

Future Urban Land Supply Strategy Refresh

Summary of submissions

General

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
3	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Jon	Dunning		1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	
3	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Jon	Dunning		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
4	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Yong Kwan	Lee		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
4	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Yong Kwan	Lee		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
5	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Francesca	Flego		1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	
5	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Francesca	Flego		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.4 Agree	
6	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Winter	Green		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
6	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Winter	Green		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
7	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Katie	Richards		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
7	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Katie	Richards		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
8	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Ellie	Booth		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
8	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Ellie	Booth		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
9	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Gillian	Shine		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
9	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Gillian	Shine		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
10	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Sharon	Stewart		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
10	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Sharon	Stewart		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
12	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Gareth	Lischner		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
12	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Gareth	Lischner		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.4 Agree	
13	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Naomi	Webster		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
13	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Naomi	Webster		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.4 Agree	
14	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	David	Ronkowski		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
14	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	David	Ronkowski		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
15	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Philippa	Hayward		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
15	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Philippa	Hayward		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.4 Agree	
16	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Bill	Fountain		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
16	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Bill	Fountain		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
17	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Joseph	Lim		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
17	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Joseph	Lim		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.4 Agree	
20	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Raewyn	Davies		1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	
20	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Raewyn	Davies		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
22	A. Online form	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	Young Jin	Seo		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
22	A. Online form	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	Young Jin	Seo		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
26	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Caroline	Fountain		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
26	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Caroline	Fountain		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
28	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Ben	Ross		1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	
28	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Ben	Ross		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.6 Don't know/NA	
29	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Tricia	Austin		1. Q1. Overall support	1.6 Don't know/NA	
29	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Tricia	Austin		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.6 Don't know/NA	
29	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Tricia	Austin		6. General comments not in scope of questions	6.1 Environmental Considerations	<p>Concerned with impact on climate change from what is being proposed in the FULSS Refresh, in particular intergration of land use with public transport to prevent increase in journeys by private vehicles (contributing to GHG emissions, congestion and an increase in vehicle accidents etc)</p> <p>Concerned with anticipated increases in stormwater events as several of the sites are close to rivers. Even if these aren't in the current flood plains, development will increase runoffs etc onto the flood plains and increase severity of any floods in areas that are already at risk. Need to understand cumulative effects for these sites with regard to possible flooding of the site itself and its associated downstream surroundings as a result of development.</p> <p>Need to consider sea level rise as many sites are coastal. What consideration has the Council given to planning for higher sea level rises than those anticipated by 2100?</p>

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
31	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	John	Scott		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
31	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	John	Scott		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
36	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Youngsoo	Kim		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
36	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Youngsoo	Kim		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
37	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Arthur	Dooded		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
37	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Arthur	Dooded		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
38	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Graeme	Coley		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
38	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Graeme	Coley		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
39	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Paita	Chou		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
39	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Paita	Chou		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.4 Agree	
41	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Su	He		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
41	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Su	He		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
42	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	James Jeffrey	McClintock		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
42	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	James Jeffrey	McClintock		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
43	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Therese	McClintoick		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
43	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Therese	McClintoick		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
44	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Ce	Cheng		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
44	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Ce	Cheng		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
45	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Na	Xu		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
45	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Na	Xu		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
46	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Graeme	McCarrison	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	
46	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Graeme	McCarrison	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.4 Agree	
46	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Graeme	McCarrison	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	5. Background	5.1 Text error/content/map	
46	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Graeme	McCarrison	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	5. Background	5.2 Council should be doing this	Concerned that Council is not involving private infrastructure companies when putting together land development strategies.
48	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Jong seong	Lim		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
48	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Jong seong	Lim		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
49	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Keun kyoo	Lim		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
49	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Keun kyoo	Lim		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
50	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Soon heui	Lim		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
50	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Soon heui	Lim		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
51	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Derek	Smith		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
51	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Derek	Smith		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
55	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Stephen	Cochrane		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
55	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Stephen	Cochrane		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
56	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Brian	Halkyard		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
56	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Brian	Halkyard		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
57	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Karen	Halkyard		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
57	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Karen	Halkyard		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
59	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Bryn	Lockie		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
59	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Bryn	Lockie		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
64	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Stephen	Havill	SFH Consultants Limited	1. Q1. Overall support	1.6 Don't know/NA	
64	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Stephen	Havill	SFH Consultants Limited	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.6 Don't know/NA	
64	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Stephen	Havill	SFH Consultants Limited	5. Background	5.2 Council should be doing this	Suggests Council learns from the New Town philosophy in the UK and suggests Council looks at the rural land between Albany and Silverdale. States that it would be beneficial to look at these areas as they are close to the Albany Metropolitan Centre, adjoining motorway and Arterial Road linkages, lower quality soils with less potential environmental issues and ability to support the Silverdale industrial area.
67	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Annie and Andrew	Shiu		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
67	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Annie and Andrew	Shiu		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
68	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Fay Mary	Treadwell		1. Q1. Overall support	1.3 Neutral	
68	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Fay Mary	Treadwell		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.3 Neutral	
69	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Larry	Michell		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
69	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Larry	Michell		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
69	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Larry	Michell		6. General comments not in scope of questions	6.13 Out of scope - other	Requests more information on land owned in Puhoi which is ready for development. Owns 1/2 acre flat sections at 106 Kippner Road and the rezoning has overlooked these sites. States they are the only sites which are flat and have road access along the whole length of Krippner Road. Requests further advice on how to work through this.
72	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Errol	Johnson		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
72	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Errol	Johnson		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
83	D. Email form	Not Supplied	Angela	Halliday	Horticulture New Zealand	1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
83	D. Email form	Not Supplied	Angela	Halliday	Horticulture New Zealand	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
83	D. Email form	Not Supplied	Angela	Halliday	Horticulture New Zealand	6. General comments not in scope of questions	6.8 Council process	Does not agree that decision making should be left to each individual structure plan and plan change process and that the FULSS should be supported by analysis and recommendations for managing reverse sensitivity issues at the developing rural urban interface. Requests council uses a coordinated and consistent approach for rural production systems providing food to the growing urban areas and that the planning processes do not recognise these relationships.
85	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Simon	Lockie		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
85	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Simon	Lockie		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
87	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Harvey	Lockie		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
87	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Harvey	Lockie		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
88	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Carreen	Lockie		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
88	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Carreen	Lockie		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
97	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Margaret	Smith		1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	
97	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Margaret	Smith		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
97	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Margaret	Smith		5. Background	5.3 Council shouldn't be doing this	Concerned that there is not enough infrastructure to support further development.
								Highlights issues around current quality of roading, houses etc. Makes comments about foreign investors, homeless and various out of scope points.
101	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Steve	Ryan	Kevin Vickers Consultancy	1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	
101	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Steve	Ryan	Kevin Vickers Consultancy	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.4 Agree	
103	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Kevin	Vickers		1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	
103	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Kevin	Vickers		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.4 Agree	
108	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Patricia (Trish)	Hutt		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
108	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Patricia (Trish)	Hutt		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
109	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Yan	Lin		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
109	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Yan	Lin		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
112	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	IAN THOMAS	GATMAN		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
112	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	IAN THOMAS	GATMAN		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
113	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Naiqi	Yang		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
113	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Naiqi	Yang		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
114	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Richard Guy Anthony	March		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
114	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Richard Guy Anthony	March		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
116	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	BRIAN CECIL	SMITH		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
116	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	BRIAN CECIL	SMITH		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
118	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Andrea	Cochrane		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
118	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Andrea	Cochrane		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
119	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Grant	Cochrane		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
119	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Grant	Cochrane		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
120	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Pauline	Scott		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
120	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Pauline	Scott		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
121	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Wendy & Glen	Nasmith		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
121	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Wendy & Glen	Nasmith		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
122	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Kevin	Chou		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
122	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Kevin	Chou		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
123	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Lisa	Chou		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
123	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Lisa	Chou		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
124	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Cherie	Chou		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
124	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Cherie	Chou		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
125	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Patty	Willis		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
125	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Patty	Willis		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
127	A. Online form	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	Sandra	Baker		1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	
127	A. Online form	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	Sandra	Baker		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.4 Agree	
131	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Rhonda	Sweetman		1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	
131	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Rhonda	Sweetman		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.4 Agree	
132	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Maree	Judson		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
132	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Maree	Judson		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
133	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Brian	Soufflot		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
133	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Brian	Soufflot		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
136	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Bruce	Harnett		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
136	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Bruce	Harnett		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
145	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Greg	Wood		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
145	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Greg	Wood		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
148	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Edward Eric	Punshon		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
148	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Edward Eric	Punshon		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
149	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Judi	Punshon		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
149	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Judi	Punshon		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
153	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Liang	Dai	Drury owner group	1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
153	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Liang	Dai	Drury owner group	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
158	B. Post form	Not Supplied	Denis	William		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
158	B. Post form	Not Supplied	Denis	William		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
163	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Sandra	Zanos		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
163	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Sandra	Zanos		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
163	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Sandra	Zanos		6. General comments not in scope of questions	6.13 Out of scope - other	Stop land being sold for Asian developments and not your average NZers.
163	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Sandra	Zanos		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.30 Future Urban Areas - Other comment	Infrastructure is badly need all over Auckland before releasing all of the land.
182	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Bradley	Don		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
182	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Bradley	Don		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
185	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Jim	Rouse		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
185	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Jim	Rouse		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
186	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Brent	Cochrane		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
186	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Brent	Cochrane		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
76	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Rebecca	Beals	Kiwi Rail	1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
76	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Rebecca	Beals	Kiwi Rail	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
76	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Rebecca	Beals	Kiwi Rail	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.25 Future Urban Areas - Pukekohe	
76	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Rebecca	Beals	Kiwi Rail	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.25.2 Future Urban Areas - Pukekohe Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
76	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Rebecca	Beals	Kiwi Rail	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.24 Future Urban Areas - Paerata	
76	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Rebecca	Beals	Kiwi Rail	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.24.2 Future Urban Areas - Paerata Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
76	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Rebecca	Beals	Kiwi Rail	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.19 Future Urban Areas - Opaheke-Drury	Requests that areas in close proximity to railway infrastructure be given greater weighting in the infrastructure/sequencing considerations.
76	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Rebecca	Beals	Kiwi Rail	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.19.2 Future Urban Areas - Opaheke-Drury Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
76	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Rebecca	Beals	Kiwi Rail	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu	
76	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Rebecca	Beals	Kiwi Rail	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10.2 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
76	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Rebecca	Beals	Kiwi Rail	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.8 Future Urban Areas - Huapai	
76	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Rebecca	Beals	Kiwi Rail	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.8.2 Future Urban Areas - Huapai Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
76	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Rebecca	Beals	Kiwi Rail	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.1 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North	
76	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Rebecca	Beals	Kiwi Rail	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.1.2 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North Disagree - Infrastructure issues	

