

## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
A. Skerten	1	1.1	PPC84	PPC84 in its entirety	Support	Retain PPC84 in its entirety as notified.	Submitter views the proposed development is well thought out and maintains a self-sufficient direction. Considering other developments have greater needs for water and sewerage.	N	N
A. van Niekerk	2	2.1	Zoning	Proposed Zoning Plan	Support in part	Seeks for council to either reject rezoning from Rural to Residential or amend the rezoning to Rural-Residential zone 1.	Submitter is concerned that that the proposed development does not align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan. and that this aspect has not been sufficiently addressed in the s32 (evaluation of options) report.	N	Y
A. van Niekerk	2	2.2	Zoning	Mangawhai Hills Development Area	Support	Retain non-residential aspects of the development proposed.	Submitter supports the creation of a Mangawhai Development area with core provisions which seek to protect ecological features, promote high quality urban design as well as provide open space and connectivity.		
A. van Niekerk	2	2.3	Transport	Transport Assessment – Proposed site access (South), directly opposite the entrance to the Moana Views development at 161 Tara Road	Oppose	Submitter opposed any site access directly opposite the entrance to Moana Views at 161 Tara Road. Submitter seeks for council to reject this part of the proposal.	Submitter views that should council accept the proposal, the position of the entrance/exit will become a four way traffic intersection or roundabout which will require careful consideration.  Submitter views that the traffic assessment does not give an accurate representation given only “normal” house numbers have been taken into account.  Submitter notes that the traffic assessment has not considered additional traffic volumes from construction related vehicles during the ten year development period proposed.		
A. van Niekerk	2	2.4	Urban Design – colour pallet	Urban Design Statement	Support	Submitter seeks for provisions to be included which direct the colour pallet of residential housing.	Submitter views the design is to reflect muted tones and colours to respect the congruence of the surrounding area.		
A. van Niekerk	2	2.5	Urban Design – Lighting	Urban Design Statement	Support	Council to request a low impact lighting assessment of the residential housing development proposed.	Submitter views that the unpolluted night sky should be protected. Any external lighting required within the boundaries of the proposed development should respect this ‘public asset’ of the neighbourhood.		
B and S. Pulham	3	3.1	Transport	Landscape Assessment – Structure Plan	Oppose	Submitter opposes rezoning of land to Residential Zone. Does not specify requested relief.	Submitter views transport information is not clear enough with specific reference to the roads proposed as part of the development. Submitter is concerned that the proposed roading network will lead to a vast increase in traffic that will create adverse effects on the natural environment, landscape and conditions around all of the properties in the area.		
B and S. Pulham	3	3.2	Transport	Mangawhai Hills Development Area	Oppose	Submitter opposes the proposed Mangawhai Development Area as shown on the 5.1 Structure Plan in particular the proposed indicative Access and Movement Network..	Submitter is concerned that the proposed road on the land to the South-east of PPC84 (Mangawhai Hills Ltd) boundary will lead to a vast increase in traffic and have adverse impact on existing ecology and natural features of the surrounding landscape.  Submitter does not feel that the development of primary road behind the church owned land connecting to Wilson Street (now Urlich Drive) is in keeping with the natural features of the surrounding landscape.		

## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
B. and S. Pulham	3	3.3	Transport	Plan provisions – “necessary consequential amendments to the Kaipara District Plan Maps”	Oppose	Submitter opposed the proposal that “any necessary consequential amendments to the KDC Plan Maps” is permitted as part of PC84.	Submitter views that property owners need to be consulted with and should have the opportunity to support or oppose all proposed amendments to the KDC Plan Map that might impact their property or others in the surrounding neighbourhood.		
Berggren Trustee Co Ltd <b>(withdrawn 27 May 2024)</b>	4	4.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Oppose	Delete PPC84 in its entirety, unless changes to the proposed provisions are made as outlined below.	The submitter views the proposed plan change requires amendment to be more directive and to provide greater clarity.	Y	Y
	4	4.2	Freshwater	DEV1 – P5	Oppose in part	Submitter seeks for DEV1 – P5 to be amended as it has no specific rules to secure the stated outcomes.	Submitter views that amending DEV1 – P5 will assist in aligning more clearly with the NPS – Freshwater Management.		
	4	4.3	Transport	Objectives, policies and rules	Oppose in part	Submitter seeks for the inclusion of provisions which set out a clear trigger for when the Primary Road needs to be connected between Cove Road and Moir Street.	Submitter views that the requested relief will provide certainty and clarity to the proposed roading connections as shown on the Structure Plan.		
	4	4.4	Density	DEV1 – R2	Oppose in part	Amend rule DEV1 – R2 which directs whether two residential units are enabled for a site of 1000m <sup>2</sup>	The submitter notes that rules DEV1 – R2a and DEV1 – R2b are not sufficiently clear whether the intention of the rule is enable two dwellings on a site with a density of 1000m <sup>2</sup> or whether the intent is to allow one residential unit per 1000m <sup>2</sup> . Submitter has suggested potential removal of Rule b. if the density outcome is to be one dwelling per 1000m <sup>2</sup> net site area or restricted discretionary status if the intention is to allow two comprehensively designed dwellings per site.		
	4	4.5	Subdivision	DEV1 – R19	Oppose in part	Amend rule DEV1 – R19 as follows  1. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Proposed allotments have a minimum net site area <b>(excluding access legs)</b> of 1,000m <sup>2</sup> , except where the proposed allotment is an access allotment, utility allotment or road to vest in Council.  (...)	The submitter notes that the rule states a minimum net site area of 1000m <sup>2</sup> and notes that the net site area is typically exclusive of the access legs. The submitter views that the wording in brackets is not necessary if the definition of net site area aligns with excluding access legs.		
	4	4.6	Community Facilities	DEV1 – P7 DEV1 – R5	Oppose in part	No specific decision requested.	The submitter views that the Description of the Development Area and DEV1 – P7 do not align given the Description of the Development Area seeks to enable community facilities, whereas DEV1 – R5 only permits community facilities up to 250m <sup>2</sup> and 1000m <sup>2</sup> total within the Mangawhai Hills Development Area before the activity status is elevated to a discretionary activity.		
4	4.7	Site Coverage	DEV1 – S1	Oppose in part	Amend DEV1 – S1 to increase permitted site coverage.	Submitter views that the proposed site coverage of 30% is too small given most dwellings and accessory buildings for a site will exceed 300m <sup>2</sup> . The submitter is			

## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
Berggren Trustee Co Ltd (withdrawn 27 May 2024)							concerned that most builds will require resource consent as a restricted-discretionary activity.		
	4	4.8	Development Standards	DEV1—S4	Oppose in part	Submitter seeks for the standards to be reviewed in the context of the zone description, objectives and policies, DEV1—S4 with specific reference to large lot residential density and pattern of development including site coverage, setbacks, and building orientation.	Submitter considers that the practicality of the current site coverage rule does not correspond with typical builds on large lot sites.  Submitter notes that under DEV1—S4. 1.a, b and d there are no internal boundary setbacks and is concerned with the spaciousness between buildings. The submitter also notes that some of the standards and objectives appear to be in conflict.		
	4	4.9	Transport	Roading Assessment	Oppose in part	Submitter seeks for Development Area provisions to be included to secure required road upgrades recommended in the Transportation Assessment.	Submitter seeks the requested relief to provide further certainty and clarity as to the proposed roading network.		
	4	4.10	Landscape and Urban Design	Development Area Objectives, Policies and Rules	Oppose in part	Submitter seeks for cultural elements of landscape values to be included in the Development Area Provisions.	Submitter seeks the requested relief to secure the outcomes of the landscape and urban design assessments.  The submitter references examples of these in their submission including paragraph 4.17 of the Development Area provisions to promote organic development of built form within the landscape and 5.5 of the Urban Design Report regarding site interfaces.		
	4	4.11	Ecology	Ecological Assessment	Oppose in part	Submitter seeks for any provisions relating to terrestrial vegetation, wetland and other freshwater resources need to acknowledge that what is shown on the Structure Plan is indicative only and not ground-truthed.  Submitter seeks for a more detailed assessment prior to the development at the submitters site with related objectives, policies or rules recognising this	Submitter notes their own property is included in the Ecological Assessment but has not been ground truthed and therefore the exact locations of wetlands and streams shown in the assessment are not confirmed.		
	4	4.12	Infrastructure	Development Area Objectives, Policies and Rules	Oppose in part	Submitter seeks for the provisions of the Development Area to clearly provide for the infrastructure servicing options.	The submitter views there is no certainty to the approach to infrastructure servicing and that the proposed development requires a planning and coordinated approach to infrastructure servicing.		
	4	4.13	Higher order planning documents	PPC84 in whole.	Oppose	Refuse PPC84 or make changes to the proposal to address the matters raised in this submission.	Submitter views the effects of PPC84 create uncertainty on the environment and view that the proposed plan change provisions do not adequately manage the plan change provisions.  The submitter views the proposed development does not align with higher order planning documents such as the NPS—UD, with respect to the integration of infrastructure, urban development, and strategic planning over the medium and long term.  Submitter also views PPC84 is not consistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement.		

## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
C. and R. Owen	5	5.1	Zoning	Proposed zoning plan	Support in part	Submitter seeks council either reject the proposed zone change, OR request that the area under PPC84 be zoned as Rural-Residential Zone 1.	Submitter is concerned that that the proposed development does not align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan and considers that this has not been sufficiently addressed in the s32 report.	Y	Y
C. and R. Owen	5	5.2	Zoning	Mangawhai Development Area	Support in part	Retain non-residential aspects of PPC84 as notified.	Submitter supports the creation of a Mangawhai Development area with core provisions which seek to protect ecological features, promote high quality urban design as well as provide open space and connectivity.		
C. and R. Owen	5	5.3	Ecological	New Provision	Support	Submitter seeks for a new comprehensive pest plan to be implemented for both pest animals and pest plants. The pest plan should consider species protection and should seek to enhance existing protection and promote responsible pet ownership awareness.	Submitter would like to see taonga, such as kiwi and the Australian Bittern which have been documented in the PPC84 area and the impacts of domestic pets in an urban subdivision, taken into consideration.		
C. and R. Owen	5	5.4	Transport	Transport Assessment – Proposed site access (South), directly opposite the entrance to the Moana Views development at 161 Tara Road	Oppose	Submitter opposed any site access directly opposite the entrance to Moana Views at 161 Tara Road. Submitter seeks for council to reject this part of the proposal.	Submitter views that should council accept the proposal, the position of the entrance/exit will become a four way traffic intersection or roundabout which will require careful consideration. Submitter views that the traffic assessment does not give an accurate representation given only “normal” house numbers have been taken into account. Further, submitter notes that the traffic assessment has not considered additional traffic volumes from construction related vehicles during the ten year development period proposed. The submitter is also concerned that the current state of Tara Road is not adequate for servicing the traffic and the proposed development may result in a further increase on traffic demand for Tara Road especially at Tara Moir corner.		
C. and R. Owen	5	5.5	Urban Design – colour pallet	Urban Design Statement	Support in part	Submitter seeks for provisions to be included which direct the colour pallet of residential housing.	Submitter views the design is to reflect muted tones and colours to respect the congruence of the surrounding area.		
C. and R. Owen	5	5.6	Urban Design – Lighting	Urban Design Statement	Support in part	Council to request a low impact lighting assessment of the residential housing development proposed.	Submitter views that the unpolluted night sky should be protected. Any external lighting required within the boundaries of the proposed development should respect the ‘public asset’ of the neighbourhood.		
C. and R. Owen	5	5.7	Existing use rights	New provisions	Support in part	Submitter seeks for council to recognise existing use rights for independent property owners.	Submitter is concerned that property owners who independently own their land will be adversely affected from the proposed zone change. Submitter is concerned that under the rural zone, certain activities are permitted but under residential the activities become restricted discretionary/discretionary and would like greater certainty that they can continue with current activities such as livestock keeping and other rural related activities that are currently permitted.		
C. and R. Owen	5	5.8	Stormwater	New Provisions	Support in part	Submitter seeks for greater holding capacity on site.	Submitter views that flooding from recent rainfall events signals to a lack of stormwater infrastructure capable of handling stormwater overflow.		

## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
C. and R. Owen	5	5.9	Stormwater	New provisions	Support in part	Submitter seeks for impermeable service limits to be reduced.	Submitter notes there have been numerous rainfall events in 2023 and is concerned that roading and hard platforms will create greater downstream effects		
C. and R. Owen	5	5.10	Stormwater	New provision	Support in part	Submitter seeks for council to investigate and implement future proofing the stability and stormwater on Tara Road for any proposed development.	Submitter views that future proofing stormwater infrastructure along Tara Road and stream network is required.  Submitter is concerned that recent rain events demonstrate that current stormwater infrastructure is not sufficient, noting that Tara Road has flooded numerous times and scoured adding sediment to the estuary.		
C. Boonham	6	6.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC84 in its entirety.	<p><b>Uncertainty over legislative framework</b> The submitter references incoming legislation including the NBEA and SPA and three waters legislation, to which the outcomes are unknown. The submitter is concerned that the granting PPC84 would be premature given the unknown outcome of the legislation.</p> <p><b>Lack of development strategy</b> The submitter is concerned that PPC84 has lacks an overall development strategy. The submitter views there is uncertainty over the wastewater scheme, and whether the Kaipara District Council will be extending the catchment area to cover the PPC84 area.</p> <p><b>Mangawhai Central</b> The submitter is concerned PPC84 has not sufficiently considered how infrastructure will be upgraded. The submitter references Mangawhai Central in which they view went ahead prematurely given that wastewater capacity was not met prior to development, and the submitter is concerned PPC84 will have the same issue.</p> <p><b>Financial Burden of Developments</b> The submitter is concerned that the cost of development in respect to infrastructure connections and potential upgrades will fall to the ratepayers.</p> <p><b>Public Services, Amenities and Sustainability</b> The submitter is concerned that the plan change is reliant on outdated documents and views that the PPC84 process is ad hoc. The submitter notes that in future the community would ideally have more of a say in how the development should proceed and that this would be better served through a fundamental change the operative DP allowing the community to have a say on the broader significance of future development, planned infrastructure and the effects on the amenities of the township.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Effect of Development</b> The submitter is concerned with the number of proposed ad hoc developments which will result in thousands of new residential dwellings. The submitter is concerned the vast increase in residents will lead to further stain and could overwhelm infrastructure and amenities.</p>	Y	-

## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
							<u>Other considerations</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stormwater and flooding</li> <li>• Pollution of the streams and estuary</li> <li>• Water supply</li> <li>• Wastewater Infrastructure</li> <li>• Earthworks</li> <li>• Roothing</li> <li>• Urban Character and density</li> </ul>		
C. Marshall	7	7.1	Zoning	Proposed zone change	Support in part	Submitter seeks for the current paper road above/adjacent to Kahu Drive and Daphne Place that is included in the zone change to be retained as green space.	<p>Submitter views that the proposed plan change is as self-sufficient as possible which will assist in the growth of Mangawhai.</p> <p>The submitter seeks the requested relief given there is an abundance of native planting in the area which a lot of birds use as nesting, as well as a flight connection path to the estuary and other habitats. This strip of land is also well utilised for exercise and dog walking.</p>	N	Y
C. Webster	8	8.1	Zoning	Proposed zoning plan	Oppose	Submitter seeks to amend but does not specify requested relief.	The submitter is concerned that the proposed area to be rezoned as residential will have adverse effect on native planting and native bird life. The submitter notes that the area is also used as walking tracks for the local community.	N	Y
D. Bell	9	9.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in its entirety	Oppose	Delete PPC84 in its entirety OR delay the proposal until it is required when the spatial plan is fulfilled.	<p>The submitter considers the land productive rural land and to develop it goes against the direction of the Mangawhai Spatial Plan 2020.</p> <p>The submitter references the Mangawhai Spatial Plan and is concerned that if the plan change goes ahead, the development will appear commercialised and will take away from the beauty of Mangawhai. Submitter views that if the development is to go ahead, staying with the initial spatial plan will be more appealing for the township.</p>	N	N
D. Bolton	10	10.1	Zoning	Proposed zoning plan	Oppose	Submitter seeks for the land owned by the Causeway Church to remain zoned as rural until landowner provides a detailed plan for consideration. Any development on their site should be separated from the existing developments.	The submitter is concerned that land owned by the Causeway Church have not provided detail of proposed land use or subdivision and is concerned that this may result in adverse development through the construction of a large format building with associated traffic and noise pollution. Details on stormwater and wastewater connections are also sought to understand the potential impact on existing properties through easements etc.	Y	Y
D. Bolton	10	10.2	Zoning	Paper road	Oppose	Retain the paper road as greenspace in its entirety. Retain existing planting and create a densely vegetated between the proposed development and the top of the existing Vista Verano Subdivision.	Submitter seeks the requested relief to create a visual and sound buffer between the new development and existing residential developments.		
D. Bolton	10	10.3	PPC84	PPC84 in while	Oppose	No specific relief sought.	Additional questions raised around:	Y	Y

## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
							<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Potential conflicts of interest between the Church site and MHL and KDC and whether any persons are involved or have a relationship in more than one of these entities?</li> <li>2. The staging of the Causeway Church Road Consent.</li> </ol>		
D. Parker	11	11.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Oppose	The submitter seeks for PPC84 to be declined unless the requested changes are made.	<p>Submitter opposes the rezoning of the PPC84 area for a number of reasons which are outlined in their submission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter views PPC84 does achieve purpose and principles of the RMA as they view the proposed development does not promote the sustainable management of resources;</li> <li>• The submitter views PPC84 is not consistent with Part 2 of the RMA, as well as the NPS- UD and Northland Regional Policy Statement;</li> <li>• Submitter views PPC84 will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations;</li> <li>• PPC84 will not enable social, economic, and cultural wellbeing;</li> <li>• Submitter views the PPC84 is not the best way to achieve the objectives of the Kaipara District Plan.</li> <li>• The submitter is concerned the Mangawhai Development Area undermines provisions of the Kaipara District Plan</li> <li>• Submitter views PPC84 has not been sufficiently assessed against the NPS – HPL.</li> <li>• Submitter views that PPC84 undermines the provisions of the draft Kaipara District Plan.</li> <li>• Submitter view that PPC84 is not consistent with the traditional ‘beach’ settlement character within Mangawhai which is preserved in the structure plan.</li> </ul>	Y	Y
D. Parker	11	11.2	Roading	Zoning	Oppose	Submitter seeks for residential expansion to be focused to the southeast of the district.	Submitter considers the requested amendment would place additional traffic pressure on Cove Road, should the proposed development occur.		
D. Parker	11	11.3	Wastewater	New provision	Oppose in part	Submitter seeks for wastewater infrastructure upgrades to occur prior to enabling PPC84.	The submitter notes that current wastewater infrastructure is at capacity and notes that the current infrastructure will not be able to support PPC84 and views the requested relief would assist in ensuring wastewater infrastructure is sufficient.		
D. Parker	11	11.4	Stormwater	New provision	Oppose in part	Submitter seeks for a comprehensive assessment to be undertaken which seeks to determine the hydrology of the stormwater catchment. The submitter also seeks for a more comprehensive flood hazard risk assessment be undertaken.	The submitter notes flooding issues in Mangawhai and is concerned that the Flood Risk Assessment and Stormwater Management Plan does not take into account the most recent advice provided by MBIE with regard to climate change adjusted sea level predictions. The submitter views the requested relief would assist in providing the most up to date advice.		
D. Parker	11	11.5	Reserves and recreational spaces	New provision	Oppose in part	Submitter considers that an agreement between developer and council on facilities such as neighbourhood reserves is required.	<p>The submitter is concerned that it is unclear how PPC84 will be supported by reserves and recreational space, noting that the proposed areas provided are viewed to be too small.</p> <p>Submitter considers the requested relief will assist in supporting a collaborative approach to PPC84.</p>		

## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
D. Parker	11	11.6	Density	Mangawhai Development Area	Oppose in part	The submitter seeks for density to be consistent with the draft DP zoning which is a mix of GRZ and MDRZ.	<p>The submitter considers that the KDC Plan and Draft KDC Plan will not appropriately mitigate the landscape and rural character effects.</p> <p>GRZ promotes a minimum density of one unit per site or two units per site for 40-80ha area or three units per site where over 80ha. MDRZ promotes a density of 400m<sup>2</sup> net site area and up to three units as a permitted activity.</p> <p>The submitter consider that keeping the GRZ and MDRZ zone provisions are a more suitable solution for PPC84 than the minimum net site area of 1000m<sup>2</sup> per unit proposed.</p> <p>The submitter is also concerned that property owners will try to reduce the proposed 1000m<sup>2</sup> allotment size down further through resource consents and further increasing pressure on the ability to maintain appropriate amenity and the rural character values of the area.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned that additional density created is not consistent with the traditional 'beach' settlement character identified within the Mangawhai Structure Plan.</p>		
E. Jenner	12	12.1	Zoning	Proposed zoning plan	Support in part	Submitter seeks for the existing 20 metre paper road width be retained as reserve and planted accordingly.	Submitter is concerned that the removal of the paper road will allow buildings to be built right to their property boundary and is concerned with the potential loss of sunlight and privacy.	N	Y
F. Lienert	13	13.1	Reserve	Proposed zoning plan	Oppose	Consider retaining the paper road and putting in a reserve.	Submitter wishes to maintain green spaces and preserve greenery for the future	N	Y
F. Lienert	13	13.2	Infrastructure	New provision	Oppose	Submitter seeks for council to consider infrastructure and roading.	Submitter is concerned the proposed development will increase pressure on current infrastructure, with particular regard to roading around SH1.		
G. Arnerich	14	14.1	Stormwater	PPC84 in whole	Oppose	Delete PPC84 in its entirety.	Submitter is concerned that infrastructure, with regard to stormwater, will not be able to cope with the increase in residential development, should the plan change go ahead. The submitter notes previous flood events along Lower Tara Road and Cove Road. The submitter is also concerned that water runoff will lead an increase in silt being deposited into the Mangawhai Estuary.	N	Y
G. Arnerich	14	14.2	Roading	PPC84 in whole	Oppose	Delete PPC84 in its entirety.	Submitter is concerned that current roading infrastructure cannot cope with the increase in residential development, regarding lower Tara Road, Cove Road and Moir Road. The submitter has concerns for traffic safety given the aforementioned roads are narrow and do not have shoulders either side of the road. The submitter also notes there is no footpath along Cove Road, and only a partially finished footpath on lower Tara Road.		
G. Hosking	15	15.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Support	Retain PPC84 in its entirety as notified.	Submitter views the proposed plan change provides for recreation opportunities for Mangawhai Community.	Y	Y
G. Mitchell	16	16.1	Zoning	Proposed Zoning Plan	Support in part	Seeks for council to either reject rezoning from Rural to Residential or amend the rezoning to Rural Residential Zone 1.	Submitter is concerned that that the proposed development does not align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan, which has not been sufficiently addressed in the s32 report.	-	Y



## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
G. Mitchell	16	16.2	Zoning	Mangawhai Hills Development Area	Support	Retain non-residential aspects of the development proposed.	Submitter supports the creation of a Mangawhai Development area with core provisions which seek to protect ecological features, promote high quality urban design as well as provide open space and connectivity.		
G. Mitchell	16	16.3	Transport	Transport Assessment – Proposed site access (South), directly opposite the entrance to the Moana Views development at 161 Tara Road	Oppose	Submitter opposes any site access directly opposite the entrance to Moana Views at 161 Tara Road. Submitter seeks for council to reject this part of the proposal.	Submitter views that should council accept the proposal, the position of the entrance/exit will become a four way traffic intersection or roundabout which will require careful consideration. Submitter views that the traffic assessment does not give an accurate representation given only “normal” house numbers have been taken into account. Submitter notes that the traffic assessment has not considered additional traffic volumes from construction related vehicles during the ten year development period proposed.		
G. Mitchell	16	16.4	Urban Design – colour pallet	Urban Design Statement	Support	Submitter seeks for provisions to be included which direct the colour pallet of residential housing.	Submitter views the design is to reflect muted tones and colours to respect the congruence of the surrounding area.		
G. van Dalsum	17	17.1	Zoning	Mangawhai Hills Development Area	Support	Retain PPC84 in its entirety as notified.	Submitter views the proposed plan change support the growth and development in the Mangawhai Area and as well as addressing the need for increased housing and suitable roading infrastructure to allow for better traffic flows.	N	Y
G. Van Niekerk	18	18.1	Zoning	Proposed Zoning Plan	Support in part	Seeks for council to either reject rezoning from Rural to Residential or amend the rezoning to Rural Residential Zone 1.	Submitter is concerned that that the proposed development does not align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan, which has not been sufficiently addressed in the s32 report.	Y	Y
G. Van Niekerk	18	18.2	Zoning	Mangawhai Hills Development Area	Support	Retain non-residential aspects of the development proposed.	Submitter supports the creation of a Mangawhai Development area with core provisions which seek to protect ecological features, promote high quality urban design as well as provide open space and connectivity.		
G. Van Niekerk	18	18.3	Transport	Transport Assessment – Proposed site access (South), directly opposite the entrance to the Moana Views development at 161 Tara Road	Oppose	Submitter opposed any site access directly opposite the entrance to Moana Views at 161 Tara Road. Submitter seeks for council to reject this part of the proposal.	Submitter views that should council accept the proposal, the position of the entrance/exit will become a four way traffic intersection or roundabout which will require careful consideration. Submitter views that the traffic assessment does not give an accurate representation given only “normal” house numbers have been taken into account. Further, submitter notes that the traffic assessment has not considered additional traffic volumes from construction related vehicles during the ten year development period proposed.		
G. Van Niekerk	18	18.4	Urban Design – colour pallet	Urban Design Statement	Support	Submitter seeks for provisions to be included which direct the colour pallet of residential housing.	Submitter views the design is to reflect muted tones and colours to respect the congruence of the surrounding area		

## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
G. Van Niekerk	18	18.5	Urban Design – Lighting	Urban Design Statement	Support	Council to request a low impact lighting assessment of the residential housing development proposed.	Submitter views that the unpolluted night sky should be protected. Any external lighting required within the boundaries of the proposed development should respect the 'public asset' of the neighbourhood.		
G. Wilson	19	19.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Support	Retain PPC84 in its entirety as notified.	Submitter notes the café they own which could benefit from the proposed plan change through the well planned growth of Mangawhai.	N	N
Horizon Surveying	20	20.1	Zoning	Proposed zoning plan	Support	Retain proposed rezoning of PPC84 land from rural to residential as notified.	Submitter views that rezoning land will assist in minimising ad hoc expansion of residential activity and restrict growth in inappropriate locations. Submitter views PPC84 promotes good urban design and protects	Y	Y
Horizon Surveying	20	20.2	Zoning	Structure Plan	Support	Retain the and Structure Plan as notified.	Submitter views the structure plan supports future residential development, which is consistent with the Spatial Plan, and provides for the integrated management of future development.		
Horizon Surveying	20	20.3	Zoning	Mangawhai Hills Development Area	Support	Retain the proposed zone change and Structure Plan as notified.	Submitter views that the proposed plan change achieves sustainable management in accordance with principles outlined in Part 2 of the RMA as demonstrated by specialist assessments in relation to relation to engineering matters, transport, ecology, landscape and urban design, and cultural issues.		
Horizon Surveying	20	20.4	Infrastructure	New provision	Support in part	Submitter seeks for caveats to be utilised, with the added requirement of a Master Plan Strategy to extend the Mangawhai Community Wastewater System and to establish a Mangawhai Wastewater Treatment Plant Advisory Group.	The submitter is concerned with infrastructure provisions being able to support the wider community.		
J. Archer	21	21.1	Zoning	Proposed zone change	Oppose	Delete PPC84 in its entirety and retain rural-residential zoning.	Submitter opposes the proposed zone change for the following reasoning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Negatively affects surrounding rural landscape</li> <li>Existing roading network cannot cope with the increase in demand from the proposed development</li> <li>Concerns with flooding, noting floods in February 2023</li> <li>Concerns with landslips on Tara Road</li> </ul>	N	N
J. Bloggs	22	22.1	Zoning	-	Oppose	Amend – does not specify	Does not specify.	N	N
J. Mentzer	23	23.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Support	Retain PPC84 in its entirety as notified.	Submitter is in support of the plan change however notes they do not want to see an increase in traffic along Old Waipu Road.	Y	Y
J. Sax	24	24.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Oppose	Delete PPC84 in its entirety.	Submitter views there is a lack of infrastructure to support the proposed development.	N	N
J. Walters	25	25.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Support	Retain PPC84 in its entirety as notified.	Submitter is in support of the proposal given Mangawhai is growing. The submitter views that the proposal offers the best opportunity and location for such growth.	N	Y
J. Warden	26	26.1	Ecology	Ecological Impact Assessment	Support in part	Submitter seeks for further clarification as to locations of confirmed wetland areas within the PPC84 area.	Submitter is concerned that ecology assessments undertaken for PPC84 are broad brush desktop assessments and that wetland areas may be larger than what has been shown. Submitter seeks the requested relief to provide greater certainty as to where wetland areas are noting potential rules triggers under the Northland Regional Plan and NES-F 2020.	N	Y
J. Warden	26	26.2	Indigenous vegetation	Ecological Impact Assessment	Support in part	Submitter seeks for further consideration of areas assessed in the Ecological Impact Assessment with consideration to indigenous vegetation.	The submitter is concerned that areas consisting of indigenous vegetation are likely to be of SNA quality and may need further consideration and assessment.		

## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
J. Warden	26	26.3	Fauna Habitat	Ecological Impact Assessment	Support in part	Submitter seeks for greater consideration be given to potential avifauna species which may reside within the PPC84 area and be at greater risk than assessed in the EIA..	The submitter does not agree with part of the assessment in the Ecological Impact Assessment which states <i>"It is unlikely that 'At Risk' or 'Threatened' species are present within the site, even on an intermittent basis."</i> The submitter makes reference to the <i>"Nationally Critical' Australasian bittern (Botaurus poiciloptilus)"</i> which resides in the PPC84 area and views the requested relief will seek to protect wetlands and species such as the aforementioned with greater		
J. Warden	26	26.4	National Policy Statement (NPS – IB)	New provision	Support	Submitter seeks for the NPS – IB to be incorporated into the master plan for PPC84.	No further information given.		
J. Warden	26	26.5	Setbacks	DEV1 – S7	Support in part	Requests further consideration of setback rules to manage the effects on wetland features.	Submitter views there are conflicts developable land, the proposed roading network and wetland features and the submitter views the current layout as demonstrated on the scheme plan are not considered effective to manage potential effects on wetlands.		
J. Warden	26	26.6	Ecological	New Provision	Support	Submitter seeks for greater consideration be had for the protection of ecological features, with respect to animal controls.	The submitter views that PPC84 does not include adequate ecological protection or consideration on protective fencing. The submitter is concerned that the proposed development will have adverse impacts on ecological features given PPC84 does not incorporate animal controls into proposed provisions.		
J. Warden	26	26.7	Roading	-	Oppose	No specific decision requested.	The submitter is concerned the one lane bridges on Cove Road will not be able to support the proposed development given the bridges are prone to flooding. The submitter is concerned the proposed development will increase traffic demand on the bridges.		
J. Warden	26	26.8	Public Access	New provision	Support	Submitter seeks for additional pedestrian access north along Cove Road to be incorporated into the scheme plan.	The submitter considers that the requested relief may assist in providing increased pedestrian access to the main beach.		
J. Young	27	27.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Oppose	Delete PPC84 in its entirety.	Submitter is concerned that current roading infrastructure cannot support the increase in demand from the proposed development.	N	Y
K. & S. Gow	28	28.1	Reserve	New provision	Support in part	Submitter seeks a reserve to be implemented the width of the paper road OR alternatively the submitter requests covenants which restricts building to single storey dwellings	Submitter seeks the requested relief to maintain privacy along the ridgeline and to avoid impeding on residents' views.	N	Y
K. & S. Gow	28	28.2	Zoning	Residential Standards	Support	Submitter requests for setbacks to be introduced.	Refer to submission point 28.1.		
K. & S. Gow	28	28.3	Stormwater		Support in part	Submitter seeks for stormwater drainage designed to capture runoff.	Submitter views that the requested relief will assist in capturing stormwater runoff to ensure stormwater is directed away from the submitter's property and the Vista Verona stormwater catchment area.		
K. & S. Gow	28	28.4	Roading and transport	-	Support in part	Submitter seeks for the road widths for new roads within the PPC84 development be consistent with current Council Standards.	Submitter seeks the requested relief as they view this will encourage room for cars passing and carparking on both sides of the road.		
K. & S. Gow	28	28.4	Roading and transport	Proposed intersection	Support in part	Submitter seeks for adequate design is implemented on the Moir Road/ Ulrich Drive intersection.	Submitter views the intersection will add to existing traffic volume on Moir Road and around the sports grounds.		

## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
K. & S. Gow	28	28.6	Roading and transport	Proposed road	Support in part	Submitter seeks for alternative design for the Old Waipu Road/Molesworth Drive.	The submitter is concerned that an additional road connected to Cove Road will result in a higher volume traffic, and potentially become a new collector road.		
K. & S. Gow	28	28.7	Schooling	New Infrastructure	Support	Submitter seeks for a new local high school to be built in the Mangawhai Area.	Submitter notes that the existing primary school is at capacity and views that a new school would alleviate additional demands for schooling due to additional growth generated by PPC84.		
K. Francis	29	29.1	Roading and transport	Proposed road	Oppose	Amend – no decision specified.	Submitter is opposed to the Ulrich Drive extension/access and any future developments to the existing paper road as they view it will have a negative impact on the existing Kahu Drive properties adjacent to the paper road.	N	N
K. Innes	30	30.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Support	Retain PPC84 in its entirety as notified.	Submitter is in support of the plan change and its ability to accommodate large forecast growth.	N	N
K. James & H. Canton	31	31.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Support	Retain PPC84 in its entirety as notified.	Submitter views the proposed development will provide for further development of Mangawhai into the future.	Y	Y
K. James & H. Canton	31	31.2	Wastewater and stormwater	New provision	Support in part	Submitter seeks a new provision in which stormwater and wastewater are disposed via land or wetlands to a maturation pond which also provides for stormwater with final discharge to the estuary.	Submitter views that disposal of stormwater and wastewater totally via land application is not a feasible option for many months of the year.	Y	Y
K. Marment	32	32.1	Environment	New provision	Support in part	Submitter seeks vegetation to be retained, with particular regard to existing vegetation near wetlands which feed the Tara Stream.	Submitter seeks for environmental impact to be minimised.	N	Y
K. Marment	32	32.2	Environment	New provision	Support in part	Submitter seeks for “skyline view” from all direction– i.e. Tara Road and Mangawhai protected and no structures built on skyline.	Refer to submission point 32.1.		
K. Marment	32	32.3	Environment	New provision	Support in part	Submitter seeks for 45% of land to be zoned as “green zones” with public access via walking or biking.	Refer to submission point 32.1.		
K. Marment	32	32.4	Roading and Transport	New Provision	Support in part	Submitter seeks for streets to include shared paths for cyclists and pedestrians.	Refer to submission point 32.1.		
K. Marment	32	32.5	Urban Design	New Provision	Support in part	Submitter seeks for new provisions around dark skies by limiting light pollution.	Refer to submission point 32.1.		
K. Marment	32	32.6	Wastewater	New Provision	Support in part	Submitter seeks for a provision to be included which directs that wastewater produced from the proposed development be treated onsite, and not directed to the Mangawhai Wastewater System. Provision for a water supply system that can cope with droughts without drawing from groundwater is also sought.	Submitter is concerned that the Mangawhai wastewater system is already at capacity and wants to ensure that a water supply system is in place that can withstand droughts and not take from groundwater.		
K. Moynihan	33	33.1	Zoning	Proposed structure plan	Support in part	Seeks for council to either reject rezoning from Rural to Residential or amend the rezoning to rural residential zone 1.	Submitter is concerned that that the proposed development does not align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan, which has not been sufficiently addressed in the s32 report.	N	Y

## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
K. Moynihan	33	33.2	Zoning	Mangawhai Hills Development Area	Support	Retain non-residential aspects of the development proposed.	Submitter supports the creation of a Mangawhai Development area with core provisions which seek to protect ecological features, promote high quality urban design as well as provide open space and connectivity.		
K. Moynihan	33	33.3	Roading	Transport Assessment – Proposed site access (South), directly opposite the entrance to the Moana Views development at 161 Tara Road	Oppose	Submitter opposed any site access directly opposite the entrance to Moana Views at 161 Tara Road. Submitter seeks for council to reject this part of the proposal.	Submitter views that should council accept the proposal, the position of the entrance/exit will become a four way traffic intersection or roundabout which will require careful consideration. Submitter views that the traffic assessment does not give an accurate representation given only “normal” house numbers have been taken into account. Further, submitter notes that the traffic assessment has not considered additional traffic volumes from construction related vehicles during the ten year development period proposed.		
K. Moynihan	33	33.4		Urban Design Statement	Support	Submitter seeks for provisions to be included which direct the colour pallet of residential housing.	Submitter views the design is to reflect muted tones and colours to respect the congruence of the surrounding area		
K. Reid	34	34.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Oppose	Delete PPC84 in its entirety.	<p>Submitter is concerned the proposed development will result in a loss of productive farmland. Submitter is also concerned the proposed development will result in a loss of amenity values and rural character.</p> <p>The submitter notes concerns around a new road onto Cove Road increasing traffic and causing safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists which are considered dangerous now.</p> <p>Additional effects related to servicing of power, water, rubbish, noise control, pollution, road maintenance and sewerage are not considered to have been adequately addressed with sewerage noted as at capacity already.</p> <p>The submitter notes flooding on their own property after heavy rain events due to a Council installed culvert and is concerned the proposed development will exacerbate flooding issues.</p> <p>Overall the submitter considers the scale of the proposal too large for this area.</p>	N	N
L. Kendall	35	35.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Oppose	Delete PPC84 in its entirety.	<p>Submitter views Mangawhai has enough housing areas, and views the following infrastructure needs to be improved for such a development can take place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity supply</li> <li>• Wastewater</li> <li>• Increase in schools</li> <li>• 24 hour accident and emergency facility</li> <li>• Road improvements – with regard to the roads into Mangawhai</li> </ul>	N	N

## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
D. Hayward (Late submission)	36	36.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Support	Retain PPC84 in its entirety as notified.	Submitter views there is a need for economic growth within Kaipara and views the proposal will benefit the community.  Submitter supports the developers intent towards sustainable and ecological practices	N	Y
R. Moffat (Late submissions)	37	37.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Support	Retain PPC84 in its entirety as notified.	Submitter views the proposed development would create safer roading for pedestrians and runners, given the submitter currently needs to drive into town to run as Garbolino Road is no longer safe for running.	-	-
M. Bell	38	38.1	Zoning	Proposed structure plan	Support	Retain PPC84 in its entirety as notified.	Submitter views the proposal supports the growth of Mangawhai.	N	N
M. Hewitt (Submission withdrawn 4 Dec 2023)	39	39.1	Zoning	Proposed structure plan	Support in part	Submitter requests Council reject this Plan Change request and that Frecklington Farm remain within the Rural Zone. Alternatively, an amendment for rezoning from residential to rural residential zone 1 is sought.	Submitter is concerned that that the proposed development does not align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan, which has not been sufficiently addressed in the s32 report.	Y	-
M. Hewitt (Submission withdrawn 4 Dec 2023)	39	39.2	Zoning	Mangawhai Hills Development Area	Support	Retain non-residential aspects of the development proposed.	Submitter supports the creation of a Mangawhai Development area with core provisions which seek to protect ecological features, promote high quality urban design as well as provide open space and connectivity.		
M. Hewitt (Submission withdrawn 4 Dec 2023)	39	39.3	Transport	Transport Assessment – Proposed site access (South), directly opposite the entrance to the Moana Views development at 161 Tara Road	Oppose	Submitter opposed any site access directly opposite the entrance to Moana Views at 161 Tara Road.  Submitter seeks for council to reject this part of the proposal.	Submitter views that should council accept the proposal, the position of the entrance/exit will become a four way traffic intersection or roundabout which will require careful consideration.  Submitter views that the traffic assessment does not give an accurate representation given only “normal” house numbers have been taken into account.  Further, submitter notes that the traffic assessment has not considered additional traffic volumes from construction related vehicles during the ten year development period proposed.		
M. Hewitt (Submission withdrawn 4 Dec 2023)	39	39.4	Urban Design – colour pallet	Urban Design Statement	Support	Submitter seeks for provisions to be included which direct the colour pallet of residential housing.	Submitter views the design is to reflect muted tones and colours to respect the congruence of the surrounding area.		
M. Loheni	40	40.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Support	Retain PPC84 as notified.	Submitter views that proposed plan change will support the growth of Mangawhai and will assist in conserving the environment whilst providing housing, paths, open public spaces and green areas.		
M. Tschirky	41	41.1	Density	New provision	Support	Submitter seeks that minimum house sizing be 250m2 with a maximum number of houses imposed with the PPC84 area.	The submitter notes the steep terrain, waterways and wetlands to be managed and their primary concerns are regarding earthworks and the potential destabilisation of land, particularly along Tara Road.	Y	Y

## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
							<p>The submitter makes reference to recent flood events, resulting in flooding along lower Tara Road and is concerned with stormwater discharge.</p> <p>The submitter is also concerned with the additional strain the proposed development will put on roading and wastewater facilities.</p>		
M. Tschirky	41	41.2	Density	New provision	Support	Submitter seeks the proposed "village" have a maximum of 300 houses, as opposed to 600.	Refer to submission point 21.1.		
L. Lewis (Incomplete submission)	42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mangawhai Church Trust	43	43.1	PPC84 as a whole	PPC84 as a whole	Support in part	The submitter is in support of PPC84 but seeks for amendments relating to appropriate infrastructure connections.	Refer to submission points below.	Y	Y
Mangawhai Church Trust	43	43.2	Roading and transport	Proposed structure plan	Oppose	The submitter seeks for the removal of any primary or secondary roads from the submitter's property in their entirety.	<p>The submitter views there is no need for the proposed road network alignment as shown on the structure plan through Mangawhai Church Trust Land.</p> <p>The submitter notes the 20 metre wide paper road to the east of their property, which is for the purpose of connecting land should the need arise. The submitter also notes there are other main access roads which connect land within the PPC84 area, including Tara Road, Cove Road and a future connection through Old Waipu Road.</p> <p>The submitter is also concerned that the proposed roading network through their property will adversely impact the expected amenity for their site with a significant increase in traffic movements predicted on the Primary Road through the submitters property.</p> <p>Submitter references existing resource consents which have been granted for the site and is concerned that the proposed roading network through their property will disrupt future projects that have already obtained resource consents for.</p>		
Mangawhai Church Trust	43	43.3	Water supply	Land Development Report	Support in part	<p>Submitter seeks for a sustainable water supply be established for Mangawhai.</p> <p>Submitter seeks for further certainty that developments can be accommodated within the three waters reticulation.</p>	The submitter notes that onsite rainwater tanks will service lots within the PPC84 development and is concerned that the dry conditions of the area will result in offsite water supply required by tanker delivery. Further to this, the submitter acknowledges that water collected by rainwater tanks will be required to be set aside for fire fighting purposes.		
Mangawhai Church Trust	43	43.4	Wastewater	Wastewater management report Land Development Report	Support in part	Submitter seeks for further certainty that developments can be accommodated within the three waters reticulation.	<p>The submitter is concerned that the plan change does not provide certainty that the existing or proposed reticulated system will be able to accommodate the development once land has been rezoned to residential.</p> <p>The submitter views that onsite wastewater disposal is better suited to rural properties as opposed to urban properties.</p>		

## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
Mangawhai Church Trust	43	43.5	Higher order planning documents	PPC84 in whole	Support in part	Refer to submission point 44.1.	<p>The submitter references a number of higher order planning documents and is concerned PPC84 does not align with certain aspects of these.</p> <p>The submitter is views PPC84 does not align with the Mangawhai Harbour Overlay, in the operative Kaipara District Plan, given the site is rural and is being developed for residential, without maintaining existing amenity values and character of the area.</p> <p>The submitter views PPC84 is contrary to the Rural chapter of the operative Kaipara District Plan. Further to this, the submitter views PPC84 is not consistent with Chapter 2 of the operative Kaipara District Plan which seeks:</p> <p><i>“to maintain and enhance opportunities for sustainable resource use, to enable economic development and growth... (objective 2.4.1), it also seeks to ...recognise and enhance the amenity and character of the District, while providing for sustainable resource use... (objective 2.4.5) and ...development and operation of utilities, utility networks and the transport network (including the state highway network) throughout the District, particularly where this is undertaken in conjunction with land use development and change...” (Objective 2.4.9)</i></p> <p>The submitter views that whilst transportation has been considered in PPC84, it does not utilise the paper road but rather seeks to fragment the submitters land with new primary and secondary proposed roads.</p>		
Mangawhai Matters Society Inc.	44	44.1	Stormwater	Stormwater Management Plan	Support in part	Submitter seeks for either the Kaipara District Council or the developer to provide “whole of site” primary and secondary stormwater system installation as part of this application.	The submitter is concerned the proposed Stormwater Management Plan is not sufficient in detail and is concerned that the proposed stormwater plan as is will lead to ad hoc stormwater servicing risking system failure. The submitter views than an overall stormwater plan will assist in providing further certainty as to how stormwater will be managed within the PPC84 scope.	Y	-
Mangawhai Matters Society Inc.	44	44.2	Ridgeline Development	New provision	Support	Submitter seeks for Kaipara District Council to consider taking into ownership an equivalent of an esplanade reserve along the top of the ridge part of the subject land. The submitter also seeks that setbacks from the reserve are implemented rather than from the edge of the ridge.	The submitter is concerned that landscape protection provisions within PPC84 (such as proposed standard DEV2 – S2 – relating to height of a building) will be incrementally ignored, which has the potential to lead to a fully developed ridgeline.		
Mangawhai Matters Society Inc.	44	44.3	Infrastructure	New provision	Support	The submitter seeks for provisions to be included in the assessment of all subdivision applications consequential to PPC84 which clarifies how the cost of infrastructure is to be funded, in particular what level of the Development Contributions component from each lot is set as the lot owner’s financial contribution to the public cost of public infrastructure to service the development. This is to include: roading, wastewater, freshwater and stormwater infrastructure.	<p>The submitter views that the requested relief will provide certainty as to how infrastructure upgrades will be paid for. The submitter is concerned that costs to upgrade infrastructure will fall to the ratepayers.</p> <p>The submitter references transport, treatment and disposal of wastewater and notes that the roading network requires further upgrades to service PPC84.</p> <p>The submitter notes there is no information included in the application as to how the cost of the required roads will be met.</p>		
Mangawhai Matters Society Inc.	44	44.4	Community Infrastructure, Parks and Reserves		Support in part	The submitter seeks that the process for considering the PPC84 application include and provide for an opportunity for the public and for the Council to consider options to work with the developer which lead to the establishment	The submitter is concerned that the proposed development may result in a block of residential land that is inaccessible. The submitter seeks to ensure that land developed retains public walking tracks and recreational spaces.		



## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
						of either a separate entity or for Council to take responsibility for land areas including picnic and recreational areas, ridge esplanade strip, walking tracks and outstanding bush areas.			
Moana Views Committee (Submission Withdrawn 7 Dec 2023)	45	45.1	Zoning	Proposed structure plan	Oppose	Submitter requests Council reject this Plan Change request and that Frecklington Farm remain within the Rural Zone. Alternatively, an amendment for rezoning from residential to rural residential zone 1 is sought.	Submitter is concerned that that the proposed development does not align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan, which has not been sufficiently addressed in the s32 report.	N	N
Moana Views Committee (Submission Withdrawn 7 Dec 2023)	45	45.2	Zoning	Mangawhai Hills Development Area	Support	Retain non-residential aspects of the development proposed.	Submitter supports the creation of a Mangawhai Development area with core provisions which seek to protect ecological features, promote high quality urban design as well as provide open space and connectivity.		
Moana Views Committee (Submission Withdrawn 7 Dec 2023)	45	45.3	Transport	Transport Assessment – Proposed site access (South), directly opposite the entrance to the Moana Views development at 161 Tara Road	Oppose	Submitter opposed any site access directly opposite the entrance to Moana Views at 161 Tara Road. Submitter seeks for council to reject this part of the proposal.	Submitter views that should council accept the proposal, the position of the entrance/exit will become a four-way traffic intersection or roundabout which will require careful consideration.  Submitter views that the traffic assessment does not give an accurate representation given only “normal” house numbers have been taken into account. Further, submitter notes that the traffic assessment has not considered additional traffic volumes from construction related vehicles during the ten year development period proposed.		
Moana Views Committee (Submission Withdrawn 7 Dec 2023)	45	45.4	Urban Design – colour pallet	Urban Design Statement	Support	Submitter seeks for provisions to be included which direct the colour pallet of residential housing.	Submitter views the design is to reflect muted tones and colours to respect the congruence of the surrounding area.		
Moana Views Committee (Submission Withdrawn 7 Dec 2023)	45	45.5	Urban Design – Lighting	Urban Design Statement	Support	Council to request a low impact lighting assessment of the residential housing development proposed.	Submitter views that the unpolluted night sky should be protected. Any external lighting required within the boundaries of the proposed development should respect the ‘public asset’ of the neighbourhood.		
N. & D. Wilson	46	46.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Oppose	Delete PCC84 in its entirety.	The submitter is concerned that the proposed development will negatively alter the amenity and large lot/rural character of the area. The submitter references the spatial plan with the view that the proposed plan change does not align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan 2020.	N	N

## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
N. Campbell	47	47.1	Zoning	Southeastern portion of the paper road above Fantail Way being rezoned to residential	Oppose	Submitter seeks the paper road becomes a native reserve, with Council records of native bush areas updated to include this area.	The submitter notes that the existing paper road adjacent to Fantail Way contains a significant area of regenerating bush. Submitter views the area forms a natural corridor for birds to travel safely. The submitter views the area is also a drawcard for people to buy and settle in the area.	Y	Y
N. Campbell	47	47.2	Zoning	Farmland between Fantail Way, Weka Street, Daphne Place and Ngaio Close	Oppose	The submitter seeks for the described area to be zoned or covenanted as Native Bush Reserve.	The submitter seeks the requested relief for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter notes the area has been a point of refuge during a tsunami warning.</li> <li>• The moderate to steep slope of the higher end to the southwest makes it unsuitable for housing development.</li> <li>• The lower north-eastern end of the area is wetland in nature.</li> <li>• There is no outlet for stormwater and wastewater.</li> <li>• Residential development may impact on birdlife and other wildlife.</li> <li>• The area is accessible from several directions and can be a place of recreation</li> </ul>		
N. Campbell	47	47.3	Zoning	Paper Road	Oppose	Submitter seeks for the paper road to be used as a walkway and cycleway.	The submitter notes the paper road forms a buffer between the existing subdivision and any future subdivision.  The submitter considers the requested relief will enable the paper road people to access the church, school, village and community hall, as well as the estuary. Further to this, the submitter views the requested relief would assist in retention of open space whilst promoting “green behaviour.”		
N. Campbell	47	47.4	Zoning	Highest area of ridge proposed to be zoned residential	Oppose	Submitter seeks for the area of the ridge proposed to be zoned residential, to be retained as rural, or be zoned as public reserve, or bush reserve.	Submitter seeks the requested relief for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area is visible from all directions.</li> <li>• Submitter notes that various councils in New Zealand restrict buildings on ridges.</li> <li>• The area connected with Urlich Drive with existing bush and potential walking/cycling tracks.</li> <li>• The area is noted to be a nesting place for skylarks.</li> </ul>		
N. Gestro	48	48.1	Zoning	Proposed structure plan	Oppose	Submitter seeks for further clarification of the plans for Old Waipu Road North, and any possible connection to Old Waipu Road.  The submitter also seeks for the developer to clarify how the proposed road can intersect with Old Waipu Road.	Submitter is concerned that Old Waipu Road North is not capable of the increased traffic should the proposed development proceed. The submitter is also concerned the proposed development will impact on their quality of living and have adverse impacts on the character of the area.	N	Y
N. Gestro	48	48.2	Zoning	Paper Road	-	Submitter seeks greater clarification of the paper road and how it will be managed in relation to the proposed plan change.	No further information given.		

## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
Northland Regional Council	49	49.1	Water supply	DEV1-R2	Support in part	<p>Amend rule DEV1-R2 as follows:</p> <p>DEV1-R2 – Residential Unit</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. The residential unit(s) provide a minimum net site area of 1,000m<sup>2</sup> per residential unit.</p> <p>b. Up to two residential units are constructed per site.</p> <p>c. It complies with:</p> <p>i. DEV1-S13 Vehicle Crossings</p> <p>ii. DEV1-S14 Roads, Vehicle Access, Pedestrian Walkways and Cycleways</p> <p>iii. DEV1-S15 Water Supply. iv. DEV1-S16 Stormwater Disposal. v. DEV1-S17 Wastewater Disposal.</p> <p>vi. DEV-S18 Minimum Floor Level</p> <p><b>vii. 50,000 litres of onsite potable water storage per residential unit is provided.</b></p>	Submitter seeks the requested relief given the permitted lot sizes of 1000m <sup>2</sup> may make it difficult to accommodate residential buildings as well as two standard water tanks. Submitter views the requested relief will make the requirement clear at the time of development to ensure the tanks can be accommodated onsite.	Y	Y
Northland Regional Council	49	49.2	Wastewater	Rule 13.14.6	Support in part	<p>The submitter seeks that operative rule 13.14.6 – wastewater disposal in the district plan applies to development in the Mangawhai Hills Development Area and the alternative wording for the rule proposed in the plan change document is not adopted.</p> <p>Submitter also seeks that rules state a minimum of 2000m<sup>2</sup> be required where no wastewater connection is available to ensure future development can provide 1500m<sup>2</sup> of land per household for wastewater disposal within the net site area of the allotment.</p>	<p>Submitter notes that the current Mangawhai Wastewater Treatment plant is limited in capacity and is unclear whether connection will be available to subdivisions.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the wording in the operative district plan Rule 13.14.6 differs from the proposed wording under PPC84 in which the minimum area for wastewater disposal is not specified. The submitter views the wording in the operative rule is appropriate and fit for purpose.</p>		
Northland Regional Council	49	49.3	Flood Hazard	Proposed structure plan	Support in part	Submitter seeks for the precinct plan to show areas subject to a 1:100 ARI and to disallow residential building platforms or wastewater disposal areas within the 1:100 ARI flood hazard areas.	Submitter notes that some areas within the PPC84 area are identified on the Northland Regional Council hazard maps as being potentially subject to river flood hazard and coastal inundation. The submitter seeks the requested relief to ensure areas potentially subject to flooding and coastal inundation and appropriately identified and managed.		
Northland Regional Council	49	49.4	NPS-HPL	Proposed structure plan	Support in part	Submitter seeks for the consideration of the soils assessment provided by the applicant will be required to determine if the rezoning of land is consistent with the NPS-HPL.	The submitter notes that approximately 4ha of land is identified as Land Use Capability (LUC) 3 and therefore requires assessment under the NPS-HPL.		

## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
P. Harris	50	50.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Oppose	Delete PPC84 in its entirety.	Submitter seeks the requested relief as they view the proposed development will have an adverse effect on the amenity and character of Mangawhai, as well as result in further increased traffic. The submitter is also concerned for the protection of ecological values.	N	N
P. Muller	51	51.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Oppose	Delete PPC84 in its entirety and retain current zoning.	Submitter considers that there is too much residential infill already planned and that infrastructure and commercial services such as the school, power, internet, health facilities and wastewater cannot support the proposed development. The submitter is also concerned the character of Mangawhai will be adversely affected from the proposed development.	N	N
P. Renner	52	52.1	Zoning	Proposed structure plan	Support in part	Rezone the submitters property at 110 Moir Street as Commercial.	Submitter views the proposed plan change will support growth in Mangawhai. Submitter views that the requested relief is appropriate given the location is well placed for commercial expansion.	Y	Y
R & J. Panhuis	53	53.1	Zoning	Proposed structure plan	Support	Retain PPC84 in its entirety as notified.	Submitter is in support of the development, with regard to provisions for the environment, land and open tracks for the public.	N	N
R. Burgess	54	54.1	Zoning	Proposed structure plan	Support	Retain PPC84 in its entirety as notified.	The submitter is satisfied PPC84 will sufficiently addresses their concerns with infrastructure, planting, footpaths, and walking tracks following a number of discussion with MHL	N	N
R. Henry	55	55.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Support	Retain PPC84 in its entirety as notified.	The submitter views the plan change has been well considered with provisions for roading, septic systems, tank water, use of solar power, cycling and walking tracks, and proposed planting areas have all been considered.	Y	Y
R. Woolnough	56	56.1	Utilities	Streetlighting	Oppose	Amend – submitter opposes any and all streetlighting installed at Mangawhai Hills.	Submitter is concerned that any proposed streetlighting at Mangawhai Hills may have adverse impacts on the environment in terms of light pollution. The submitter is concerned that streetlighting will negatively impact residents and native wildlife.  Submitter notes that objections to streetlights were made and upheld during the planning of Moana Views.	N	Y
Rachel. McQuerry	57	57.1	Zoning	Proposed structure plan	Oppose	Delete PPC84 in its entirety.	Submitter is concerned that infrastructure will not be able to support the increase in traffic. The submitter also raises the concern that schools and medical facilities will not be able to cope with the increase in residential development.	N	N
Ryan McQuerry	58	58.1	PPC84 in whole.	PPC84 in whole.	Oppose	Delete PPC84 in its entirety.	Submitter is concerned the proposed development will have adverse effects on traffic and traffic safety on pedestrians, particularly school kids and families. The submitter views the existing roads cannot support the increase in traffic movements	N	N
S. & J. McInteer	59	59.1	Zoning	Proposed structure plan	Support in part	Amend – no further information given.	Submitter comments “visual and light pollution”. No further information is given.	N	Y
S. & J. McInteer	59	59.2	Utilities	Proposed structure plan	Support in part	Add – no further information given.	Submitter notes “may want to develop because of above.” No further information given.		

## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
S. Brabant	60	60.1	Roading and transport	Appendix 6b – Revised traffic assessment	Oppose	Submitter seeks for an independent traffic report be undertaken.	Submitter is concerned that the traffic assessment does not give an accurate representation of traffic movements.  The submitter is also concerned the cost of roading upgrades will fall to the ratepayers and that the costs of this and where they will fall should be clarified.	N	N
S. Brabant	60	60.1	Wastewater	Appendix 13a and 13b Wastewater Management Assessment	Oppose	The submitter requests a further wastewater assessment be undertaken and requests a more detailed report on the three wastewater options proposed with an independent validation on the feasibility of the options.	The submitter is concerned the wastewater assessment is not robust enough to support the proposed development.		
S. Bray	61	61.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Support	Retain PPC84 in its entirety as notified.	The submitter views the proposed development is well thought out and considers impacts on the environment, land and the community. The submitter appreciates initiatives for onsite electrical generation, land restoration, forest enhancement and protection, as well as consideration for a community owned food forest and location of densification near existing residential areas.	N	N
S. Hartley	62	62.1	Roading and transport	Precinct provisions	Support in part	Submitter seeks for further consideration of alternative transport/movement options which extends beyond the immediate surrounding environment to connect to other destinations.	Submitter notes the proposed development may yield 500 – 600 additional residential dwellings which has potential to adversely affect the character and amenity of Mangawhai. Submitter views the requested relief will assist in the safe movement of pedestrians and cyclists.	Y	Y
S. Hartley	62	62.2	Roading and transport	Proposed structure plan: Pedestrian and cycle linkages	Support in part	Submitter seeks for key cycle destinations such as the primary school, Mangawhai Central, Mangawhai Village, the estuary and the hotel should be explicitly recognised and provided for.	The submitter is concerned that if alternative transport options are not considered, the result will be cumulative effects on transport and will require the need for major intersections and multi lane roads.		
S. Hartley	62	62.3	Roading and transport	Proposed structure plan: Old Waipu Road	Support in part	The submitter seeks for cycle linkages into Mangawhai Central be recognised and provided for to avoid the need for major intersections upgrading and multi lane roads.  Submitter seeks that this connection to Mangawhai Central is provided through the provision of an explicit precinct rule without which no direct motor vehicle link to Old Waipu Road should be permitted.	The submitter views that if PPC84 is connected to Old Waipu Road without the referenced direct link to Mangawhai Central, the amenity of this existing area will be highly impacted, and a major intersection improvement with Molesworth Drive will be needed.  The submitter also views that the PPC84 application is not clear as to the safety of pedestrian walkways and cycle ways given the increased volume of traffic through the village shops intersection (Moir/Insley Streets).		
S. Hartley	62	62.4	Roading and transport	Development Contributions	Support	Submitter seeks for development contributions to supplement the improvements needed to support the PPC84.	Submitter is concerned development costs and necessary improvements from cumulative traffic effects from PPC84 and other developments will fall to the ratepayers.		

## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
S. Manwaring	63	63.1	Zoning	Proposed structure plan	Support	Retain PPC84 in its entirety as notified.	Submitter views the proposed development has been well thought out, and the alternative methods to energy sources i.e., solar power are appreciated by submitter. Further to this, the submitter views the proposed development will fill a current lack in larger building sites in the area and support the growth of Mangawhai.	N	Y
S. Reid	64	64.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Oppose	Delete PPC84 in its entirety and retain rural zone.	<p>Submitter is concerned the proposed development will result in a loss of productive farmland. Submitter is also concerned the proposed development will result in a loss of amenity values and rural character.</p> <p>The submitter notes concerns around a new road onto Cove Road increasing traffic and causing safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists which are considered dangerous now.</p> <p>Additional effects related to servicing of power, water, rubbish, noise control, pollution, road maintenance and sewerage are not considered to have been adequately addressed with sewerage noted as at capacity already.</p> <p>The submitter notes flooding on their own property after heavy rain events due to a Council installed culvert and is concerned the proposed development will exacerbate flooding issues.</p>	N	N
T. & J. Wilson	65	65.1	Zoning	Proposed structure Plan	Support in part	Seeks for council to either reject rezoning from Rural to Residential or amend the rezoning to Rural Residential Zone 1.	Submitter is concerned that that the proposed development does not align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan, which has not been sufficiently addressed in the s32 report.	N	Y
T. & J. Wilson	65	65.2	Zoning	Mangawhai Development Area	Support in part	Retain non-residential aspects of PPC84 as notified.	Submitter supports the creation of a Mangawhai Development area with core provisions which seek to protect ecological features, promote high quality urban design as well as provide open space and connectivity.		
T. & J. Wilson	65	65.3	Transport	Transport Assessment – Proposed site access (South), directly opposite the entrance to the Moana Views development at 161 Tara Road	Oppose	<p>Submitter opposed any site access directly opposite the entrance to Moana Views at 161 Tara Road.</p> <p>Submitter seeks for council to reject this part of the proposal.</p>	<p>Submitter views that should council accept the proposal, the position of the entrance/exit to Moana Views will become a four way traffic intersection or roundabout which will require careful consideration.</p> <p>Submitter views that the traffic assessment does not give an accurate representation given only “normal” house numbers have been taken into account.</p> <p>Further, submitter notes that the traffic assessment has not considered additional traffic volumes from construction related vehicles during the ten year development period proposed.</p> <p>The submitter is also concerned that the current state of Tara Road is not adequate for servicing the traffic and the proposed development may result in a further increase on traffic demand for Tara Road.</p>		

## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
T. & J. Wilson	65	65.4	Urban Design – colour pallet	Urban Design Statement	Support	Submitter seeks for provisions to be included which direct the colour pallet of residential housing.	Submitter views the design is to reflect muted tones and colours to respect the congruence of the surrounding area.		
T. de Baugh	66	66.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Support	Retain PPC84 in its entirety as notified.	Submitter views the proposed development will assist in supporting the projected growth of the community. The submitter is in support of the proposed infrastructure plan, service plan, proposed planting and walking tracks.	N	Y
T. Hanna	67	67.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Oppose	Amend – no further information provided.	The submitter is concerned the proposed development will not be able to support current infrastructure, with reference to pre-schools/kindergarten waitlists and limited primary school capacity.  The submitter notes their concerns with getting children into schools, given Mangawhai currently only has one school.	Y	Y
T. Harris	68	68.1	Zoning	Proposed structure plan	Oppose	Delete PPC84 in its entirety.	The submitter is concerned the proposed development will have an adverse effect amenity value of the Mangawhai area given traffic movements will increase. The submitter references current issues with parking in the Village and Heads.  The submitter is also concerned the medical centre is already overwhelmed and is concerned that the proposed development will result in additional pressure.	N	N
T. Harris	68	68.2	Stormwater	Mangawhai Development Area	Oppose	Delete PPC84 in its entirety.	The submitter is concerned the proposed development will have adverse effect on stormwater runoff due to a lack of detailed engineering design.		
T. Simpkin	69	69.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Support	Retain PPC84 as notified.	The submitter views the plan change will assist in the growth of Mangawhai. The submitter notes they are in support of onsite wastewater disposal and the use of solar power.	N	N
W. & F. MacLennan	70	70.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Oppose	Delete PPC84 in its entirety unless the requested amendments as below are achieved.	Submitter views the plan change requires more detail to further inform services to the development, and potential effects from flooding. The submitter notes they would be more supportive of the plan change if it were more in line with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan, as outlined in submission point 72.2.	Y	Y
W. & F. MacLennan	70	70.2	Zoning	PPC84 application	Oppose	Submitter seeks for the proposed development to be consistent with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan.	The submitter views that the proposed zoning for PPC84 does not align with the direction of the Mangawhai Spatial Plan. The submitter notes the spatial plan identifies the Frecklington Farm which within the scope of the spatial plan anticipates a density of 79 dwellings with a population of 190. In contrast, the submitter notes that PPC84 would enable the development of 400-600 dwellings on this land and does not align with the rural-residential character of the wider Tara Road environment.		
W. & F. MacLennan	70	70.3	Floodwater Management	Land development report	Oppose	Submitter seeks a further assessment is undertaken which determines potential flooding effects on Tara Road.	Submitter discusses flooding in the PPC84 area and views that the proposed plan change may exacerbate flooding as a result of increased residential development and considers that further assessment is required.		

## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
W. & F. MacLennan	70	70.4	Services	PPC84 supporting documents	Oppose	Submitter seeks for the details of wastewater disposal and potential adverse effects to be established prior to re-zoning being approved.	Submitter views that provisions for wastewater disposal and electricity infrastructure are not clearly outlined. The submitter is concerned that there is lack of detail for such provisions, and views that the clarification of wastewater disposal and electricity service details will assist the plan change.		
W. & F. MacLennan	70	70.5	Restorative planting	Ecological Impact Assessment	Support	Submitter seeks to retain the restoration planting aspects of PPC84 as notified.	Submitter supports the restorative planting aspects of PPC84. They also reference the bird sanctuary near the intersection of Tara Road and Moir Road, and query what impact the development may have on this area as it does not appear to have been assessed.		
W. Martin	71	71.1	-	-	Support	No information given.	No information given.	N	N
W. Neal	72	72.1	Zoning	Proposed structure Plan	Support in part	Seeks for council to either reject rezoning from Rural to Residential or amend the rezoning to rural-residential zone 1.	Submitter is concerned that that the proposed development does not align with the Mangawhai Spatial Plan, which has not been sufficiently addressed in the s32 report.	N	Y
W. Neal	72	72.2	Zoning	Mangawhai Development Area	Support in part	Retain non-residential aspects of PPC84 as notified.	Submitter supports the creation of a Mangawhai Development area with core provisions which seek to protect ecological features, promote high quality urban design as well as provide open space and connectivity.		
W. Neal	72	72.3	Transport	Transport Assessment – Proposed site access (South), directly opposite the entrance to the Moana Views development at 161 Tara Road	Oppose	Submitter opposed any site access directly opposite the entrance to Moana Views at 161 Tara Road.  Submitter seeks for council to reject this part of the proposal.	Submitter views that should council accept the proposal, the position of the entrance/exit to Moana Views will become a four way traffic intersection or roundabout which will require careful consideration.  Submitter views that the traffic assessment does not give an accurate representation given only “normal” house numbers have been taken into account.  Further, submitter notes that the traffic assessment has not considered additional traffic volumes from construction related vehicles during the ten year development period proposed.  The submitter is also concerned that the current state of Tara Road is not adequate for servicing the traffic and the proposed development may result in a further increase on traffic demand for Tara Road.		
W. Neal	72	72.4	Urban Design – colour pallet	Urban Design Statement	Support	Submitter seeks for provisions to be included which direct the colour pallet of residential housing.	Submitter views the design is to reflect muted tones and colours to respect the congruence of the surrounding area.		
Y. Reid.	73	73.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Oppose	Delete PPC84 in its entirety and retail rural zoning.	Submitter is concerned the proposed development will result in a loss of productive farmland. Submitter is also concerned the proposed development will result in a loss of amenity values and rural character.  The submitter notes concerns around a new road onto Cove Road increasing traffic and causing safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists which are considered dangerous now.  Additional effects related to servicing of power, water, rubbish, noise control, pollution, road maintenance and sewerage are not considered to have been adequately addressed with sewerage noted as at capacity already.	N	N



## PPC84 - Mangawhai Hills Limited

Submitter Name	Submitter number	Submission Point #	Topic	Provision #	Support/Oppose/Support in Part	Relief Sought	Reason for Submission	Requests to be heard	Joint heard
							The submitter notes flooding on their own property after heavy rain events due to a Council installed culvert and is concerned the proposed development will exacerbate flooding issues.		
C. Best (Late submission)	74	74.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Support	Retain PPC84 as notified.	Submitter is in support of PPC84 as they view the developer has considered all relevant aspects, including ecological, transport links and local community. They view Mangawhai has a need for economic growth and view the plan change will assist with that.  The submitter appreciates the approach taken by the developer, which promotes a rural/residential lifestyle.	N	Y
D. Patel	75	75.1	PPC84 in whole	PPC84 in whole	Support	Retain PPC84 as notified.	Submitter views the proposed plan change has good potential to improve the local economy. The submitter supports the proposed provisions to include solar power, walking tracks and sewage infrastructure. The submitter notes they support the community engagement that has taken place.	N	N
L. Leslie	76	76.1	Zoning	Proposed structure plan	Oppose	Retain current zoning as per operative Kaipara District Plan.	Submitter is there is a lack of adequate access roads into Mangawhai Area to support the proposed plan change.  The submitter is also concerned there is a lack of infrastructure i.e. schools, water supply and medical facilities.	N	Y