

Joint statement submitted and presented on behalf of Debbie Bolton and Nicola Campbell, Submitters No. 10 and 47, and myself and Bevan Pulham, Submitters No. 3.

As residents bordering the paper road and/or living in close proximity to the Church owned land in/around the Urlich Drive/Moir Street area, our statements are mostly related to the proposed residential rezoning of land owned by the Mangawhai Church Trust, and also the potential use of the paper road running along the ridgeline as a southern connection point from the MH development to Urlich Drive and Moir Street.

With reference to Jonathan Clease' point 251 – Reverse Sensitivity; with public amenities planned and in progress on the Causeway Church land, we strongly encourage any residential re-zoning on this land to be consistent with the MH proposal in that details for separation, privacy and green space are ensured and the overall lay of the land integrates socially and environmentally with both the new public amenities and the proposed MH development.

Should the Plan Change 84 rezoning request be adopted in its entirety, we ask that the environmental values of greenspace (as allowed for in the MH zoning) be included in the rezoning rules of the church land and paper road. We ask for consideration that the already established indigenous corridor that is on and below the short and disconnected paper road that runs along the eastern edge of the church land to be zoned as Native reserve along with the small wedge of land below it to be zoned as greenspace. This area can be accessed by residents on the subdivision behind and is visible from the village below.

In relation to the Transport section of the Plan Change 84 application, our original submission raised concerns that establishing a primary road on the land to the South-east of the Mangawhai Hills boundary will lead to a vast increase in traffic and have an adverse impact on existing ecology and natural features of the surrounding landscape.

We seek assurance that any changes to the Paper Road, now or in the future, are controlled by notifiable resource consents and not discretionary, and necessary consultation processes and environmental assessments are carried out.

As residents with rear boundaries adjoining the paper road, our concerns are around the safety and security of our homes - given the close proximity to the proposed Primary Road; concerns around excess vibration, noise and light disturbance associated with a primary road which will inevitably become a busy through road from Cove Road West to Urlich Drive/Moir Street; concerns around the loss of a visual green corridor along the ridgeline which provides a safe corridor for birdlife and a peaceful backdrop for the neighbourhood; and importantly, major concerns around stormwater runoff and drainage on both sides of the ridgeline – posing an increased flooding risk for any houses and land directly beneath the ridge and also the lower Moir Street area in general, which has already proven to have flooding issues during periods of prolonged heavy rain and storm surges.

In terms of the necessity of a southern roading connection for the MH development to proceed, we reference point 33 (under Roothing) in the Applicants Opening Statement, and acknowledge the shared view of the Applicant and KDC's expert consultants that the formation of a southern roading connection should not be made mandatory as part of the development of the first stage of the site.

(Point 33, Page 10 – Applicants Legal Submission; included for reference only)

33. There is agreement between Council and MHL's expert consultants that formation of a southern roading connection should not be made mandatory as part of development of the first stage of the Site.

It's clear from the evidence submitted by the expert consultants that a southern boundary connection is not necessary for the initial stages of the development to proceed, and in our view, perhaps it might not be needed for many years to come.

We feel the formation of a southern connection point at such an early stage of the development would aim to serve the interests of one – or very few parties, whilst having the potential to adversely affect many other surrounding land owners unnecessarily.

In relation to point 34, as to whether an alternative southern roading connection should be illustrated on the Structure Plan at the outset, as sought by Berggren Trustees and thought to be beneficial by the Council's 42A team, we are somewhat ambivalent about this. The Structure Plan has been incorrect from the outset as the southern connection road is shown to be running through privately owned Church land, the use of which the owners have not agreed to. The Structure Plan also lacks detail and is somewhat ambiguous as to the actual final plan, which has led to uncertainty for anyone who may be directly affected by parts of the development.