General North

35	A. Online form	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	Alan	Addison		1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	
35	A. Online form	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	Alan	Addison		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.3 Neutral	
35	A. Online form	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	Alan	Addison		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26 Future Urban Areas - General North	
35	A. Online form	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	Alan	Addison		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26.2 Future Urban Areas - General North Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Concerned with lack of transport infrastructure.
35	A. Online form	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	Alan	Addison		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.17 Rural Settlements General North	States we need a bus lane or light rail system from Orewa to Auckland CBD before any more houses are built north of the Harbour Bridge.
35	A. Online form	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	Alan	Addison		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.17.2 Rural Settlements General North Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
1	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Warwick	Hojem		1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	
1	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Warwick	Hojem		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
1	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Warwick	Hojem		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26 Future Urban Areas - General North	
1	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Warwick	Hojem		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26.2 Future Urban Areas - General North Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Disagrees with all proposed development north of the Harbour Bridge without a second harbour crossing to address the current issues.

Silverdale, Dairy Flat, Wainui

19	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Steve	Hayden		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
19	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Steve	Hayden		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
19	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Steve	Hayden		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.7 Future Urban Areas - Dairy Flat	
19	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Steve	Hayden		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.7.8 Future Urban Areas - Dairy Flat Disagree - Other	Requests that a particular area rezoned to Countryside Living. Believes the 'Dairy Flat business' area needs to be supported with residential so business owners can live by where they work. Believes this countryside living land would enable more people to move to the area (via subdivision) without the need for publicly funded infrastructure as this area generally develops its own septic, water and waste systems off-grid.
19	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Steve	Hayden		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.7.2 Future Urban Areas - Dairy Flat Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
58	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Craig	Hegan		1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	
58	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Craig	Hegan		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.4 Agree	
58	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Craig	Hegan		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.7 Future Urban Areas - Dairy Flat	
58	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Craig	Hegan		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.7.2 Future Urban Areas - Dairy Flat Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Requests that the currently zoned 'Mixed Rural' area of Blackbridge Road be zoned as 'Countryside Living'.
75	D. Email form	Not Supplied	Aaron	Grey	Hugh Green Ltd	5. Background	5.2 Council should be doing this	States that it would avoid infrastructure costs to council as it would then be open to subdivision and private land owners would fund the services. Requests that Council do the following: Make reference to the National Policy Statement (NPS) on Urban Development Capacity and highlight how the FULSSS relates to this Identify the development capacity over the next three years separately to other development areas within the first decade in order to provide consistency with the NPS Recognise that as a requirement under the NPS, infrastructure needs to support the development of livestoned areas to provide development capacity in the short term That Infrastructure and Sequencing Considerations be separated into areas that are live zoned and those that are zoned Future Urban, in order to provide distinction between immediate and future infrastructure requirements Recognise that the requirement for bulk water supply to support the development of Hingaia is required immediately
75	D. Email form	Not Supplied	Aaron	Grey	Hugh Green Ltd	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.7 Future Urban Areas - Dairy Flat	
75	D. Email form	Not Supplied	Aaron	Grey	Hugh Green Ltd	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.7.3 Future Urban Areas - Dairy Flat Disagree - Taking too long	Requests the area to the east of the Northern Motorway adjacent to North Shore Aerodome be brought forward.
								States that this would allow it to be delivered simulatneously with Penlink.

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
78	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Euan	Williams	Fulton Hogan	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.6.9 Future Urban Areas - Silverdale - Dairy Flat (Business) - Agree	This submission relates to an area of land within Silverdale West comprising 226ha. Within this area of interest. Agrees with business area being brought forward. Requests that rest of Silverdale is brought forward to enable economically viable business with supporting residential development. Believes that there are no bulk infrastructure constraints to bringing the residential land forward for immediate live zoning, rather than the proposed sequencing of Decade 2 – 2nd half - 2033-2037. The submission provides analysis by specialists that propose that there are no transportation, stormwater, ecological, or economic impediments to immediately commencing with the Silverdale West structure planning and plan change process.
78	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Euan	Williams	Fulton Hogan	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.6.5 Future Urban Areas - Silverdale - Dairy Flat (Business) Disagree - Areas included	
78	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Euan	Williams	Fulton Hogan	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.6.2 Future Urban Areas - Silverdale - Dairy Flat (Business) Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
81	D. Email form	Waitakere Ranges Local Board	Craig	Shearer	Orewa West Investments Ltd	1. Q1. Overall support	1.3 Neutral	Requests that Orewa Resource Consent area be brought forward to Decade One. States that land owned by Orewa West Investments Limited be identified as being development ready in first half of Decade One. States that the timing of the release of land should not be dependant on the resource consent process as there are good reasons to urbanise the land in Decade One, regardless of resource consent process outcomes. States that the land will provide significant development capacity and that there are no infrastructure capacity issues that would constrain any development. There are no additional capital costs required by Council or CCO's in its development.
81	D. Email form	Waitakere Ranges Local Board	Craig	Shearer	Orewa West Investments Ltd	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.3 Neutral	
81	D. Email form	Waitakere Ranges Local Board	Craig	Shearer	Orewa West Investments Ltd	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.4 Future Urban Areas - Upper Orewa	
81	D. Email form	Waitakere Ranges Local Board	Craig	Shearer	Orewa West Investments Ltd	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.4.3 Future Urban Areas - Upper Orewa Disagree - Taking too long	
81	D. Email form	Waitakere Ranges Local Board	Craig	Shearer	Orewa West Investments Ltd	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.4.3 Future Urban Areas - Upper Orewa Disagree - Taking too long	
82	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Tim	Grace	Lakes Golf Course Limited	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.7.3 Future Urban Areas - Dairy Flat Disagree - Taking too long	Requests that the land seperated from the wider Dairy Flat urban by the Northern motorway be brought forward. States it is already serviced, i.e. has watersupply. The land is located adjacent to the Silverdale-Dairy Flat (Business) area which is proposed to be developed in the first half of Decade One which suggests that the land could be efficiently services for wastewater in conjunction with this business area. The land is also in proximity to where the Penlink will be constructed and questions why the FULSS is not in alignment with development of Penlink.
82	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Tim	Grace	Lakes Golf Course Limited	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.7.2 Future Urban Areas - Dairy Flat Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
84	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	John	Williams	Kervus Property Group Limited	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.3 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth South	Requests Warkworth South be brought forward on the basis that the apparent infrastructure issues are overstated and that it would be more hollistic to develop the whole of Warkworth together.
84	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	John	Williams	Kervus Property Group Limited	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.3.3 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth South Disagree - Taking too long	
84	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	John	Williams	Kervus Property Group Limited	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.3.3 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth South Disagree - Taking too long	
84	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	John	Williams	Kervus Property Group Limited	1. Q1. Overall support	1.6 Don't know/NA	Requests that the mixed rural area of Blackbridge Road is re-zoned to Countryside Living to enable additional housing to be created in the area without Council needing to incur large capital costs.
84	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	John	Williams	Kervus Property Group Limited	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.6 Don't know/NA	
86	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Tammy	Stitt		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
86	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Tammy	Stitt		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
86	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Tammy	Stitt		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.6 Future Urban Areas - Silverdale - Dairy Flat (Business)	
86	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Tammy	Stitt		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.6.9 Future Urban Areas - Silverdale - Dairy Flat (Business) Agree - Other	
96	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Sean	Spargo		1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	Requests that Dairy Flat be zoned as residential, not Business. States that it makes more sense due to it being close to the motorway, Silverdale roundabout, park and ride and that developing this area close to public transport hubs will alleviate traffic congestion.
96	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Sean	Spargo		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.4 Agree	
96	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Sean	Spargo		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.7 Future Urban Areas - Dairy Flat	
96	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Sean	Spargo		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.7.9 Future Urban Areas - Dairy Flat Agree - Other	
96	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Sean	Spargo		5. Background	5.3 Council shouldn't be doing this	
106	A. Online form	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	Kate	Mccleery		1. Q1. Overall support	1.3 Neutral	Concerned that the developments are not taking into consideration requirements for more schools.
106	A. Online form	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	Kate	Mccleery		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.6 Don't know/NA	
106	A. Online form	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	Kate	Mccleery		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.6 Future Urban Areas - Silverdale - Dairy Flat (Business)	
106	A. Online form	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	Kate	Mccleery		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.6.2 Future Urban Areas - Silverdale - Dairy Flat (Business) Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
111	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Lynley	Holme		1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	Requests that areas that are close to business zones be zoned as urban - and not mixed rural. Believes it will make sense to make both sides of Blackbridge Road "country side living" to be able to support intensification of housing with low infrastructure costs.
111	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Lynley	Holme		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.3 Neutral	
111	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Lynley	Holme		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.7 Future Urban Areas - Dairy Flat	
111	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Lynley	Holme		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.7.8 Future Urban Areas - Dairy Flat Disagree - Other	

