131	3	Moir Jackson	Y	Y	seek amendment	Open / Green Space	That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the developer.	Concerned with reduction of green space from what had been approved; the amenities have been reduced to walking and cycling tracks with no pans for other amenities such as park, playgrounds and playing fields.
134	2	Belinda Vernon	Y	N	Support	Open / Green Space	None stated.	SUPPORT provision of open space within sub zones to break up large tranches of housing that is so dense that without relief simply presents a sea of rooves. I refer to the Parklands development as an example of what needs to be avoided.
137		Susan Rowbotham	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Seek amendment.	Concerned with 16.1 deletion and sever edited regarding connectivity and green space, questions where will all the inhabitants find their recreational activities without getting in their vehicles. Seeks a revision of the clauses regarding open space and interconnectivity.
138	2	John Dickie	Y	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about impact of loss of open space. Carrying capacity of districts features already at capacity.
140	5	Stephanie Gibson	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Gum diggers track needs to stay open to the public.
142	6	Abby Meagher	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about lack of access to Gum diggers track.
143	2	Peter Bankers	Y	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about loss of green areas.
145	1	Julie Blanchard	N	N	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Require further information and confirmation of servicing.	Opposes the reduction of green space.
150	4	William Keith Draper	N	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Concerned with lack of open space such as parks and playing fields.
152	6	Carla Hood	Y	Y	Oppose	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.
153	6	Philippa Muller	N	Y	Oppose	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.
154	5	Philip James McDermott	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Seek amendment.	Requests provision of green space in keeping with the character of Mangawhai which may require more conservative density.
155	7	Christine Basham	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Community loses out with reduction of green space and queens chain.
156	8	Clive Boonham	Y	Y	Oppose	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.
158	8	Alister Kim Hamilton	y	y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about the reduction of green space, recreational areas and landscaping. Proposed is not sufficient for the intended 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 of a Parkland Community.
160	8	Judith Anne Boonham	Y	Y	Oppose	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.
161		Linda Ritchie	N	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Opposes the reduction of green space and inadequate provision of recreational activities. Green space provided is inadequate for level of development.
163	5	Sue Fountain	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about reduction of open space and lack of recreational facilities.
164	6	Alan Preston	Y	Y	Oppose	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.
166		Mark Watson Rowbotham	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Revision of clauses regarding open space and connectivity.	Concerned about lack of requirement to create open space. Concerned with Deletion of 16.8.1.2, 16.14, 16.8.1.3, 16.8.1.4.
167	6	Tony Baker	y	Y	Oppose	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.
169	6	Jedda Kelly	y	Y	Oppose	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.

170	1	John Dawson	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Not stated	Oppose the reduction in green space and access to the originally proposed walking track.
171	6	Euan Upston	y	Y	Oppose	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.
177	4	Graham Bayes	Y	y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Request further information.	Need to understand anticipated numbers to properly plan for green space and recreation facilities.
178		Richard Smith	y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Oppose the replacement of the green network overlay with the new natural environment subzone and reduced greenspace. Native bush and wetlands should be protected.
179		David & Janet Norris	N	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Further information and consultation.	Concerned about impact on existing Recreation facilities, expansion of these areas has not been provided for.
183		Trewby & Rosemary Bull	N	Y	seek amendment	Open / Green Space	Due consideration to these matters.	2) Also rumour has it that the Queen's chain is to be ignored in the subdivision. Mangawhai has several examples where this has happened, detrimental effect on the long term benefit of the town.
184	8	Rob & Mary Farmer	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about the reduction of green space, recreational areas and landscaping. Proposed is not sufficient for the intended 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 of a Parkland Community.
185	5	Faye & James Shewan	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change and request further information.	Concerned about lack of open space and esplanade reserve. Questions where the esplanade reserve noted on the development is.
186	4	Sally & Richard Wood	N	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Wants access to the track around the development.
187	1	Fiona Simon	N	N	seek amendment	Open / Green Space	Keep waterside open to the public, using both sides of the road as walkway.	Concerned about reduction of greenspace and unclear if green network will be maintained. Waterway walkway will be essential with an increased population.
189	4	Grant Mitchell	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Green spaces to be provided, not contribution to reserves fund.	Concerned about lack of green space.
191	1	Mangawhai Recreational Charitable Trust	y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Legal access over parts of C Lands where gum diggers track has ben formed, permanent protection of existing tracks in zone 8.	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 themselves of doing anything in terms of recreation etc/ 16.5.1 again divest MC from making ANY contributions to any so called 'green network' when on a development of this size and nature would be expected. It is noted new lots will attract reserve contributions, but these don't ensure green space or connectivity.
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.
196	3	David Macpherson	y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about the lack of open space and esplanade reserve resulting in semi privatisation of waterfront areas.
197	2	Barbara Pengelly	Y	Y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	None stated.	Concerned about the lack of sports facilities and open space. Waking/cycling track appears to lead to nowhere.
198	5	Lisa Marshall	Y	y	Oppose	Open / Green Space	Decline the plan change and request further information.	Inadequate provision for recreational activities, unclear where esplanade reserve is.
28	3	Geoffrey William Campbell	N	N	Oppose	Other	Requests that the zoning of his land is not changed to disadvantage or effect property value.	Concerned about any potential zoning changes.
16	5	Thomas Williams	N	N	Oppose	Parking	Consideration as to whether there is a need for this size of development.	Considers that existing parking is insufficient and that planned parking extensions should be included.

80	4	Brenda Coleman	N	N	Oppose	Parking	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about where visitors to smaller sections will park. Originally promoted walking and cycling but this has been reduced.
155	9	Christine Basham	Y	Y	Oppose	Parking	Decline the plan change.	Concerned with impact on parking, particularly during summer.
158	2	Alister Kim Hamilton	y	y	Oppose	Parking	Decline the plan change.	Landscaping and short term parking is being compromised.
162		Melanie Jane Gallo	Y	Y	Oppose	Parking	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Parking is an issue.
184	2	Rob & Mary Farmer	Y	Y	Oppose	Parking	Decline the plan change.	Landscaping and short term parking is being compromised.
1	2	Lance Cocker	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Residential sections should be minimum 1050m2.	Should be kept at this size to be in keeping with surrounding sections and as per the district plan.
2	1	Belinda Harman	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Objects to new zoning that allows housing to a minimum size of 350m2 as not in keeping with character of the surrounding environment.
4	1	David James Cunningham	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Additional housing is outside of the original plan with reduced section size. Additional houses will put unspecified demands on Council infrastructure.
5	1	Alex Flavell-Johnson	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Strongly opposed to additional residential housing, especially small section size and high density. Unmitigatable adverse effects on the character of Mangawhai.
6	2	Samantha Wood	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	350m2 sections is too small where will two water tanks fit or individual septic tank systems.
7	1	Jo Lee	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Site should be no less than 600m2.	Residential zoning is too intensive. 1700 residential sites is going to massively impact the town. Infrastructure cannot handle such intensive development.
9	1	Jane Rowe	N	N	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	Questions how many residential properties are proposed.
10	1	David Medland-Slater	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	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.
12	2	Rob Cameron	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	None stated.
13	2	Desna Pilcher	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Does not agree with the amount of houses or units, section sizes are too small.
16	1	Thomas Williams	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Clear information regarding number of dwellings.	Concerned with the number of proposed sections and the need for such a large scale subdivision.
18	1	Sascha Tschirky	N	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Already too many houses for the towns infrastructure. Concerned with the minimal site requirements per section.
19	5	Corinne Callinan	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Increased density should be rejected.	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 density, not this developer.
21	4	Raewyn Dodd	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Concerned with 'super high' density.
22	2	Ken Marment	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Submitter suggest no more houses on small density lots are needed, concerned that lots are not large enough to provide water storage for fire fighting supply.
23	1	Natalie Bray-Gunn	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	Opposes additional houses.
24	1	Roger & Megan Kendall	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	A full review of the proposal to slow down the rate at which housing is released.	Opposes the change to the number of houses able to be built and the minimal site requirements.
25	1	Miguel Hamber	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Reject the application for increased housing density.	Oppose any changes to Viranda's original submission that allow increased density of housing.
30	3	Sandie Souter	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decreased number of houses.	Opposes increased number of houses.
31	1	Ross Hill	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Change zoning of area 3D from 1000m2 to a rural zoning as per earlier proposal.	Current zoning will relate in to big of a population.
35	3	Mark Macdonald	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	Questions if the 'incredibly small' lot sizes fit with the vision for Mangawhai.
36	1	Grant Renall	N	N	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	Opposes the minimum lot size.
38	1	Adam Minoprio	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about the increase in houses and the pollution impact on the estuary.
39	1	Sarah Biggs	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Increase in scale of development will change Mangawhai more that what was intended by the original plan.
44	1	Nigel Slight	N	N	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	Limit the number of small sections.	Number of small sections should be capped and designated e.g. how many are reserved for terrace houses and retirement village.