Whilst we agree it might be helpful to proceed with more clarity as to a preferred southern roading connection on the Structure Plan, as long as any future preferred connection options are subject to full traffic, geo and environmental assessments and the usual resource consent and community consultation processes are adhered to, as indicated by MHL would be the case, then illustrating an alternative connection on the SP at the outset might not be unnecessary.

We seek assurance in this regard that any future proposed connection options for key transportation and multimodal outcomes are transparent and are subject to the usual resource consents and community consultation processes. Approvals for future connections should not be covered or automatically approved on a discretionary basis under the initial residential rezoning approval.

In terms of alternative roading options being considered, we note that to date there doesn't appear to have been any formal inspection or assessment of the paper road between our property and the church owned land to assess the true impact and feasibility of utilising the Paper Road as a potential southern connection point from MH to Ulrich Drive.

Whilst the paper road may appear on "paper" to be an easy option, as is the case with many historical Paper Roads throughout New Zealand, this road was drafted on the town plan decades ago without consideration of the topography of the land or the use of modern surveying equipment. As it stands today, any excavation along the clay-based ridgeline and development of large expanses of impermeable surfaces will require extensive engineered stormwater and drainage plans and careful consideration as to where the diverted run off should go; not to mention well considered and responsible design measures for roading and pathways to ensure the safety and security of the surrounding houses.

As individual home owners, not large-stake land owners or developers, we can't help but be concerned that any potential changes to the paper road and surrounding areas will have detrimental effects on the enjoyment and value of our properties, and we are keen to ensure any future developments are well considered and respectful of the existing properties.

Given that a southern roading connection is not required for the initial stages of the development to proceed, our preference would be for planning and development of future roading and/or green connection options, to be considered and implemented on a staged basis, in line with the completion of various stages of the MH development.

Real time modelling and assessments can be carried out at relevant intervals to determine how the initial connections are working, highlight pressure points and provide clear indicators as to where enhanced connectivity options (including multi modal options) are required and/or sought by residents and the wider community.

FINAL SUMMARY

Whilst we've focused our submissions largely on aspects of zoning and transport, key areas which have the potential to directly impact our homes, as residents of Mangawhai, it would be remiss of us not to question whether our rapidly expanding town can handle another large scale development at this time, particularly given the ongoing recovery period and escalated rates the community faces for the foreseeable future.

From own point of view, having lived in Mangawhai for the past 10 years and raising a young family during this time, we know first-hand there are clear pressure points on roading, schooling, ready access to medical care and emergency services and a strain on future wastewater connectivity and management, to name a few.

Clearly we do not have the knowledge, skills or experience to assess the wider implications of the PC84 rezoning request, or similar future large scale development requests. We've done our best to follow and participate in the PC84 process but on the whole, the process has been confusing, complicated and far from easy to comprehend.

However we are local residents; we are rate payers and we do experience - at grass roots level every day, the direct effects of a rapidly increasing population without the supporting infrastructure and amenities to match.

As a community all we can do is rely on the "powers that be" ie Kaipara District Council and Commission hearings such as this, to ensure the continued growth of our town is handled carefully and responsibly - so that we can all continue to live in the area and enjoy everything the town has to offer.

According to the Mangawhai Spatial Plan, which was released by Council in December 2020 and described as a blueprint for how Mangawhai could grow over the coming years, the plan was designed to "allow the Council to be master, not servant, of growth, allowing options for development, while also placing boundaries around what is sustainable and what is not. Growing like topsy is not a phrase to be applied to Mangawhai."

Whilst deemed in Mr Cleese's report to be a useful tool but not binding in terms of the future growth of Mangawhai, , perhaps the above statement from the MSP at least serves to provide a timely reminder of the purpose of this hearing.

As a community, we are relying on you as the appointed Commissioners to process every detail of the Mangawhai Hills Plan Change 84 request and ensure the best outcomes for Mangawhai as a whole are reached, not just the interests of those with larger stakes in/around the Mangawhai Hills development area.

Thank you for your time and consideration.