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
115	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Scott & Jackie	Lester		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
115	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Scott & Jackie	Lester		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
115	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Scott & Jackie	Lester		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East	
115	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Scott & Jackie	Lester		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5.3 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East Disagree - Taking too long	Requests that upper Orewa Road and Russell Road is brought forward.
								States that there are currently two motorway access points and this area has better access than anywhere else proposed in the general North. This area is also closer to the beach, shopping centres and most economic to link up to existing infrastructure than else where.
115	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Scott & Jackie	Lester		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5.2 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
115	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Scott & Jackie	Lester		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.6 Future Urban Areas - Silverdale - Dairy Flat (Business)	
115	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Scott & Jackie	Lester		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.6.2 Future Urban Areas - Silverdale - Dairy Flat (Business) Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
115	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Scott & Jackie	Lester		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.6.3 Future Urban Areas - Silverdale - Dairy Flat (Business) Disagree - Taking too long	
117	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Barbara and Neil	De Cort		1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	
117	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Barbara and Neil	De Cort		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
117	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Barbara and Neil	De Cort		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.4 Future Urban Areas - Upper Orewa	
117	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Barbara and Neil	De Cort		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.4.8 Future Urban Areas - Upper Orewa Disagree - Other	Requests that Upper Orewa stays undeveloped.
								States that it would be better to complete one area before moving to another to minimise noise and disruption.
117	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Barbara and Neil	De Cort		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.4.9 Future Urban Areas - Upper Orewa Agree - Other	Supports the development of this area due to it being less than a kilometer from Millwater and motorway on and offramps.
126	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Stephen	Johnston		1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	
126	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Stephen	Johnston		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
126	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Stephen	Johnston		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.7 Future Urban Areas - Dairy Flat	
126	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Stephen	Johnston		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.7.2 Future Urban Areas - Dairy Flat Disagree - Infrastructure issues	If the future urban business area in Dairy Flat is to be developed from 2018 in order to create local jobs for local people then Auckland Council should consider rezoning the mixed rural side of Blackbridge road in Dairy Flat to countryside living, this would enable further houses to be built without Auckland Council incurring massive infrastructure bills such as water, sewage and waste as these would be built and funded by the private landowners themselves.
126	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Stephen	Johnston		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.7.8 Future Urban Areas - Dairy Flat Disagree - Other	If the future urban business area in Dairy Flat is to be developed from 2018 in order to create local jobs for local people then Auckland Council should consider rezoning the mixed rural side of Blackbridge road in Dairy Flat to countryside living, this would enable further houses to be built without Auckland Council incurring massive infrastructure bills such as water, sewage and waste as these would be built and funded by the private landowners themselves.
129	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Rod	Clarke		1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	
129	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Rod	Clarke		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
129	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Rod	Clarke		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East	
129	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Rod	Clarke		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5.3 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East Disagree - Taking too long	Requests that Wainui East be brought forward.
								Landowners who make up majority of the land in this area support the submission from Diana Bell.
139	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Gregory	Hines		1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	
139	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Gregory	Hines		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
139	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Gregory	Hines		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.4 Future Urban Areas - Upper Orewa	
139	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Gregory	Hines		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.4.3 Future Urban Areas - Upper Orewa Disagree - Taking too long	Requests that this area is brought forward in sequencing to development ready in 1st half decade One 2018 - 2022. This submission relates to the land at Russell Road, Upper Orewa Lot 1 DP 431409 and the land surrounding it being the Wainui East future urban zone. All the landowners at Russell Road together with the landowners of 88,100,118,130 and 132 Upper Orewa Road support this submission.
								The land is located immediately to the West of SH1 and in between the Orewa and Millwater on/off ramps. These ramps are not at capacity unlike the Silverdale and Oteha Valley Rd ramps that the Dairy Flat FUZ lies between, thus roading infrastructure will be significantly less than almost all other future urban areas.
								Believes Wainui East being development ready in Decade One would compliment the currently proposed sequencing in Decade One 1st Half of the Silverdale-Dairy Flat business area.
139	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Gregory	Hines		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.6.9 Future Urban Areas - Silverdale - Dairy Flat (Business) Agree	
144	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Brian	Sutton		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
144	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Brian	Sutton		1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	Strong support for sequencing and business area. Will service wider catchments. Needs to be well structure planned with provision of supporting network infrastructure particularly transportation and water; protection of the environment, particularly elite soils; economically viable, good urban design; involves all primary agencies including health providers and education and recreation.
								Inclusion of the Dairy Flat/Silverdale Business zone in the first decade period of 2018-2022, will help to ensure that employment opportunities are created close to the future primary residential areas of the catchment. This will have a direct impact, particularly on infrastructure as the residential development subsequently follows i.e Employment led growth.

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
144	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Brian	Sutton		6. General comments not in scope of questions	6.8 Council process	Need support and active collaboration by key infrastructure planners/providers such as WATERCARE and AT.
144	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Brian	Sutton		6. General comments not in scope of questions	6.1 Environmental considerations	Need to protect the environment in the process.
146	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Joe	Fountain		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
146	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Joe	Fountain		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
146	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Joe	Fountain		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26 Future Urban Areas - General North	
146	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Joe	Fountain		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26.9 Future Urban Areas - General North Agree - Other	Note: first half of submission appears to be the same comments as submission #147).
146	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Joe	Fountain		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.7.2 Future Urban Areas - Dairy Flat Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Early assessment by some major landholders, such as Fulton Hogan appear to have some ideas which are worthy of further investigation for the cost effective staged expansion of infrastructure, particularly water and wastewater, to meet the demand as the area expands.
147	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	John	Punshon		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
147	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	John	Punshon		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
147	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	John	Punshon		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.7 Future Urban Areas - Dairy Flat	Supports business zoning for Dairy Flat - Business
147	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	John	Punshon		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.7.3 Future Urban Areas - Dairy Flat Disagree - Taking too long	Requests that Dairy Flat North Sector is moved to Decade 1 if appropriate infrastructure can be provided or developed, even if on a private basis, in line with Dairy Flat Business area.
147	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	John	Punshon		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.7.2 Future Urban Areas - Dairy Flat Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Believes that the inclusion of the Dairy Flat/Silverdale Business zone in the first decade period of 2018 – 2022 will help to ensure that employment opportunities are created close to the future primary residential areas of the catchment. Supports structure planning for entire catchment.
147	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	John	Punshon		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.7.2 Future Urban Areas - Dairy Flat Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Early assessment by some major landholders, such as Fulton Hogan appear to have some ideas which are worthy of further investigation for the cost effective staged expansion of infrastructure, particularly water and wastewater, to meet the demand as the area expands.
155	B. Post form	Not Supplied	Judith	Brown	Maka Downs Family Trust	1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	
155	B. Post form	Not Supplied	Judith	Brown	Maka Downs Family Trust	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
155	B. Post form	Not Supplied	Judith	Brown	Maka Downs Family Trust	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East	Specifically refers to 120 Cemetery Road in Wainui, zoned FU. Requests be brought forward in sequencing to avoid planning blight (limited ability to develop)
155	B. Post form	Not Supplied	Judith	Brown	Maka Downs Family Trust	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5.3 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East Disagree - Taking too long	Requests that Wainui Silverdale area should be in the first group of land given an urban zoning rather than 20 years away and that all necessary infrastructure should be put in place as soon as possible.
155	B. Post form	Not Supplied	Judith	Brown	Maka Downs Family Trust	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5.2 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Reasons: Good transport connections including motorways on and off ramps; close to coast and retail; will be popular like Silverdale.
155	B. Post form	Not Supplied	Judith	Brown	Maka Downs Family Trust	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.6 Future Urban Areas - Silverdale - Dairy Flat (Business)	Believes extension of bulk services should be relatively easy and inexpensive; New recreational facilities being developed in Silverdale East would benefit from the additional catchment.
155	B. Post form	Not Supplied	Judith	Brown	Maka Downs Family Trust	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.6.2 Future Urban Areas - Silverdale - Dairy Flat (Business) Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Believes extension of bulk services should be relatively easy and inexpensive; New recreational facilities being developed in Silverdale East would benefit from the additional catchment.
155	B. Post form	Not Supplied	Judith	Brown	Maka Downs Family Trust	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.6.3 Future Urban Areas - Silverdale - Dairy Flat (Business) Disagree - Taking too long	Requests that Wainui Silverdale area should be in the first group of land given an urban zoning rather than 20 years away and that all necessary infrastructure should be put in place as soon as possible.
155	B. Post form	Not Supplied	Judith	Brown	Maka Downs Family Trust	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.6.3 Future Urban Areas - Silverdale - Dairy Flat (Business) Disagree - Taking too long	Reasons: Good transport connections including motorways on and off ramps; close to coast and retail; will be popular like Silverdale.
156	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Susan	Quarrie	Mrs Grayson	1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	
156	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Susan	Quarrie	Mrs Grayson	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
156	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Susan	Quarrie	Mrs Grayson	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East	
156	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Susan	Quarrie	Mrs Grayson	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5.2 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Believes extension of bulk services should be relatively easy and inexpensive; New recreational facilities being developed in Silverdale East would benefit from the additional catchment.
156	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Susan	Quarrie	Mrs Grayson	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5.3 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East Disagree - Taking too long	Requests that Wainui Silverdale area should be in the first group of land given an urban zoning rather than 20 years away and that all necessary infrastructure should be put in place as soon as possible.
156	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Susan	Quarrie	Mrs Grayson	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5.3 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East Disagree - Taking too long	Reasons: Good transport connections including motorways on and off ramps; close to coast and retail; will be popular like Silverdale.