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.
46	3	John Stephens	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	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.
47	2	Anne Robbins	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require the applicant to reduce the number of residential allotments.	No minimum size of sections noted.
48	4	Nicky Crocker	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	housing gin this area should not be increased above the 300-350 originally discussed.
50	1	Ali Ajodani	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	Considers the proposed residential sections to be too small.
53	1	Ray Crocker	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Thinks the original housing plan that was agreed to should be used as not as dense.
54	3	Robin Hale	Y	Y	Oppose	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.
55	2	Gary Cameron	N	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Oppose the decreased lot sizes.
56	2	Elizabeth Cameron	N	Y	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 increase in residential unity, lots are too small.
63	3	Grant McCarthy	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	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.
64	3	Aaron McConchie	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	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 on number of sites , sites are too small to accommodate rain water harvest and open space. Should be increased to 500m2.
65	1	David Grant	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	Review and change with the community in mind.	Concerned about the lack of certainty in terms of number of new houses.
66	1	Gail Williams	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	Opposes the number of dwellings proposed.
68	1	Peter Nicholas	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	Seeks clarity on lot density and total number of lots.
71	4	Rachael Williams	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 in dwelling numbers does not fit well with Mangawhai, or align with the Mangawhai Community Plan.
72	1	Alison Baird	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Council to address all issues, protect the harbour and if the development proceeds - for it to be sympathetic to the existing environment.	Concerned about lot sizes being reduced to 300m2, appeal for Mangawhai is open space and green belts. Population increase Big impact on community and environment.
73	3	Ross Hinton	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	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.
74	3	Joy Murray	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	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.
76	3	Phillip Murray	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	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.
79	3	Denise Stuart	Y	Y	Oppose	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.
80	1	Brenda Coleman	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Opposes the increase, has changed significantly with little benefit to the community.
81	1	David Beattie	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	Opposes planned residential.
82	3	Neil Wilson	N	Y	Oppose	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.
83	3	Graeme White	N	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Opposes the density of development and concerned that the maximum number of residential lots isn't stated. High density out of character.
84	3	Graham & Gloria Drury	Y	Y	Oppose	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.
85	7	Sue Clayton	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Publicise what has been granted and additional public consultation.	350m2 too small, multi story buildings should be prohibited.
86	2	Paul Hendrickx	Y	Y	seeks amendment	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	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.
87	3	Dianne Glucina	N	Y	Oppose	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.

88	1	Cameron Shaw	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	350m2 'way too small' aesthetically .
89	2	Gainor & Graham Kerrigan	N	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	Object to 600m2 property size, not in keeping with the open space of Mangawhai.
90	5	Doug Lloyd	N	N	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Number of lost will not fit with Mangawhai special nature and no mention of total number to be developed.
91	3	Jonathan Drucker	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	Address concerns about increased number of permitted dwellings.	None stated.
94	1	Douglas V Moores	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Opposes the number of dwellings proposed.
95	2	Ella Grant	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 in dwelling numbers does not fit with Mangawhai, or align with the Mangawhai Community Plan.
96	2	S & G Hockenhuil	N	Y	seek amendment	Residential Allotment Size	Restrictions regarding block size.	Blocks need to be bigger.
100	2	Johanna Kloostenboer	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	Concerned about the number of houses and the impact on nature, concerned about character of Mangawhai getting lost.
101	3	Madara Vilde	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline application in current form.	Considers that a better environmental outcome could be achieved if residential density remains reduced and includes integrated design including vegetated buffers and water course rehabilitation.
103	1	Gerard Wooters	N	N	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	Decline application until a revised housing density is provided.	Concerned that the infrastructure is not inline with residential housing. High density will make Mangawhai unbearable.
104	1	Gillian Cottrell	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	There are far too many houses go back to the original. This is not what the community initially supported
111	3	Myra Squire	N	N	Oppose	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.
112	3	Andrew Paul	N	N	Oppose	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.
115	3	Debra Searchfield	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	The lot sizes are too small and will negatively affect the special character.
116	2	John White	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	The beach school is spilling at the seams - by increasing residential lots - this will not help.
117	2	Lukas Kendall	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Highly disagree with house sites being 300-350sm when we live in a rural town. Highly disagree with over 1000+ houses getting jammed into such a small area.
118	2	Mary Hurley Brown	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Requests further information , certainty and clarity including independent engineering report on capacity and life span of wastewater plant.	oppose the plan change provision regarding residential lots because the maximum number of residential lots is not stated. Rule 16.8.2.2 currently sets limit at 500 residential units. But there is talk of up to 1000 dwellings or ore. This high density does not fit with rural location of Mangawhai.
119	1	Mike Taylor	N	N	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	Seek amendment.	Maintain current character of Mangawhai and surrounds, current limit of 500 on allowable number of residential units (Chapter 16.8.2.2. should be retained.
120	3	Sherryll Burke	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Seek amendment.	Number of residential allotments not stated. Chapter 16 states no more that 500 but this is being removed. Needs to be a cap.
121	1	Kara Stones	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	Concerned about housing density and impacts on the community and environment.
125	3	Nick Carre	N	N	Seek Amendment	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.
126	4	Joby Beretta	N	Y	Seek Amendment	Residential Allotment Size	Request further information.	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) and what the new proposed cap is?

127	3	Georgina Carre	N	N	seeks amendment	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.
130	8	Mike Ferguson	Y	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline plan change and retain the current provisions.	Density will adversely effect landscape, no covenants preserving the unique environment or allowing for the type of housing required resulting in potential low cost slum housing. No minimum standards.
134	3	Belinda Vernon	Y	N	Support	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	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 away from the 'town centre' of Mangawhai Central.
134	4	Belinda Vernon	Y	N	Support	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	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.
134	9	Belinda Vernon	Y	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Seek amendment.	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 minimum size. This will add to character and appeal.
134	12	Belinda Vernon	Y	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Seek amendment.	16.15.2.1 Residential Lot Layout While I SUPPORT rectangle-shaped sites I also SUPPORT provision of 'offsetting' such sites so that they don't directly back onto each other (rectangle on rectangle) but
137		Susan Rowbotham	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Seek amendment.	16.14 and 16.8.22 density tables set limits at 500 however the 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 density table 16.8.22 especially subzone 3A.
140	3	Stephanie Gibson	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about the number of houses, 1000 . Should be no more than 300-500 houses with larger sections.
142	3	Abby Meagher	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Number of houses is too high, concerned with size of sections, must have room for water tanks.
144	5	Joel Cayford	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	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 capacity, costs and who and how those matters will be provided for.