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
169	D. Email form	Rodney Local Board	Alan, Dion and Melanie	Mayes		1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	The submitter requests that the timing of Wainui East/Upper Orewa be brought forward to decade one 2023-27. The submitter notes that the Kumeu/Huapai area, with anticipated capacity of 6600 dwellings has now been pushed back, and considers bringing forward the Wainui East area, being 7,400 dwellings, to be an appropriate relief. The submitter considers that an ongoing supply of development ready land in the north needs to be provided seperately of the south, because the northern areas (for a range of reasons) are more desirable.
169	D. Email form	Rodney Local Board	Alan, Dion and Melanie	Mayes		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
169	D. Email form	Rodney Local Board	Alan, Dion and Melanie	Mayes		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26 Future Urban Areas - General North	
169	D. Email form	Rodney Local Board	Alan, Dion and Melanie	Mayes		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26.8 Future Urban Areas - General North Disagree - Other	
169	D. Email form	Rodney Local Board	Alan, Dion and Melanie	Mayes		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.4 Future Urban Areas - Upper Orewa	The submitter requests that the timing of Wainui East/Upper Orewa be brought forward to decade one 2023-27. The submitter considers this will be a more efficient use of land, a more proactive response to strong growth pressures in the north, and make good use of planned infrastructure. The submitter notes that land nearby [at Wainui] is being developed, and bringing forward Upper Orewa would allow a more contiguous urban form.
169	D. Email form	Rodney Local Board	Alan, Dion and Melanie	Mayes		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.4.3 Future Urban Areas - Upper Orewa Disagree - Taking too long	
169	D. Email form	Rodney Local Board	Alan, Dion and Melanie	Mayes		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East	The submitter requests that the timing of Wainui East/Upper Orewa be brought forward to decade one 2023-27. The submitter considers this will be a more efficient use of land, a more proactive response to strong growth pressures in the north, and make good use of planned infrastructure. The submitter notes that land nearby [at Wainui] is being developed, and bringing forward Upper Orewa would allow a more contiguous urban form.
169	D. Email form	Rodney Local Board	Alan, Dion and Melanie	Mayes		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5.3 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East Disagree - Taking too long	
169	D. Email form	Rodney Local Board	Alan, Dion and Melanie	Mayes		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5.2 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East Disagree - Infrastructure issues	The submitter considers that an ad-hoc or out of sequence approach to development will have major funding implications on all infrastructure providers, affect the ability to co-ordinate delivery and is likely to have major implications on the ability to service other areas. This in turn may have significant consequences on the ability to provide sufficient development capacity across Auckland. The submitter considers it more appropriate, from a practical and funding perspective, to co-ordinate infrastructure to the Wainui future urban area as a whole rather than as part of a piecemeal approach.
169	D. Email form	Rodney Local Board	Alan, Dion and Melanie	Mayes		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5.6 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East Disagree - Anticipated dwelling capacity	The submitter considers that the strategy needs to provide greater capacity to meet anticipated demand in the Wainui area.
180	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Bernie & Gary	McCallion		1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	Requests that 379 Wainui Road should be brought forward from the second half of decade two and into decade one to be consistent with Wainui area. Notes that the ad-hoc sequencing of the whole Wainui area will cause issues and have major funding implications on all providers. The submitter highlights that this will affect the coordination of delivery and will potentially have implications on the ability to service other areas. The submitter seeks coordination of infrastructure for hte Wainui future urban area rather than taking a peicemeal approach.
180	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Bernie & Gary	McCallion		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
180	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Bernie & Gary	McCallion		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East	
180	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Bernie & Gary	McCallion		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5.3 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East Disagree - Taking too long	
180	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Bernie & Gary	McCallion		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5.2 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
180	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Bernie & Gary	McCallion		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26.8 Future Urban Areas - General North Disagree - Other	Notes that Kumeu Huapai Riverhead has been pushed back and, to ensure that rapid growth in the northern areas can be accommodated, requests that the Wainui East area be brought forward to provide for this. The reasoning provided by the submitter includes the proximity to employment, transport and high amenity areas.
175	E. Email non form	Rodney Local Board	Paul	Wigglesworth		1. Q1. Overall support	1.6 Don't know/NA	Requests that the 'Wainui Triangle' (boarded by Wainui Road, Lysnar Road and SH1) be brought forward from the second half of decade two to the first half of decade one to align with the live zoned area at Wainui East. The submitter highlights the anticipated infrastructure provision for the wider Wainui area will be in place or sufficiently committed to service this land in the first half of decade one.
175	E. Email non form	Rodney Local Board	Paul	Wigglesworth		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.6 Don't know/NA	
175	E. Email non form	Rodney Local Board	Paul	Wigglesworth		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East	
175	E. Email non form	Rodney Local Board	Paul	Wigglesworth		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5.3 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East Disagree - Taking too long	
175	E. Email non form	Rodney Local Board	Paul	Wigglesworth		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5.5 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East Disagree - Areas included	The submitter notes that the holdings of a development capable land owner has influenced the sequencing of urbanisation which has resulted in an illogical gap in the sequencing for urbanisation for the Wainui Traiangle. The submitter considered Wainui Road to be a logical northern boundary as it runs down a ridge line.
175	E. Email non form	Rodney Local Board	Paul	Wigglesworth		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.5.2 Future Urban Areas - Wainui East Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Notes that the Wanui Precinct provisions require subdivision and edvelopment to occur in a comprehensive and integrated manner in line with infrastructure (including wastewater, water and transport services). The submitter suggests that the same provisions can be applied to the development of Wainui Triangle. It is highlighted that sufficient water and wastewater capacity exists for upto 2000 homes with targeted upgrades realising capacity for another 5,500 homes. This provides capacity for both the Wainui East Precinct and the development of Wainui Triangle.
								The submitter suggests that the widening of one side of Sidwells Road to accommodate urban developemnt will lead to sub-optimal planning outcomes

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
176	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Kaaren	Rosser	North Shore Aero Club	1. Q1. Overall support	1.6 Don't know/NA	Supports the application of a 'business' area around North Shore Aero Club. Supports the proposed resequencing to bring forward the Sibirsdale-Dairy Flat business area by 15 years.
176	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Kaaren	Rosser	North Shore Aero Club	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.6 Don't know/NA	
176	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Kaaren	Rosser	North Shore Aero Club	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.6 Future Urban Areas - Silverdale - Dairy Flat (Business)	
176	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Kaaren	Rosser	North Shore Aero Club	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.6.9 Future Urban Areas - Silverdale - Dairy Flat (Business) Agree - Other	
176	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Kaaren	Rosser	North Shore Aero Club	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.6.4 Future Urban Areas - Silverdale - Dairy Flat (Business) Disagree - Happening too quick	Notes that bringing the Silverdale-Dairy Flat business area forward has compressed the timeline in which North Shore Aero Club has to plan the airports future. To mitigate this the submitter has requested that an Auckland Council-North Shore Aero Club working group is established immediately to investigate opportunities that will not have an adverse impact on airport operations and future development.
176	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Kaaren	Rosser	North Shore Aero Club	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.6.5 Future Urban Areas - Silverdale - Dairy Flat (Business) Disagree - Areas included	Requests that the defined Silverdale-Dairy Flat business area is extended to the south and south west of the existing area to take into account main take off paths and the predominant flight circuit to the south. The submitter notes that the larger business area would facilitate appropriate economic opportunities. The submitter also states that a larger business area will promote a holistic integrated approach and address competing land uses.
176	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Kaaren	Rosser	North Shore Aero Club	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.6.2 Future Urban Areas - Silverdale - Dairy Flat (Business) Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Highlights that, through the RUB hearings for the Unitary Plan, that it advocated for there to be one structure plan process for Dairy Flat to avoid a piecemeal approach that leads to unintended outcomes. Notes that as the sequencing of the Silverdale-Dairy Flat business area has been brought forward, infrastructure must be provided accordingly. The submitter requests that the airport is included in any discussion about transport infrastructure. Notes that wastewater infrastructure is constrained and a structure plan may need to include the establishment of a wastewater treatment facility close to the airport. The submitter highlights that establishment of business ahead of housing would improve utilisation of State Highway 1. The submitter highlights that the airport has the potential to be a significant regional transport asset and the centre of a major transport hub.