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.
147	1	David Goold	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Seek amendment.	Concerned with size and number of sections, should not be more than 500.
148	7	Grant O'Malley	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	seek amendment to residential intensity.	Proposed density will have impact on infrastructure, requests that the development be scaled back significantly.
150	1	William Keith Draper	N	Y	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.
152	3	Carla Hood	Y	Y	Oppose	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.
153	3	Philippa Muller	N	Y	Oppose	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.
154	1	Philip James McDermott	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Seek amendment.	Requests a market based rationale for revised mix of housing given the census evidence of a wider range of age and family groups in the growth mix, and the physical character of the site.
155	2	Christine Basham	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	High density housing undesirable in Mangawhai and could result in reverse sensitivity where right next to farms.
156	2	Clive Boonham	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned with the size and density of development proposed, effects on the environment and village atmosphere. Need certainty/cap on the number of lots. Should be 500. Concerned with lot size, 350m2 too small as cant accommodate water tanks.
158	3	Alister Kim Hamilton	y	y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Density is a significant increase and will have significant effects on Mangawhai.
159	2	Anne Hollier	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	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 Mangawhai and not in character.
160	2	Judith Anne Boonham	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned with the size and density of development proposed, effects on the environment and village atmosphere. Need certainty/cap on the number of lots. Should be 500. Concerned with lot size, 350m2 too small as cant accommodate water tanks.
161		Linda Ritchie	N	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned that the maximum number of lots is not stated, and that it has increased. Minimum size of 350m2 is too small.
163	3	Sue Fountain	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	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.
164	3	Alan Preston	Y	Y	Oppose	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.
165	2	Alex and Linley Galbraith	n	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Oppose the number of residential lots, maximum number is not stated 16.8.2.2 currently sets the limit at 5000, 1000 dwellings is too many in a concentrated area. Minimum size of 350m2 is too small.
166		Mark Watson Rowbotham	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Reduction in density, especially subzone 3A.	16.8.2.2 is not appropriate density level.
167	3	Tony Baker	y	Y	Oppose	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.
168	3	James Bremner	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Oppose the new revised smaller allowance, have not been given public approval.
169	3	Jedda Kelly	y	Y	Oppose	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.
170	2	John Dawson	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Not stated	Oppose as this is the third planned increase in number of residential units.
171	3	Euan Upston	y	Y	Oppose	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.

172	1	Kevin Platt	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	None stated.	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 anticipated.
173	1	Peggyann Colville	N	Y	Seek amendment	Residential Allotment Size	Grant the application on the condition that sufficient greenspace is included.	Concerned with the additional housing on smaller sections.
175	2	John Southward	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Not stated	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
176	1	Peter Rothwell	y	y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Not stated	Proposed density is not consistent with District Plan, 350m2 not consistent with the existing development in Mangawhai and is not what residents have asked for.
178		Richard Smith	y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Oppose residential policy 16.3.6.1 increase residential units. Concerned about lack of cap and potential strain on infrastructure.
179		David & Janet Norris	N	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Further information and consultation.	No certainty in total number of lots. Concerned about increase. Minimum size of 350m2 is too small.
184	3	Rob & Mary Farmer	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	Density is a significant increase and will have significant effects on Mangawhai.
185	4	Faye & James Shewan	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and request further information.	Oppose number of houses, not in keeping with Mangawhai, should be limited to what was originally proposed with a mix of section size. 350m2 too small.
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.
195	2	David Ainley	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change.	reduce the number of residential allotments to control effluent into the estuary and impact on existing infrastructure.
197	3	Barbara Pengelly	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	confirmation of number and size of residential allotments.	High density development not suitable for Mangawhai. Concerned with increased housing as a result of the deletion of subzones 2, 4, 5 and 6. Concerned with restriction of lot size and effect on character.
198	6	Lisa Marshall	Y	y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and request further information.	Maximum number of lots not stated - there needs to be a cap, 350m2 is too small and will ruin character of Mangawhai.
199	1	Shane Cullen	Y	Y	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Reduce lot size on the common boundary to what was originally proposed. Have a no complaints consent notice registered on titles that fall within 100m of the common boundary.	Oppose increase in density in zone 3D not what was original y anticipated ad will have a detrimental effect on K Platts property 16.8.2.5 max height allowable, concerned about impact on their property - much higher than what was originally anticipated. Don't believe effects on this property have been properly addressed.
200	1	Ella Rickit	N	N	Oppose	Residential Allotment Size	Decline the plan change and request further information.	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 character of Mangawhai.
206	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.
28	2	Geoffrey William Campbell	N	N	Oppose	Security	Seeks a fence along he walkway not at his expense for security purposes, and that the zoning of his land is not changed to disadvantage or effect property value.	Concerned about walkway and potential security issues.

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.
4	2	David James Cunningham	Y	Y	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	Concerned regarding increased stormwater which when released into the harbour will impact on natural resources, in particular natural wildlife.
5	3	Alex Flavell-Johnson	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	Concerned regarding additional stormwater runoff into the harbour 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.
12	1	Rob Cameron	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	Changes made to protect Mangawhai Harbour water quality.	Mangawhai is a treasure and needs to be developed in a way that looks after the environment and keeps it a special place.
13	4	Desna Pilcher	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	Concerned with stormwater from har surfaces being piped into the estuary
14	1	Ryan Vujcich	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	Application should be declined due to ongoing issues with stormwater.
16	4	Thomas Williams	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	Clear information regarding where stormwater is being directed and the expected volumes.	Concerned about where all of the stormwater generated from the planned area of build will be directed.
18	3	Sascha Tschirky	N	Y	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	Concerned that the stormwater will be piped into the harbour with no treatment. Should be stormwater ponds.
18	4	Sascha Tschirky	N	Y	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	Y	Oppose	Stormwater	None stated.	Concerned that stormwater to be piped into harbour.
21	1	Raewyn Dodd	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	Concerned with the adverse effects on the estuary.
24	3	Roger & Megan Kendall	Y	Y	Oppose	Stormwater	None stated.	Opposes the increased stormwater and it being piped into the 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.
29	3	Wendy Sheffield	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Stormwater	Amend application to require Roof collection for water supply.	Roof top catchment will help to relieve the volume of stormwater entering the estuary.
32	1	Emma Mallock	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	None stated.	Concerned about stormwater run off contaminating the water ways.
34	2	Suzanne Cameron	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Stormwater	Amend to require treatment of stormwater.	Requests that Council ensures stormwater is treated before entering any waterways including during the earthmoving and construction 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.
46	5	John Stephens	Y	Y	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.
54	5	Robin Hale	y	Y	Oppose	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.
62	2	Paul David Rae	N	Y	Oppose	Stormwater	None stated.	Concerned about untreated stormwater running into estuary and impact on the fairy turns and bittern and potential additional costs to ratepayers.
63	5	Grant McCarthy	Y	Y	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.
64	4	Aaron McConchie	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Stormwater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Oppose the discharge of stormwater to the estuary, general swale 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.
71	3	Rachael Williams	Y	Y	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 detrimental to the wetlands. Concerned with change in activity status.

72	3	Alison Baird	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	Council to address all issues, protect the harbour and if the development proceeds - for it to be sympathetic to the existing environment.	Concerned about the lack of soakage and the 'massive' amount of stormwater.
73	5	Ross Hinton	Y	Y	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.
74	5	Joy Murray	Y	Y	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.
76	5	Phillip Murray	Y	Y	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.
78	3	Ian Fish	Y	Y	seeks amendment	Stormwater	Council rejects application and requires further supporting evidence.	Opposes discharge of stormwater to harbour, inadequate provision for stormwater an notes submission on these points 15 years ago.
79	5	Denise Stuart	Y	Y	Oppose	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.
82	5	Neil Wilson	N	Y	Oppose	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.
83	5	Graeme White	N	Y	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Opposes discharge to harbour, inadequate provisions for treatment.
84	5	Graham & Gloria Drury	Y	Y	Oppose	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.
85	5	Sue Clayton	Y	Y	Oppose	Stormwater	Publicise what has been granted and additional public consultation.	Development is close to harbour and estuary, should be no discharge from construction and consider adequate must be protection from flooding.
87	4	Dianne Glucina	N	Y	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Provisions for stormwater are not adequate, concerned about sediment discharge.
88	2	Cameron Shaw	Y	Y	Oppose	Stormwater	None stated.	Kaipara harbour overlay is 40% residential sections. Questions where stormwater will go and how it will effects estuary.
90	1	Doug Lloyd	N	N	Seek Amendment	Stormwater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about quality of water discharged and effect of volume on salinity. Not sufficiently addressed.
91	2	Jonathan Drucker	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	stormwater	Address concerns about stormwater run off.	None stated.
94	4	Douglas V Moores	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned with sediment from earthworks and untreated stormwater flowing into the harbour.
95	6	Ella Grant	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 detrimental to the wetlands. Concerned with change in activity status.
98	4	Martina Tschirky	Y	Y	Oppose	Stormwater	None stated.	Concerned with stormwater.
112	5	Andrew Paul	N	N	Oppose	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.
117	1	Lukas Kendall	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	I highly disagree storm water and excess run off to drain directly into the estuary.
121	5	Kara Stones	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	None stated.	Developer must pay for any necessary upgrades, cost should not fall on ratepayers.
123	1	Mangawhai Harbour Restoration Society	Y	y	Oppose	Stormwater	Ensure adequate safeguards in place during construction phase.	Concerned about sediment discharge int the harbour, requests that it be monitored by a third party to ensure water quality not impacted.
124	5	Arnie & Yvette Leeder	N	N	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	water runoff has not been appropriately addressed.
125	5	Nick Carre	N	N	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.
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.

130	3	Mike Ferguson	Y	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.
138	6	John Dickie	Y	N	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	Does not consider swales to be effective management for sediment, suggest retention and sediment basins. Recent history of site raises concern re: sediment control during construction.
138	7	John Dickie	Y	N	Oppose	stormwater	Decline the plan change.	100m3/day available under the existing consent not adequate for 1000 households proposed and commercial/industrial use. Already pressure on water supply, particularly in drought.
152	5	Carla Hood	Y	Y	Oppose	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.
153	5	Philippa Muller	N	Y	Oppose	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.
155	6	Christine Basham	Y	Y	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about stormwater impact on the estuary and the impact on recreation and wildlife values.
156	7	Clive Boonham	Y	Y	Oppose	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.
160	7	Judith Anne Boonham	Y	Y	Oppose	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.
161		Linda Ritchie	N	Y	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned about run off into harbour during construction.
164	5	Alan Preston	Y	Y	Oppose	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.
167	5	Tony Baker	y	Y	Oppose	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.
169	5	Jedda Kelly	y	Y	Oppose	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
171	5	Euan Upston	y	Y	Oppose	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.
174	5	Neil Torrie	N	Y	Oppose	Stormwater	Provisions to be reviewed and greater margins provided for extreme events.	Concerned with proposed stormwater management, considers it inadequate. Concerned about fun off and siltation of harbour.
176	2	Peter Rothwell	y	y	Oppose	Stormwater	Not stated	Sites do not allow for stormwater soakage due to small size.
178		Richard Smith	y	Y	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	oppose the change in the storm water management in the plan change there is no details to suggest how the stormwater will be successfully managed, particularly given low lying flood prone area.
194	5	Raewyn Torrie	N	Y	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about stormwater and increased siltation and contamination of the harbour.
198	7	Lisa Marshall	Y	y	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change and request further information.	Oppose discharge into harbour, inadequate provisions of treatment provided.
1	1	Lance Cocker	Y	Y	Oppose	Stormwater	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about runoff and damage this may cause on waterways. The estuary must be protected.
134	10	Belinda Vernon	Y	N	Oppose	Subdivision	Seek amendment.	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 shown as 750m2 in the Table in 16.8.2.2.
178		Richard Smith	y	Y	Oppose	Subdivision	Decline the plan change.	POLICIES16.3.11.1 to include the mandatory catchment of all rain water off every roof within the subdivision (both business and residential). This would also reduce stormwater.
10	3	David Medland-Slater	Y	Y	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about increase in general traffic at peak times once development is completed.

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.
19	1	Corinne Callinan	Y	Y	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	None stated.	Concerned with incremental traffic increases. Roading is insufficient to cope with 1000 more houses, causeway could divide the community unless developers pay for works to improve the causeway and roundabout.
29	1	Wendy Sheffield	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Traffic / Roading	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 Molesworth Drive.	Concerned with impact on traffic between Mangawhai Village and Mangawhai Heads.
30	5	Sandie Souter	N	N	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	None stated.	Concerned potential traffic flow problems arising from entrance and exit onto Molesworth Drive, not cleared what is being proposed.
47	3	Anne Robbins	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Traffic / Roading	Decline the plan change and require the applicant to reduce the number of residential allotments.	Concerned about the impact of increased traffic on the existing network and considers the increase not to have been appropriately mitigated.
69	4	Helen Current	N	N	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about impact on roading.
80	5	Brenda Coleman	N	N	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	Decline the plan change.	Need more pedestrian friendly walkways and cycle ways to reduce congestion.
86	3	Paul Hendrickx	Y	Y	seeks amendment	Traffic / Roading	None stated.	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 roading layout.
96	4	S & G Hockenhuill	N	y	seek amendment	Traffic / Roading	Restrictions regarding roading.	Roading can't sustain development - needs looking into.
98	2	Martina Tschirky	Y	Y	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	None stated.	Disappointed that the developer has reneged on making Molesworth into a slow street.
100	1	Johanna Kloostenboer	Y	Y	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	None stated.	Concerned about adverse effects on Old Waipu Road Connection and amount of traffic in the village, especially in summer.
111	4	Myra Squire	N	N	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 traffic volumes and access to be planner and avoid traffic jams and impact on emergency vehicles.
121	6	Kara Stones	N	N	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	None stated.	Concerned about traffic congestion on ring road and impact on access to local amenities.
126	1	Joby Beretta	N	Y	Seek Amendment	Traffic / Roading	Request further information.	Concerned about traffic on Molesworth Drive, questions if traffic impact study has been undertaken.
139	3	Renata Blair	Y	N	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	Decline the plan change.	Concerned with the increased traffic and the effects on the environment.
144	3	Joel Cayford	Y	Y	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	None stated.	Considers technical documents provided in regards to traffic to be 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.
149	1	Sharon Martin	Y	Y	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	Seek amendment to include arterial road and further consideration of increased traffic to be generated.	Concerned that the proposal hasn't considered the capacity of the 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 increased traffic. One way in and out proposed - this should be re-addressed.
154	3	Philip James McDermott	Y	Y	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	Seek amendment.	Requests a review of traffic impacts on the wider network including comprehensive review ITA taking into account future impact on and around Molesworth Drive.
155	3	Christine Basham	Y	Y	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	Decline the plan change.	Roading cannot support additional housing development.
158	1	Alister Kim Hamilton	y	y	Oppose	Traffic / Roading	Decline the plan change.	Road scape amenity as provided in the DP and Structure pan is being diminished.