Warkworth

25	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Richard	Griffiths		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	Is strongly opposed to the further development of rural land for urban expansion in the Auckland Region, in particular land around Warkworth, Wellsford and the Mahurangi area. Need to make more efficient use of land and build up, not out, which is not sustainable. Urban sprawl exacerbates the need for expenditure on infrastructure, takes arable land out of productivity and diminishes whatever biodiversity values may still exist in the area. For Auckland to remain a desirable place to live its natural landscapes and character must be retained as far as is possible.
25	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Richard	Griffiths		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
25	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Richard	Griffiths		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	
25	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Richard	Griffiths		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.8 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Other	
25	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Richard	Griffiths		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.1 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North	
25	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Richard	Griffiths		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.1.8 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North Disagree - Other	
25	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Richard	Griffiths		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.2 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North East	Development will add extra congestion, especially during the construction and building stages. States that roading is already poor in the area, that there is insufficient parking, poor pedestrian access and no public transport.
25	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Richard	Griffiths		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.2.8 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North East Disagree - Other	
25	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Richard	Griffiths		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.3 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth South	
52	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Michael	Cronin		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	Concerned with transport infrastructure in Warkworth.
52	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Michael	Cronin		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
52	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Michael	Cronin		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.1 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North	Hlghlights major issues with Hill Road intersection.
52	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Michael	Cronin		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.1.2 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
52	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Michael	Cronin		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.3 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth South	
52	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Michael	Cronin		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.3.2 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth South Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
61	E. Email non form	Rodney Local Board	Roger	Williams		1. Q1. Overall support	1.6 Don't know/NA	Concerned with the potential of major infrastructure issues.
61	E. Email non form	Rodney Local Board	Roger	Williams		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.6 Don't know/NA	
61	E. Email non form	Rodney Local Board	Roger	Williams		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.3 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth South	
61	E. Email non form	Rodney Local Board	Roger	Williams		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.3.2 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth South Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
								States that the proposed population growth in Warkworth South Urban Area will place increased pressure on the Hill Road intersection. Requests that the motorway connection is provided first. Applicant has provided proposed reconfiguration of motorway interchanges as well to free up more land.

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
73	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Roger	Willams	Forest and Bird	1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	
73	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Roger	Willams	Forest and Bird	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.4 Agree	
73	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Roger	Willams	Forest and Bird	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.3 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth South	
73	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Roger	Willams	Forest and Bird	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.3.2 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth South Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Concerned that the Matakana link should now be adjacent to A&P grounds.
73	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Roger	Willams	Forest and Bird	6. General comments not in scope of questions	6.13 Out of scope - other	States that the land is too valuable for future schools who could share sports grounds and parking. Requests Council looks at the provision for the following: Park and Ride Walking and cycle networks Education facilities Parking for CBD Preservation of Warkworth as a Riverbark Town Maintenance of parks
74	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Wayne	Drinnan		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.2 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North East	
74	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Wayne	Drinnan		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.2.3 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North East Disagree - Taking too long	Requests that Warkworth North East be brought forward. States this is due to the area being closes to wastewater upgrades and closest to town.
80	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Burnette	Macnicol	Stubbs Farm Estate and Turnstone Capital Limited	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.2 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North East	
80	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Burnette	Macnicol	Stubbs Farm Estate and Turnstone Capital Limited	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.2.9 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North East Agree - Other	Requests this happens as soon as possible. States that the motorway is already underway, that WaterCare has obtained necessary resource consents, water supply will soon be available and therefore since it is all available Council should start ASAP.
80	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Burnette	Macnicol	Stubbs Farm Estate and Turnstone Capital Limited	1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
80	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Burnette	Macnicol	Stubbs Farm Estate and Turnstone Capital Limited	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
80	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Burnette	Macnicol	Stubbs Farm Estate and Turnstone Capital Limited	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.1 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North	
80	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Burnette	Macnicol	Stubbs Farm Estate and Turnstone Capital Limited	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.1.9 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North Agree - Other	
159	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Shane	Hartley	Brooklyn Farm Ltd	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.2 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North East	
159	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Shane	Hartley	Brooklyn Farm Ltd	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.2.3 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North East Disagree - Taking too long	Requests that north-eastern Warkworth be brought forward to 2022-2026 as in the adopted FULSS.
159	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Shane	Hartley	Brooklyn Farm Ltd	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.2.2 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North East Disagree - Infrastructure issues	This proposed rescheduling in the north-eastern sector of Warkworth does not take into account advanced status of roading, wasterwater and water supply initiatives and the opportunity to complete the collector road network in this sector (as per Supporting Growth); the interrelationship between this infrastructure, and employment and residential integration opportunities in northern Warkworth; and the opportunity to achieve a relatively easy increase in Auckland's housing supply in Warkworth in a location very close (i.e. within walking and cycling distance) to employment, recreation, retail and community activity. Acknowledges existing infrastructure constraints but believes that infrastructure improvement solutions - including roading, water supply and wastewater projects – are well advanced, and ahead of other FULSS sectors, including in southern Warkworth, where urban land activation is now proposed for 2028 – 2033 despite this area being a significant distance from employment and community facilities, and water supply, wastewater and roading infrastructure.

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
165	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	W D	McKenzie	Karariki Ltd	1. Q1. Overall support	1.6 Don't know/NA	Requests Warkworth North East should be developed in 2022-2027, in its original sequencing position, in conjunction with Warkworth North as it will use the same infrastructure, in particular roading and wastewater.
165	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	W D	McKenzie	Karariki Ltd	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.6 Don't know/NA	
165	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	W D	McKenzie	Karariki Ltd	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.2 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North East	
165	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	W D	McKenzie	Karariki Ltd	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.2.3 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North East Disagree - Taking too long	
								Believes earlier development complies with principles in the FULSS.
170	D. Email form	Rodney Local Board	David	Hay	One Warkworth Business Association	1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	The submitter considers the timing of Warkworth is too conservative and does not reflect the current growth, and more rapid growth that will occur within the next three years.
170	D. Email form	Rodney Local Board	David	Hay	One Warkworth Business Association	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
170	D. Email form	Rodney Local Board	David	Hay	One Warkworth Business Association	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.1 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North	
170	D. Email form	Rodney Local Board	David	Hay	One Warkworth Business Association	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.1.3 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North Disagree - Taking too long	
170	D. Email form	Rodney Local Board	David	Hay	One Warkworth Business Association	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.2 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North East	The submitter considers the timing of Warkworth is too conservative and does not reflect the current growth, and more rapid growth that will occur within the next three years.
170	D. Email form	Rodney Local Board	David	Hay	One Warkworth Business Association	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.2.3 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North East Disagree - Taking too long	
170	D. Email form	Rodney Local Board	David	Hay	One Warkworth Business Association	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.3 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth South	The submitter considers the timing of Warkworth is too conservative and does not reflect the current growth, and more rapid growth that will occur within the next three years.
170	D. Email form	Rodney Local Board	David	Hay	One Warkworth Business Association	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.3.3 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth South Disagree - Taking too long	
170	D. Email form	Rodney Local Board	David	Hay	One Warkworth Business Association	6. General comments not in scope of questions	6.8 Council process	The submitter seeks that the development of a structure plan for Warkworth needs to be prioritised by council and initiated by the end of 2017. The submitter notes that through the structure plan process the live-zoning of future urban areas may be further refined.
178	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Bill	Endean		1. Q1. Overall support	1.6 Don't know/NA	Requests that the development of Valerie Close is brought forward from the first half of decade two to the first half decade one to coincide with the completion of the motorway in 2021.
178	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Bill	Endean		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.6 Don't know/NA	
178	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Bill	Endean		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.1 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North	
178	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Bill	Endean		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.1.3 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North Disagree - Taking too long	
178	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Bill	Endean		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.1.2 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Believes that bringing the development of Valerie Close forward would not impact on the Hill Street Intersection due to its location in Warkworth South.
187	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Allan	Bell		6. General comments not in scope of questions	6.13 Out of scope - other	Believes that Watercare is contributing to the shortage of land for housing
187	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Allan	Bell		6. General comments not in scope of questions	6.4 Schooling/Education	Requests that 230ha east of Keri Hill is included as it is already serviced by infrastructure, schools, community facilities and public transport
188	A. Online Form	Rodney Local Board	David	Hay		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.1.3 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North Disagree - Taking Too Long	Notes that they are underutilised education facilities and vacant educational land near the 230ha piece of land east of Keri Hill.
188	A. Online Form	Rodney Local Board	David	Hay		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.2.3 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North EastDisagree - Taking Too Long	Notes that the current timing for development in Warkworth does not reflect the current or expected rate of growth. Requests that Spaital and Structure Planning commences now to reflect current growth demands and to ensure infrsatructure is provided.
188	A. Online Form	Rodney Local Board	David	Hay		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.3.3 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth South Disagree - Taking Too Long	Notes that the current timing for development in Warkworth does not reflect the current or expected rate of growth. Requests that Spaital and Structure Planning commences now to reflect current growth demands and to ensure infrsatructure is provided.