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

46	1	John Stephens	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 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.
50	1	Ali Ajodani	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Confirmation of impact on residents.	Want to know what the impact on the wastewater system will be as a result of the ne residential dwellings.
51	1	Maralynne Latu	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Guarantee that increased odour will not be generated.	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 done into potential effects on the wildlife.
54	1	Robin Hale	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 treatment.
55	3	Gary Cameron	N	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	Opposes the connection to the wastewater system and concerned about additional costs to ratepayers, to deal with additional load, questions if applicant are still going to pay to upgrade.
56	3	Elizabeth Cameron	N	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	Opposes the connection to the wastewater system and concerned about additional costs to ratepayers, to deal with additional load, questions if applicant are still going to pay to upgrade.
58	1	Katie Richards	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	Oppose connection to wastewater system, and concerned with potential costs to ratepayers. Development should provide their own system. Not clear how many connections are required.
59	1	Gary Colhoun	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	Lack of clarity around wastewater, independent assessment required. Concerned about potential cost to ratepayers.
60	1	Jan Colhoun	Y	Y	Not stated	Wastewater	None stated.	Not enough information about the sewerage, existing system wont cope.
63	1	Grant McCarthy	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 treatment.
64	1	Aaron McConchie	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 assessment needed, if development will result in near capacity - developer should be required to fund.
65	2	David Grant	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	Review and change with the community in mind.	Concerned about the lack of certainty in terms of number of new connections to wastewater, and who will pay for any required upgrades.
66	2	Gail Williams	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	Wants to understand the existing capacity of the wastewater system and whether it can support the increase.
67	2	Allanna Pendleton	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change unless applicant pays for own water supply and wastewater disposal.	Concerned about impact on wastewater system and potential costs for ratepayers.
68	2	Peter Nicholas	Y	Y	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.
70	1	Glen Real	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 treatment.

71	1	Rachael Williams	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Oppose connection to KDC treatment plant, concerned with lack of detail re number of connections and volume of discharge, no evidence to suggest the system has capacity. Requires more detail and further consultation with ratepayers.
72	4	Alison Baird	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Council to address all issues, protect the harbour and if the development proceeds - for it to be sympathetic to the existing environment.	Concerned about impact on wastewater system and potential costs for ratepayers - developer should pay for own system.
73	1	Ross Hinton	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 treatment.
74	1	Joy Murray	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 treatment.
76	1	Phillip Murray	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 treatment.
77	1	Alan & Maureen Hunt	N	Y	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	Applicant should provide own independent treatment facility for the development. If not feasible, council to obtain report on condition lifespan of current system.	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.
78	2	Ian Fish	Y	Y	seeks amendment	Wastewater	Council rejects application and requires further supporting evidence.	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 discharge to harbour.
79	1	Denise Stuart	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 treatment.
80	3	Brenda Coleman	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	System is already under strain not designed to cope with this level of development. Applicant should contribute and not burden ratepayers.
81	4	David Beattie	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	Concerned that wastewater system will be overloaded if development proceeds to the planned level.

82	1	Neil Wilson	N	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 treatment.
83	1	Graeme White	N	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Oppose connection to wastewater system, no evidence to suggest it can cope with additional demand, lack of clarity in terms of number of connections. Applicant should provide their own. Concerned about additional costs to ratepayers.
84	1	Graham & Gloria Drury	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 treatment.
85	1	Sue Clayton	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Publicise what has been granted and additional public consultation.	servicing should be undertaken by the developer, need to ensure no run off into harbour.
86	6	Paul Hendrickx	Y	Y	seeks amendment	Wastewater	None stated.	Detailed independent report needs to be commissioned to understand capacity. Applicant must be accountable for any additional costs, not the ratepayers.
87	1	Dianne Glucina	N	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 treatment.
88	3	Cameron Shaw	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	Questions why there is no upgrade proposed and concerned about capacity.
89	1	Gainor & Graham Kerrigan	N	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	Oppose connection to current system; lacks capacity. The developer could offer to extend plant. Concerned about smell and cost for ratepayers. Need further research on the sustainability of the plant.
90	2	Doug Lloyd	N	N	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Developer should provide their own system as current one couldn't cope. Need further independent information on capacity and further consultation with community.
94	3	Douglas V Moores	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Oppose - the applicant should provide their own independent system as the existing could not cope. Need hydrological assessment.
95	7	Ella Grant	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Oppose connection to KDC treatment plant, concerned with lack of detail re number of connections and volume of discharge, no evidence to suggest the system has capacity. Requires more detail and further consultation with ratepayers.
102	1	Bruce Rogan	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the application. Council should be held account for granting resource consents illegally before the necessary district plan changes were approved.	1. has the (Ecocare) sewage system the capacity to cope with projected demand been validated by an independent expert.
103	3	Gerard Wooters	N	N	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	Decline application until a revised housing density is provided.	No reliable evidence presented to establish adequate capacity, Council needs to decide if applicant should supply own system.
105	1	Janne Rowe linked to 1st submission	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	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	1	Grainne Taylor	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	Low lying development, and should not be connected to already overloaded system
107	2	Jeannette Reid	Y	y	Oppose	Wastewater	Requests further information , certainty and clarity including independent engineering report on capacity and life span of wastewater plant.	oppose the plan change provisions in respect of wastewater treatment, number of connection not stated. No reliable evidence to suggest capacity, current information suggests insufficient capacity. No provision for capital cost of any works to upgrade the system.
108	1	Tim Taylor	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	Low lying development, and should not be connected to already overloaded system.

110	1	Benjamin Finney	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	Low lying development, and should not be connected to already overloaded system.
111	1	Myra Squire	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 treatment.
112	1	Andrew Paul	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 treatment.
115	1	Debra Searchfield	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	The applicant should supply their own facility for wastewater treatment for the development.
117	4	Lukas Kendall	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	I highly disagree that they want to hook into our overstrained wastewater system.
118	1	Mary Hurley Brown	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Requests further information , certainty and clarity including independent engineering report on capacity and life span of wastewater plant.	I oppose the plan change provision regarding the wastewater treatment by connecting with the KDC's existing treatment system, applicant should provide own facility. No indication of number of connections so no way of knowing volume or if the system can cope.
119	2	Mike Taylor	N	N	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	Seek amendment.	An independent (from Council and the Applicant) assessment is required to validate the assumptions and undertakings relative to wastewater contained in Sec 6.7.17-6.7.22.
121	4	Kara Stones	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	Developer must pay for any necessary upgrades, cost should not fall on ratepayers.
124	3	Arnie & Yvette Leeder	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	wastewater has not been appropriately addressed.
125	1	Nick Carre	N	N	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Oppose connection 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 capital costs of any works required to connect Mangawhai Central to the current system.
126	3	Joby Beretta	N	Y	Seek Amendment	Wastewater	Request further 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.
127	1	Georgina Carre	N	N	seeks amendment	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Oppose connection 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 capital costs of any works required to connect Mangawhai Central to the current system.
128	1	James Hislop	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Transparency in decision and no additional cost to ratepayers.	Waste water should be provided by developer at their cost alone, due to insufficient information of quantity of connections, volumes, insufficient evidence from KDC that there is adequate capacity in the present plant.
131	3	Moir 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.
137		Susan Rowbotham	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Seek amendment.	Confirmation of residential allotments and further reporting required to confirm if wastewater system can cope with increase.
138	4	John Dickie	Y	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	No indication as to whether the proposal will result in increased flow and how this will be managed. Concerned about potential costs for ratepayers and what that the development contribution will be fair.
139	2	Renata Blair	Y	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	Increase in wastewater will have huge effect on the taiao.

140	1	Stephanie Gibson	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	Opposes connection to current wastewater system as the system doesn't have capacity. Should be depending on on-site disposal. Concerned about costs to ratepayers.
141	1	Karl Kadlec	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	Need to provide their own wastewater system, KDC scheme already at capacity.
142	2	Abby Meagher	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	Wastewater system is inadequate and lacking maintenance.
144	2	Joel Cayford	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	None stated.	Concerned with lack of information, and how wastewater needs for the development will be met and paid for.
147	2	David Goold	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Seek amendment.	Concerned about limits of wastewater system that is already over loaded, and septic water evacuation. Requests further information and that the developer provides their own system.
148	8	Grant O'Malley	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	seek amendment to residential intensity.	Concerned about impact on wastewater system , assumptions made need to be tested and verified so as to avoid costs on ratepayers.
150	2	William Keith Draper	N	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	concerned that the wastewater system is inadequate to cope with increased housing.
151	3	Francis & Michael Hookings	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about how the wastewater system will manage and 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 into without further consultation.
152	1	Carla Hood	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 treatment.
153	1	Philippa Muller	N	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 treatment.
155	5	Christine Basham	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	Community loses out with lack of independent wastewater system.
156	3	Clive Boonham	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 development agreement is required to address any costs so that this does not fall on the residents.
158	6	Alister Kim Hamilton	y	y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	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 with the National Policy Statement.
159	4	Anne Hollier	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	oppose connection to council wastewater system. Recent information suggest it doesn't have capacity now, let alone with
160	3	Judith Anne Boonham	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 development agreement is required to address any costs so that this does not fall on the residents.
163	1	Sue Fountain	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	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 treatment.

164	1	Alan Preston	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 treatment.
165	6	Alex and Linley Galbraith	n	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	supply own facility. Concerned with lack of detail re number of connections and volume of discharge, further consultation should be
166		Mark Watson Rowbotham	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Confirmation that the wastewater system has capacity for residential and commercial area, and re-evaluation of calculations for volumes.	Insufficient investigation. Calculation in 6.1.19 of the AEE do not reflect the possible yields as per table 16.8.2.2.
167	1	Tony Baker	y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 treatment.
168	1	James Bremner	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Oppose the changes due to proposed wastewater connections and potential implications on ratepayers. The design of the plant may be undersized and the development load unknown.
169	1	Jedda Kelly	y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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
170	4	John Dawson	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Not stated	Concerned about the factual deficit between KDC statement that plant has capacity to cope with the additional households and previous statement that it doesn't.
171	1	Euan Upston	y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 treatment.
173	2	Peggyann Colville	N	Y	Seek amendment	Wastewater	Grant the application on the condition that a proper and full investigation is carried out re capacity, and ensure no additional costs to ratepayers.	Concerned with the additional load on wastewater system.
174	2	Neil Torrie	N	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Applicant provides their own scheme.	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 cost the development. More evidence required.
175	1	John Southward	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Not 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 undertaken with ratepayers before agreement to wastewater treatment.
178		Richard Smith	y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	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 community will have to foot the bill. Applicant should provide it.
179		David & Janet Norris	N	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Further information and consultation.	Applicants should provide own facility. Volume of discharge unclear.
180		Josie Gritten	y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	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. Applicant should provide own system.
184	6	Rob & Mary Farmer	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	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 with the National Policy Statement.

185	2	Faye & James Shewan	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and request further information.	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 connection.
186	1	Sally & Richard Wood	N	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	More discussion with ratepayers.	Concerned that the applicant is connecting to existing system. Ratepayers had been assured by Andrew Guest that they would be providing their own.
188	3	Cheryl Mitchell	N	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Require developer to build and maintain own system.	Oppose developer latching onto wastewater system.
189	1	Grant Mitchell	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Provide own wastewater system.	Concerned about capacity and expenditure required to extend facility to accommodate the development.
190	1	Roger Bull	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	Concerned that connection to the wastewater system will overload it, applicant should provide their own system. Lack of detail re number of connection and no provision for capital costs.
192	1	Elizabeth & Toby Evans	N	n	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	Concerned that connection to the wastewater system will overload it, applicant should provide their own system. Lack of detail re number of connection and no provision for capital costs.
193	1	Kathy Gordon	n	N	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	Oppose connection to wastewater system, applicant should provide their own. No evidence to suggest capacity. Told by Andrew Guest applicant would provide wastewater.
194	2	Raewyn Torrie	N	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change.	Concerned about demand on wastewater system and potential costs to ratepayers. Lack of evidence to confirm the system has capacity. Applicant should provide own scheme.
197	4	Barbara Pengelly	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Assurance that any further costs will not come back to ratepayers and hydrological report.	Concerned about capacity of wastewater system and potential costs to ratepayers, no evidence to suggest the scheme can support 1000 new residential dwellings.
198	8	Lisa Marshall	Y	y	Oppose	Wastewater	Decline the plan change and request further information.	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 treatment.
199	2	Shane Cullen	Y	Y	Oppose	Wastewater	Review total water take from groundwater.	Concerned about the effect of water extraction on the water table. Concerned about effects on the water supply they currently use for stock.
200	3	Ella Rickit	N	N	Oppose	Wastewater	That the Council will not enter into any agreement in respect of wastewater treatment for Mangawhai Central without full and open consultation with ratepayers including proving ratepayers with a copy of the engineering report.	There are serious concerns that the current waste water infrastructure cannot accommodate this huge increase in residential and commercial development. We need an independent report on the plant, the reticulation, the pumping system, and the discharge system - which tell us how much capacity it has and it's projected longevity. The existing community has grave concerns that the increased strain on the system could mean another huge expense for ratepayers which we cannot afford. In other words - we worry that the property developer and council are externalising the true cost of the new development by getting ratepayers to pay for wastewater upgrades.
5	2	Alex Flavell-Johnson	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Oppose extraction of groundwater resources from Mangawhai aquifers, especially with climate change.
6	1	Samantha Wood	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Access to the local aquifer will not cope with the 2019/20 drought and will not be able to support the commercial / residential development in the plan change. Breaching sandstone in development of drainage systems could contaminate water source for this development and surrounding properties.
8	1	Gill Wharfe	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	No increase in housing.	Mangawhai already has water supply issues. Increasing housing will impact residents as water is already scarce.
13	6	Desna Pilcher	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Does not agree with the use of aquifer water as opposed to tank water like everyone else.