North West

Kumeu Huapai Riverhead

18	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Dave	Smith		1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	Concern that roading infrastructure will not be in place.
18	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Dave	Smith		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
18	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Dave	Smith		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu	
18	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Dave	Smith		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10.2 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu Disagree Infrastructure	
18	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Dave	Smith		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10.8 Future Urban Areas - Disagree - Kumeu - Other	
30	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	JI YEON	HA		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	Disagrees with Huapai Kumeu as the area is a flood plain. Notes concern that the flood plain has been filled at maddren site and the impact this will have on others living along the river. More flood plain work needs to be done to mitigate this. Also believes that more productive land for food and green belts are needed therefore this area should be left out. Concerned with immigration.
30	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	JI YEON	HA		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
30	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	JI YEON	HA		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu	
30	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	JI YEON	HA		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10.2 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
								Requests that Kumeu Huapai Riverhead area be brought forward.
								Concerned with lack of infrastructure and the current transport issues the area is facing and believes bypass should be built now as area currently faces congestion issues.
								Believes that pushing the date back further will create a bigge rdiscrepancy with the living in the rest of Auckland and landowners in the area have been waiting a long time. Notes that now is the cheapest time to invest and build.
66	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Trevor	Canty	The Neil Group Limited	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.9 Future Urban Areas - Riverhead	

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
66	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Trevor	Canty	The Neil Group Limited	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.9.3 Future Urban Areas - Riverhead Disagree - Taking too long	Requests that Riverehead be brought forward. States that the location should be assessed seperately from Kumeu and Huapai as it already has the necessary transport infrastructure requirements in comparison to Kumeu and Huapai.
71	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Monte	Neal		1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	
71	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Monte	Neal		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
71	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Monte	Neal		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu	
71	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Monte	Neal		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10.2 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
71	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Monte	Neal		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10.3 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu Disagree - Taking too long	
71	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Monte	Neal		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.8.2 Future Urban Areas - Huapai Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Requests that land should be put aside for schooling. Requests that the Huapai bypass be brought forward. Requests that the future urban area needs to be rezoned as industrial to create employment opportunities. Requests that the northern interceptor needs to be brought forward. Requests that Huapai be re-assessed every two years.
71	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Monte	Neal		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.8.3 Future Urban Areas - Huapai Disagree - Taking too long	
71	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Monte	Neal		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.9 Future Urban Areas - Riverhead	
71	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Monte	Neal		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.9.2 Future Urban Areas - Riverhead Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
71	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Monte	Neal		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.9.3 Future Urban Areas - Riverhead Disagree - Taking too long	
71	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Monte	Neal		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.8 Future Urban Areas - Huapai	
89	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Bunty	Condon	Burns Oraha Residents Group	1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
89	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Bunty	Condon	Burns Oraha Residents Group	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
89	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Bunty	Condon	Burns Oraha Residents Group	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu	
89	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Bunty	Condon	Burns Oraha Residents Group	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10.2 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
89	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Bunty	Condon	Burns Oraha Residents Group	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.8 Future Urban Areas - Huapai	
89	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Bunty	Condon	Burns Oraha Residents Group	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.8.2 Future Urban Areas - Huapai Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Concerned with lack of infrastructure, particularly transport systems and the ability for current systems to service more growth.
89	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Bunty	Condon	Burns Oraha Residents Group	6. General comments not in scope of questions	6.8 Council process	
91	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Janice	Soufflot		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
91	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Janice	Soufflot		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.5 Strongly agree	
92	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Ian	Dutton		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
92	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Ian	Dutton		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
92	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Ian	Dutton		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu	
92	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Ian	Dutton		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10.2 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Concerned that the only solution to road transport issues is an extension of the existing motorway up Old North Road - going firstly through Helensville and then to Wellsford. States that this would then not be flood prone.
92	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Ian	Dutton		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10.3 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu Disagree - Taking too long	Requests their property at 174 Access Road, Kumeu be brought forward. States they had initially been rezoned as Future Urban and are now being subject to further delay and in total they would have been zoned Future Urban for 28-32 years.
92	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Ian	Dutton		6. General comments not in scope of questions	6.8 Council process	Concerned that Council has zoned their property as "potential business" and that it should be zoned as "large lots". States that this is because it has some of the best land in Kumeu, north facing, fertile soils, not under power pylons and would retain the rural character.
95	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Theresa	Smith		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
95	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Theresa	Smith		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
95	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Theresa	Smith		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu	
95	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Theresa	Smith		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10.2 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Concerned that there will be infrastructure issues with more development.
95	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Theresa	Smith		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10.8 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu Disagree - Other	
95	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Theresa	Smith		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.8 Future Urban Areas - Huapai	
95	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Theresa	Smith		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.8.2 Future Urban Areas - Huapai Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Concerned that there will be infrastructure issues with more development.
95	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Theresa	Smith		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.8.8 Future Urban Areas - Huapai Disagree - Other	Requests that Kumeu and Huapai be left as a semi-rural town, food production area and horticultural land. Requests that the timing of Kumeu be brought forward to first half decade one 2018-2022. The submitter disagrees that limited transport accessibility to/from the area is a sufficient reason to withhold the area. Believes significant investment has already taken place to improve transport networks nearby, such as upper harbour motorway, northwestern extension to brigham creek road and the waterview connection and associated widening.
166	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Brian William	Putt	Green Desert Ltd and D E Nakhle Investement Trust	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu	Requests that the timing of Kumeu be brought forward to first half decade one 2018-2022. The submitter disagrees that limited transport accessibility to/from the area is a sufficient reason to withhold the area. Believes significant investment has already taken place to improve transport networks nearby, such as upper harbour motorway, northwestern extension to brigham creek road and the waterview connection and associated widening.
166	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Brian William	Putt	Green Desert Ltd and D E Nakhle Investement Trust	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10.3 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu Disagree - Taking too long	
166	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Brian William	Putt	Green Desert Ltd and D E Nakhle Investement Trust	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.8 Future Urban Areas - Huapai	Requests that the timing of Huapai be brought forward to first half decade one 2018-2022. The submitter disagrees that limited transport accessibility to/from the area is a sufficient reason to withhold the area. Believes significant investment has already taken place to improve transport networks nearby, such as upper harbour motorway, northwestern extension to brigham creek road and the waterview connection and associated widening.
166	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Brian William	Putt	Green Desert Ltd and D E Nakhle Investement Trust	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.8.3 Future Urban Areas - Huapai Disagree - Taking too long	

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
166	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Brian William	Putt	Green Desert Ltd and D E Nakhle Investement Trust	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.9 Future Urban Areas - Riverhead	Requests that the timing of Riverhead be brought forward to first half decade one 2018-2022. The submitter disagrees that limited transport accessibility to/from the area is a sufficient reason to withhold the area. Believes significant investment has already taken place to improve transport networks nearby, such as upper harbour motorway, northwestern extension to brigham creek road and the waterview connection and associated widening.
166	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Brian William	Putt	Green Desert Ltd and D E Nakhle Investement Trust	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.9.3 Future Urban Areas - Riverhead Disagree - Taking too long	