16	3	Thomas Williams	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Clear information regarding where water supply will be sourced from, expected volumes and back up plans to cater for climate change.	Concerned about how reticulated water will be supplied and what back up is proposed given the likely hood of increased droughts.
18	5	Sascha Tschirky	N	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Concerned that the water dams have been removed and that the bore will run out.
19	6	Corinne Callinan	Y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Further information as to how the water allocation was calculated, how much was paid for access and if RC has been granted.	Concerned how the bore allowance has been calculated for Mangawhai Central.
21	5	Raewyn Dodd	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Concerned that local aquifer will be over-taxed.
22	7	Ken Marment	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	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 storage in place.
23	2	Natalie Bray-Gunn	N	N	Oppose	Water supply	None stated.	Opposes water being taken from aquifer that supplies the community.
24	4	Roger & Megan Kendall	Y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	Concerned with up to 100,000L a day being taken from the aqueduct given that it was nearly dry in 2020.
25	2	Miguel Hamber	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Council to engage an independent consultant (and Viranda to fund) to carry out a full new investigation on the current capacity of the aquifer and the long term effects of the proposal.	Oppose any changes to Viranda's original submission that allow disproportionate use of the aquifer.
26	3	Simon Hardley	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Changes should not be allowed until consultation is made and community support achieved.	Concerned that there are insufficient water resources to cope with this number of additional residential dwellings.
28	4	Geoffrey William Campbell	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Assurance from Kaipara Council that his property wont be adversely affected as a result of the bore.	Concerned about slumping of land /land movement or liquid pooling on his property.
29	2	Wendy Sheffield	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Water Supply	Amend application to require Roof collection for water supply.	Concerned with impact on water supply.
30	1	Sandie Souter	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Applicant to supply own water storage supply.	Concerned with impact on underground water supply and effects on current users.
40	2	Dion Pilmer	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	Concerned that the proposal could overload the aquifer.
42	1	Johanna Baylis	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Require roof top water collection.	Concerned about the proposed water supply given the limited availability particularly in drought.
45	2	Vivienne Martens	N	N	Seek Amendment	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Opposes the reliance on underground natural water supply instead of water tanks for each property, concerned about droughts becoming more common.
46	2	John Stephens	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	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.
48	2	Nicky Crocker	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Infrastructure cannot cope.
49	1	Paul Walyon	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	Opposes water supply.
54	2	Robin Hale	y	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.
55	8	Gary Cameron	N	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Opposes use of aquifer for water supply.
56	8	Elizabeth Cameron	N	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Opposes use of aquifer for water supply
58	2	Katie Richards	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	Oppose the change to water supply, residential units should have tanks. Research required into reservoir capacity and effects of climate change e.g. drought.
59	2	Gary Colhoun	Y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	Lack of clarity re water supply, independent assessment required.
60	2	Jan Colhoun	Y	Y	Not stated	Water Supply	None stated.	Not enough information about the water supply.

63	2	Grant McCarthy	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	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.
64	2	Aaron McConchie	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	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 hydrological assessment required that considered effects of climate change on aquifer . Roof water harvesting should be mandated. Need solid policies re waste storage.
66	3	Gail Williams	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	Concerned that NRC has approved he water draw from the Mangawhai bore, particularly given the water shortage in the region. 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.
70	2	Glen Real	Y	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.
71	2	Rachael Williams	Y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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
72	2	Alison Baird	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Council to address all issues, protect the harbour and if the development proceeds - for it to be sympathetic to the existing environment.	Houses should be collecting rainwater, water should not be taken from aquifer. Concerned about low water table.
73	2	Ross Hinton	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	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.
74	2	Joy Murray	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	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.
76	2	Phillip Murray	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	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.
78	4	Ian Fish	Y	Y	seeks amendment	Water Supply	Council rejects application and requires further supporting evidence.	Opposes water being taken from aquifer with no hydrological assessment, no consideration of effects of climate change.
79	2	Denise Stuart	Y	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.
80	2	Brenda Coleman	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Concerned with lack of consideration given to alternative water supplied. Aquifer is being depleted. Should harvest rainwater. NRC granted extraction unlikely to be sufficient.
82	2	Neil Wilson	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.
83	2	Graeme White	N	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Opposes proposed water supply connection no evidence provided to suggest there is capacity. Original proposal was supposed to draw from a damn in the Brynderwyns - why was this not followed.
84	2	Graham & Gloria Drury	Y	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.
85	4	Sue Clayton	Y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Publicise what has been granted and additional public consultation.	Aquifer is not infinite, needs to be another source such as rainwater harvest.

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.
88	5	Cameron Shaw	Y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	Questions where potable water will come from and if the aquifer can 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.
90	3	Doug Lloyd	N	N	Seek Amendment	Water Supply	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned that aquifer can support the volume of water required, and potential cost for ratepayers. Need independent hydrological assessment.
91	1	Jonathan Drucker	Y	Y	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.	Oppose proposed draw from aquifer and tanks - will not adequately provide the necessary water. More detailed reports needed. 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	Y	seek amendment	Water Supply	Restrictions regarding water.	Water can't sustain the development - needs looking into.
98	3	Martina Tschirky	Y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	Concerned with proposed use of bore water instead of water tanks.
102	2	Bruce Rogan	Y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the application. Council should be held account for granting resource consents illegally before the necessary district plan changes were approved.	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?
103	4	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.
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	2	Janne Rowe linked to 1st 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	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	No provision for additional water supply
111	2	Myra Squire	N	N	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.
112	2	Andrew Paul	N	N	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.
115	2	Debra Searchfield	Y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	With possible future droughts the aquifers will not have enough capacity.
120	4	Sherryl 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.

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

160	4	Judith Anne Boonham	Y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	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 effects of drought. No hydrological report has been provided. Rainwater harvesting should be required for water supply and fire.
162		Melanie Jane Gallo	Y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Oppose the proposed water supply as will be inadequate. Minimal detail provided on water supply network and how it will be managed, who will pay?
163	2	Sue Fountain	Y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	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.
164	2	Alan Preston	Y	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.
165	1	Alex and Linley Galbraith	n	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	extended high use. Further information including hydrological assessment required.
166		Mark Watson Rowbotham	Y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	A review of total water available and in comparison to total yield in table 16.8.2.2 and investigation into using some of the treated water from the wastewater plant	review of water quality talked about in AEE 6.7.24 will show suggested water treatment to be insufficient. 6.7.26 water calc don't reflect total achievable yield.
167	2	Tony Baker	y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	further information required that considered effects of climate change on aquifer so effects on existing users can be understood.
168	2	James Bremner	Y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Concerned with the absence of overall design information, and total users not being defined.
169	2	Jedda Kelly	y	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.
171	2	Euan Upston	y	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.
172	2	Kevin Platt	Y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	Concerned about the effect of water extraction on the water table. Concerned about effects on the water supply they currently use for stock.
174	3	Neil Torrie	N	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Feasibility of proposed water supply quantified in greater detail.	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 amount of water. Using aquifer as base water could impact emergency source for community.
176	5	Peter Rothwell	y	y	Oppose	Water Supply	Not stated	Supply of water not adequately addressed, existing aquifer wont cope.
178		Richard Smith	y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Oppose the use of the aquifer, concerned about capacity and effects on existing users.
179		David & Janet Norris	N	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Further information and consultation.	Oppose the provision, no responsibility to harvest water. Concerned about drought implications and cost to residents.
180		Josie Gritten	y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	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 holders and consideration of drought and climate change.
180		Josie Gritten	y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	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 holders and consideration of drought and climate change.

184	7	Rob & Mary Farmer	Y	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	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 amount of water required to be set aside for fire fighting supply.
185	3	Faye & James Shewan	Y	Y	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	Y	Oppose	Water Supply	None stated.	Concerned where the additional water supply will be coming from.
188	2	Cheryl Mitchell	N	Y	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	Y	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.
193	2	Kathy Gordon	n	N	Oppose	Water Supply	Decline the plan change.	Oppose proposed water supply, does not consider it adequate particularly during drought.
194	3	Raewyn Torrie	N	Y	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.
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	y	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.
200	2	Ella Rickit	N	N	Oppose	Water Supply		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 area 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 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.

18	6	Sascha Tschirky	N	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	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 accepted.
22	6	Ken Marment	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	The development was supposed to be sustainable and managed to ensure minimal impact. As proposed, the development would be sub standard development.
25	3	Miguel Hamber	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	Council to stop treating Mangawhai like a cash cow and consider long-term future effects to be a higher priority than short-term gains through increased rates.
33		Charlotte Scott	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	None stated.
37	1	Belinda Tipene	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.
41	1	Clive Currie	Y	N	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.
46	8	John Stephens	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.
48	1	Nicky Crocker	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	Does not think it will be good for Mangawhai community, changes have not been discussed with ratepayers.
52	1	Garrett Hall	Y	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change unless significant amendments are made to address submitters concerns.	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 environment objectives, and Transport Network and Access Strategy (to be enhances with cycling provisions).
54	8	Robin Hale	y	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.
55	1	Gary Cameron	N	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	Opposes the application as the applicant have said that the plan change is similar to original application and it isn't. No timeline provided for development
56	1	Elizabeth Cameron	N	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	Opposes the application as the applicant have said that the plan change is similar to original application and it isn't. No timeline provided for development.
57	1	David Cunningham	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	There is inadequate information on water use age and supply plus 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 residential dwellings. The traffic management plan is inadequate for the environmental increased flow.
58	7	Katie Richards	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	Disappointing that KDC are supporting the changes, they will damage the character and environment, and cost ratepayers.

63	8	Grant McCarthy	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.
64	7	Aaron McConchie	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Whole plan change	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Further technical information required and needs to consider accumulative effects.
67	4	Allanna Pendleton	Y	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change unless applicant pays for own water supply and wastewater disposal.	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.
68	5	Peter Nicholas	Y	Y	Seek Amendment	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	Questions variance in 'up front payments' and what the proposal varies from the Mangawhai Plan.
69	1	Helen Current	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	Opposed the original Estuary Estates proposal and its inclusion in the 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	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.
75	1	Robin Walters	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	None stated.
76	8	Phillip Murray	Y	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
78	6	Ian Fish	Y	Y	seeks amendment	Whole Plan Change	Council rejects application and requires further supporting evidence.	Concerned with dependency on cars, and concerned about timing of plan change when construction has already begun under existing consent.
79	8	Denise Stuart	Y	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.
80	8	Brenda Coleman	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	Plan change removes the developer responsibility to meet the needs of the new community.
81	5	David Beattie	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	More detail is required including who is behind the development.

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.
84	8	Graham & Gloria Drury	Y	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.
86	1	Paul Hendrickx	Y	Y	seeks amendment	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	Supports the current estuary estate plan with zone of permitted activities with application of resource consent to pursue discretionary activities.
92	1	Florian Primbs	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	Get some professional independent planning help and consider the long term effects on the people and environment
93	1	Maylene Lai	Y	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	The merits of the earlier plan deserves careful reconsideration. Queries how increased density and smaller retail can be more viable.
95	1	Ella Grant	N	N	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.
97	1	John Brown	N	N	seek amendment	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	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 development.
98	1	Martina Tschirky	Y	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	extremely disappointed' with the development.
99	1	Paul Wightman	N	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline and undertake proper consultation.	Does not support application, not the development that it was supposed to be. Questions where the spatial plan for Mangawhai is and if this would be aligned.
106	4	Grainne Taylor	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	Lack of strategic approach for Mangawhai need to maintain the identity and take holistic approach. KDC is not representing Mangawhai interests.
108	4	Tim Taylor	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	Lack of strategic approach for Mangawhai need to maintain the identity and take holistic approach. KDC is not representing Mangawhai interests.
109	1	Daniel Taylor	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Do not let them buy the land.	None stated.
110	4	Benjamin Finney	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	Lack of strategic approach for Mangawhai need to maintain the identity and take holistic approach. KDC is not representing Mangawhai interests.
112	8	Andrew Paul	N	N	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.
113	1	Jo Lewin	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	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 housing.

114	1	Prasado Struab	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	None stated.
116	1	John White	Y	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	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 town/ regional/ environmental planning.
117	5	Lukas Kendall	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline 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 life.
122	1	Juliet Pendleton	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	There is no benefit to the existing community simply a money making venture for Viranda and the council not acting in the best interest of the community.
124	1	Arnie & Yvette Leeder	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	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 are issues that have not been addressed.
125	8	Nick Carre	N	N	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.
126	5	Joby Beretta	N	Y	Seek Amendment	Whole Plan Change	Request further information.	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 asks what is proposed instead.
127	8	Georgina Carre	N	N	seeks 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.
130	9	Mike Ferguson	Y	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline plan change and retain the current provisions.	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 all rate payers not just Mangawhai.
131	4	Moira Jackson	Y	Y	seek amendment	Whole Plan Change	That KDC do not enter into an agreement with the developer.	Feels as though the proposed changes are major and the land is in a strategic location with issues relating to infrastructure, and environmental concerns. Further community input is needed.
132	1	Heather Crosbie	N	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	Concerned about the major changes, potential for 1400 residential sites, way too much for our beach town. No provisions for Tank water - Nor bores! No increase in rates.
134	1	Belinda Vernon	Y	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Seek amendment.	development, as outlined at various public meetings in recent years. I acknowledge that Chapter 16 of the District Plan is outdated and not fit for purpose. I SUPPORT its revision. However, I OPPOSE the

138	1	John Dickie	Y	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	Due to its size, the development will result in significant implications which have not been addressed. 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 what is proposed.
144	6	Joel Cayford	Y	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	None stated.	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 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.
152	8	Carla Hood	Y	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 are not prejudiced. The 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 need for KDC to provide oversight.
153	8	Philippa Muller	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 are not prejudiced. The 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 need for KDC to provide oversight.
155	1	Christine Basham	Y	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	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 for public access.
156	1	Clive Boonham	Y	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Supports many aspects of the proposal and understands that the existing Estuary Estate Plan has significant deficiencies however is concerned with the vague and general information provided, particularly in regards to the provision of infrastructure.
156	10	Clive Boonham	Y	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 are not prejudiced. The 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 need 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.
158	10	Alister Kim Hamilton	y	y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	Not in keeping with the District Plan Engineering Standards.
160	1	Judith Anne Boonham	Y	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change and require it to be re-submitted with additional information.	Supports many aspects of the proposal and understands that the existing Estuary Estate Plan has significant deficiencies however is concerned with the vague and general information provided, particularly in regards to the provision of infrastructure.

160	10	Judith Anne Boonham	Y	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. 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	Y	Oppose	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	Y	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.
166		Mark Watson Rowbotham	Y	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Relief is sought to give effect to this submission.	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.
167	8	Tony Baker	y	Y	Oppose	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
169	8	Jedda Kelly	y	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.
171	8	Euan Upston	y	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.
174	1	Neil Torrie	N	Y	Oppose	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	Y	Oppose	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.
177	1	Graham Bayes	Y	y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Request further information.	Need to understand what the completed development will look like - need layout, plans, elevations and perspectives. Requests review of reports.

179		David & Janet Norris	N	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Further information and consultation.	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.
181	1	Alister Hamilton	Y	y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	not in keeping with the District plan , policies, policy statements, strategies, Regional Plans, Structure Plans or Engineering Standards of the District Plan.
181	1	Alister Hamilton	Y	y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	not in keeping with the District plan , policies, policy statements, strategies, Regional Plans, Structure Plans or Engineering Standards of the District Plan.
182		Mangawhai Central Limited	Y	y	Support	Whole Plan Change	Plan change be approved subject to consequential amendments outlined in submission.	Submitter seeks a number of consequential amendments to various chapters.
183		Trewby & Rosemary Bull	N	Y	seek amendment	Whole Plan Change	Due consideration to these matters.	encouraging to see and hear the proposals which have been announced for the development of this area.
194	1	Raewyn Torrie	N	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	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.
195	1	David Ainley	Y	Y	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	To maintain the status quo as it currently stand.
196	2	David Macpherson	y	Y	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	y	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	N	Oppose	Whole Plan Change	Decline the plan change.	Business can't cope with the mass influx of people.
207	1	Donna Flavell	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, le, 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, le, schools, libraries, medical etc.