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
Whenuapai Red Hills								
21	A. Online form	Upper Harbour Local Board	Yong	Liu		1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	
21	A. Online form	Upper Harbour Local Board	Yong	Liu		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
21	A. Online form	Upper Harbour Local Board	Yong	Liu		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.14 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 2	
21	A. Online form	Upper Harbour Local Board	Yong	Liu		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.14.3 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 2 Disagree - Taking too long	Requests that Whenuapai stage2 be moved forward to Decade One 1st half 2018-2022. Some sites in the aera could be developed without additional infrastructure as current transportation infrastructure supports the growth in this area, and the wastewater infrastructure is avaiable on both Brigham Creek Rd and Dale Rd and would help address housing demand.
23	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Michael	Lasham		1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	
23	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Michael	Lasham		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
23	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Michael	Lasham		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.18 Rural Settlements General North-West	
23	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Michael	Lasham		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.18.2 Rural Settlements General North-West Disagree - Infrastructure issues	No future urban areas in the north west should go ahead until roading infrastructure is put in place to cope with the increased demand that the housing will create.
23	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Michael	Lasham		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.27 Future Urban Areas - General North-West	
23	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Michael	Lasham		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.27.2 Future Urban Areas - General North-West Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
d	A. Online form	Waitakere Ranges Local Board	Michael	Wu		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
32	A. Online form	Waitakere Ranges Local Board	Michael	Wu		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
32	A. Online form	Waitakere Ranges Local Board	Michael	Wu		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.1 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North	
32	A. Online form	Waitakere Ranges Local Board	Michael	Wu		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.1.2 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
32	A. Online form	Waitakere Ranges Local Board	Michael	Wu		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.1.4 Future Urban Areas - Warkworth North Disagree - Happening too quick	
32	A. Online form	Waitakere Ranges Local Board	Michael	Wu		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu	
32	A. Online form	Waitakere Ranges Local Board	Michael	Wu		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10.2 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
32	A. Online form	Waitakere Ranges Local Board	Michael	Wu		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10.3 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu Disagree - Taking too long	
32	A. Online form	Waitakere Ranges Local Board	Michael	Wu		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.11 Future Urban Areas - Red Hills North	
32	A. Online form	Waitakere Ranges Local Board	Michael	Wu		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.11.2 Future Urban Areas - Red Hills North Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
32	A. Online form	Waitakere Ranges Local Board	Michael	Wu		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.11.3 Future Urban Areas - Red Hills North Disagree - Taking too long	
32	A. Online form	Waitakere Ranges Local Board	Michael	Wu		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.14 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 2	
32	A. Online form	Waitakere Ranges Local Board	Michael	Wu		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.14.2 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 2 Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Requests that Whenuapai Stage 2 not be delayed as government and local council have spent billions on the Waterview access and update of SH16.
32	A. Online form	Waitakere Ranges Local Board	Michael	Wu		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.14.3 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 2 Disagree - Taking too long	
62	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Wesley	Gerber	Stakeholders in Whenuapai Stage 2	1. Q1. Overall support	1.6 Don't know/NA	
62	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Wesley	Gerber	Stakeholders in Whenuapai Stage 2	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.6 Don't know/NA	
62	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Wesley	Gerber	Stakeholders in Whenuapai Stage 2	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.27 Future Urban Areas - General North-West	
62	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Wesley	Gerber	Stakeholders in Whenuapai Stage 2	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.27.2 Future Urban Areas - General North-West Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Concerned with infrastructure constraints.
								States that with over 15,000 new homes proposed over the next 10 years in North West, the area will require more infrastructure.
65	A. Online form	Upper Harbour Local Board	Alastair	Kent-Johnston	Riverlea Road & Totara Road landowners	1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	
65	A. Online form	Upper Harbour Local Board	Alastair	Kent-Johnston	Riverlea Road & Totara Road landowners	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
65	A. Online form	Upper Harbour Local Board	Alastair	Kent-Johnston	Riverlea Road & Totara Road landowners	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.14 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 2	
65	A. Online form	Upper Harbour Local Board	Alastair	Kent-Johnston	Riverlea Road & Totara Road landowners	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.14.2 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 2 Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Disagrees with the wastewater design solution for Whenuapai Stage Two and proposes a new connection for traffic congestion.
								Proposes a new solution that involves pumping and gravity reticulation connecting the proposed pump station WH-12 in Totara Road directly to the existing Pump Station at the eastern end of Brigham Creek Road near the intersection with Kauri Road. This Pump Station will connect to Stage One of the Northern Interceptor which would enable development of Whenuapai Stage 2 to commence in the second half of Decade One.
								Proposes that there needs to be a direct link between the southbound lanes of SH16 to the eastbound lanes of SH18 and this will alleviate traffic issues.
65	A. Online form	Upper Harbour Local Board	Alastair	Kent-Johnston	Riverlea Road & Totara Road landowners	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.14.3 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 2 Disagree - Taking too long	Requests Whenuapai Stage 2 be brought forward to Decade One.
								States that this will enable the area to be included in the Whenuapai Structure Plan and will therefore accelerate the supply of residential housing.

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
66	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Trevor	Canty	The Neil Group Limited	1. Q1. Overall support	1.6 Don't know/NA	Requests Whenuapai Stage 2 to be brought forward to Decade One. This is due to the completion of the Northern Interceptor Stage 1.
66	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Trevor	Canty	The Neil Group Limited	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.6 Don't know/NA	
66	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Trevor	Canty	The Neil Group Limited	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.14 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 2	
66	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Trevor	Canty	The Neil Group Limited	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.14.3 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 2 Disagree - Taking too long	
66	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Trevor	Canty	The Neil Group Limited	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26 Future Urban Areas - General North	Requests Council to reconsider allocating \$3.8 - 4.5 billion in the North in Decade One. States it is uneconomic to do so.
66	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Trevor	Canty	The Neil Group Limited	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26.8 Future Urban Areas - General North Disagree - Other	
66	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Trevor	Canty	The Neil Group Limited	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.27 Future Urban Areas - General North-West	Requests Council brings forward "big ticket" infrastructure in one high priority location (North West) at the expense of other locations. Requests that the FULSS assesses how it defines what "development ready" means.
66	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Trevor	Canty	The Neil Group Limited	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.27.3 Future Urban Areas - General North-West Disagree - Taking too long	
66	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Trevor	Canty	The Neil Group Limited	5. Background	5.1 Text error/content/map	States that "development ready" should mean the stock of consented house sites, together with land that is readily convertible to house sites with bulk services and roading connections already in place. This needs to take into account the lead time between live zoning occurring and the date that the houses could feasibly be built.
66	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Trevor	Canty	The Neil Group Limited	5. Background	5.2 Council should be doing this	Requests Council better articulates the costs and timings of infrastructure delivery using detailed location by location analysis for each future Greenfield land area. States Council should be promoting the areas with the lowest marginal infrastructure capital costs per HUE. Requests Council should use a 'use it or lose it' approach when opening up more land so it encourages development as early as possible so it discourages land-banking and promotes rationing the supply. Requests that there should be more flexibility in the FULSS refresh to allow for land to be rezoned and developed if it can be demonstrated that infrastructure issues can be overcome - this would create a more proactive plan addressing housing shortage in a less rigid manner. Requests Council considers the possibility that some areas are uneconomic to service unless 100% developer funded.
66	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Trevor	Canty	The Neil Group Limited	6. General comments not in scope of questions	6.8 Council process	Requests that the FULSS Refresh is deferred. States that Council should only be progressing this when population projections have been updated, the Auckland Plan completed, the housing shortfall plan is accurately assessed, and until a market driven analysis of the Unitary Plan capacity has been completed to test the 70:30 split between Urban and Greenfields. States that Council should research the number of house sites likely to be developed in the whole First Decade schedule and then assess whether or not enough land has been included - and that this process should involve consultation with existing land owners and developers to better understand the drivers of supply.
93	A. Online form	Henderson-Massey Local Board	Stephanie	Woodward		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	Requests Whenuapai Stage 2 be brought forward. States there have been big decisions made by their family based on being told that Whenuapai Stage 2 would be live-zoned in June 2017 but now it has been changed.
93	A. Online form	Henderson-Massey Local Board	Stephanie	Woodward		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
93	A. Online form	Henderson-Massey Local Board	Stephanie	Woodward		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.14 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 2	
93	A. Online form	Henderson-Massey Local Board	Stephanie	Woodward		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.14.3 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 2 Disagree - Taking too long	
94	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Timothy	Reuben		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	Requests Whenuapai Stage 2 be brought forward. States that their family has made decisions based on being told it would be live-zoned in June 2017 but now it has all changed. States that we should be hurrying up development and we cannot delay it any further.
94	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Timothy	Reuben		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
94	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Timothy	Reuben		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.14 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 2	
94	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Timothy	Reuben		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.14.3 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 2 Disagree - Taking too long	

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
162	E. Email non form	Waitemata Local Board	Catherine	Raeburn	Kennedy Road Landowners Group	1. Q1. Overall support	1.6 Don't know/NA	
162	E. Email non form	Waitemata Local Board	Catherine	Raeburn	Kennedy Road Landowners Group	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.6 Don't know/NA	
162	E. Email non form	Waitemata Local Board	Catherine	Raeburn	Kennedy Road Landowners Group	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.13 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 1	
162	E. Email non form	Waitemata Local Board	Catherine	Raeburn	Kennedy Road Landowners Group	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.13.8 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 1 Disagree - Other	Requests that subject site at Kennedys Road be included in Whenuapai Stage 1 and not Whenuapai Stage 2. Whenuapai Structure Plan and existing FULSS indicate land would be available in 2-10 years. Believes there are no fundamental constraints to urban development as sufficient capacity is available in the existing Whenuapai Pump Station to provide wastewater servicing for development of the subject land. Development is not reliant on the Northern Interceptor being in place; AT and NZTA have indicated that development of approximately 200-300 dwellings could occur within the subject land prior to key transport upgrades being in place. Development of the 1,000 dwelling capacity could be staged commensurate with transport capacity as key transport network upgrades are undertaken (subject to developer-led local network upgrades). This approach is taken in the Redhills Precinct and the draft Whenuapai Plan Change, and can therefore be extended to Stage 1F, enabling development to commence from 2018; there are no fundamental water, stormwater or network utilities infrastructure constraints to urban development of the subject land. Houses would be delivered: Decade One 1st Half "Development Ready" areas should focus on land where the landowners and market are likely to deliver housing supply on the ground. The landowners in the Kennedys Road area have signed a Memorandum of Understanding. They are coordinated and motivated to develop their landholdings.
164	A. Online form	Upper Harbour Local Board	Mark and Sherrie	Dawe		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
164	A. Online form	Upper Harbour Local Board	Mark and Sherrie	Dawe		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
164	A. Online form	Upper Harbour Local Board	Mark and Sherrie	Dawe		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.13 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 1	
164	A. Online form	Upper Harbour Local Board	Mark and Sherrie	Dawe		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.13.3 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 1 Disagree - Taking too long	We agree with the original timeframe of Whenuapai 2017-2021 not the refreshed time frame of 2028-2032. (see full submission for more details)
164	A. Online form	Upper Harbour Local Board	Mark and Sherrie	Dawe		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.14 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 2	
164	A. Online form	Upper Harbour Local Board	Mark and Sherrie	Dawe		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.14.2 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 2 Disagree - Infrastructure issues	The main constraint for the development of Whenuapai is the wastewater capacity.
164	A. Online form	Upper Harbour Local Board	Mark and Sherrie	Dawe		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.14.3 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 2 Disagree - Taking too long	We propose that at least part of Whenuapai Stage 2 be brought forward to coincide with development of the passing infrastructure.
166	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Brian William	Putt	Green Desert Ltd and D E Nakhle Investement Trust	1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
166	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Brian William	Putt	Green Desert Ltd and D E Nakhle Investement Trust	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	Bringing the development ready timeframes for the future urban area at Wainui East/ Upper Orewa forward is a proactive and practical approach to enable efficient use of the land resource, efficient use of infrastructure upgrades and achieve a compact urba
166	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Brian William	Putt	Green Desert Ltd and D E Nakhle Investement Trust	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.10 Future Urban Areas - Kumeu	
177	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Rebecca	Davies	New Zealand Defence Force	1. Q1. Overall support	1.6 Don't know/NA	
177	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Rebecca	Davies	New Zealand Defence Force	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.6 Don't know/NA	
177	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Rebecca	Davies	New Zealand Defence Force	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.14 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 2	
177	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Rebecca	Davies	New Zealand Defence Force	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.14.8 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 2 Disagree - Other	Highlights its critical concerns relating to reverse sensitivity of development on New Zealand Defence Force operations at the Whenuapai Airbase. Concerns include the reverse sensitivity effects of noise and amenity expectations of new residents. Notes other potential effects on Whenuapai Airbase which include the development of permanent and/or temporary structures that create a hazard for aircraft operations, the increased risk of bird strike due to the change in habitat, earthworks, creation of wetlands, ecological, vegetated areas, open space, water features and potential roosting and nesting sites, and the effects of lighting, glare and building reflectivity which impacts on aircraft navigation and safety.
177	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Rebecca	Davies	New Zealand Defence Force	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.14.9 Future Urban Areas - Whenuapai Stage 2 Agree - Other	Supports the exclusion of the Whenuapai Airbase from the Strategy
20	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Raewyn	Davies		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.21 Rural settlements - Other comment	Believes that the area (no specifics) has insufficient infrastructure to cope with the proposed increase in population with insufficient roading, pubic transport etc. This needs to be addressed before additional housing/settlement.
20	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Raewyn	Davies		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.30 Future Urban Areas - Other comment	
South								
Takinini Drury Opaheke								
28	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Ben	Ross		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.17 Future Urban Areas - Takanini	
28	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Ben	Ross		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.20 Future Urban Areas - Drury West Stage 1	
28	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Ben	Ross		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.16 Future Urban Areas - Puhinui	
28	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Ben	Ross		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.20.9 Future Urban Areas - Drury West Stage 1 Agree - Other	Believes that all of Drury West could be brought online if Pukekohe Electrification is complete and the two new stations in Drury and Paerata are built. This needs to be done ASAP so all of Drury West can be brought online right through Decade One rather than the two decade split.
28	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Ben	Ross		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.17.9 Future Urban Areas - Takanini Agree - Other	Takanini could be brought online as soon as the Southern Interceptor is upgraded. The area will not be suited to housing but is suited to light industry, light industry the South could do with to support jobs.

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
28	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Ben	Ross		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.16.9 Future Urban Areas - Puhinui Agree - Other	Puhinui (housing industrial land) should also be brought online as fast as possible (as soon as SH20B is upgraded and the Airport to Manukau bus way is built) to release that land for growing industrial use in the South (given industry like to have certainty on land supply).

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
33	A. Online form	Manurewa Local Board	Jon	Maplesden		1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	
33	A. Online form	Manurewa Local Board	Jon	Maplesden		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
33	A. Online form	Manurewa Local Board	Jon	Maplesden		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.16 Future Urban Areas - Puhinui	
33	A. Online form	Manurewa Local Board	Jon	Maplesden		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.16.8 Future Urban Areas - Puhinui Disagree - Other	Requests content to be corrected.
								States that the Puhinui North location is shown outside the RUB and identified as now being Partially Operative. This decision of council was contrary to the I.H.P. recommendations and has been appealed to the Environment Court. Depending on the outcome, some land would be available for sequencing for development at an early date.
33	A. Online form	Manurewa Local Board	Jon	Maplesden		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.17 Future Urban Areas - Takanini	
33	A. Online form	Manurewa Local Board	Jon	Maplesden		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.17.8 Future Urban Areas - Takanini Disagree - Other	Requests area division to be revised.
								Concerned that Takanini needs to be divided into North and South, since they have totally different soil types and other characteristics.
107	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Fu-Hsing	Lin		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
107	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Fu-Hsing	Lin		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
107	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Fu-Hsing	Lin		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.19 Future Urban Areas - Opaheke-Drury	
107	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Fu-Hsing	Lin		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.19.3 Future Urban Areas - Opaheke-Drury Disagree - Taking too long	Requests Opaheke be brought forward.
								States that it is closer to the city than areas like Drury South.
								They have a piece of land that they want to develop in the area too.
150	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Chih-Han	Tseng		1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	
150	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Chih-Han	Tseng		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
150	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Chih-Han	Tseng		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.17 Future Urban Areas - Takanini	
150	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Chih-Han	Tseng		d	4.17.3 Future Urban Areas - Takanini Disagree - Taking too long	Requests that the Takanini area be moved forward to Decade Two 2nd half 2027-2031 as per current FULSS.
150	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Chih-Han	Tseng		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.17.2 Future Urban Areas - Takanini Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Concerned that the public and any stakeholders within that area will not be able to formulate a proper feedback or submission without the results of the stormwater analysis done by the Council as these are not yet available to the public. Feels that it is inappropriate in my view to push the sequencing back without further investigations (and the information made available) and without further exploration of development options with large landowners and stakeholders in the area. Such exploration may possibly lead to alternative stormwater solutions so the cost and the burden of stormwater solution may not be as high and does not rest entirely on the Council.
151	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Barry	Robinson		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
151	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Barry	Robinson		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
151	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Barry	Robinson		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.19 Future Urban Areas - Opaheke-Drury	
151	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Barry	Robinson		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.19.3 Future Urban Areas - Opaheke-Drury Disagree - Taking too long	Requests that timing for Opaheke-Drury be brought forward as much as possible to allow the community to grow in a planned and well-managed way.
151	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Barry	Robinson		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.19.2 Future Urban Areas - Opaheke-Drury Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Drury West has encountered major traffic and infrastructure problems.
154	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Victoria	Ross		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
154	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Victoria	Ross		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
154	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Victoria	Ross		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.19 Future Urban Areas - Opaheke-Drury	
154	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Victoria	Ross		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.19.3 Future Urban Areas - Opaheke-Drury Disagree - Taking too long	Requests that Opaheke-Drury be moved for earlier development than 2028-2032. Considers suitable due to easy access on/off the motorway; shopping in Papakura, and would support Papakura, as well as Drury. Would provide more housing. Housing will be required to people working at the Stevenson's development.
166	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Brian William	Putt		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.17 Future Urban Areas - Takanini	
166	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Brian William	Putt		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.17.3 Future Urban Areas - Takanini Disagree - Taking too long	Requests that the timing of Takanini area be brought forward to second half decade one 2023-27. This would provide the practical lead time for the infrastructural improvements necessary to achieve a sustainable urban environment on both sides of Mill Road.
166	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Brian William	Putt		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	6.13 Out of scope - other	Requests that an area east of Mill Road not currently zoned Future Urban, be included in the FULSS.

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
168	E. Email non form	Franklin Local Board	Charles	Ma		1. Q1. Overall support	1.6 Don't know/NA	The submitter agrees with the timing of Drury West Stage 1 in first half decade one 2018-2022 but disagrees with the qualification that Drury West Stage 1 will only be development ready in 2022. The submitter reasons that an earlier timing will allow them to recoup earlier the costs of infrastructure scaled for a larger geography, for which spend has already been committed on their part. The submitter has purchased over 150ha of land at Drury West and invested in hard infrastructure in a way that future-proofs capacity for additional development in the wider Drury area and serves an area beyond its own SHA development catchment (\$17M). For example, the bulk water supply has been planned with Watercare so that the Drury West Future Urban Zone, together with the Hingaia Peninsula are served; the wastewater pipelines have been planned to serve the equivalent of 6,500 houses. The submitter has invested an additional \$3M for bridge upgrades over the motorway at Bremner Road.
168	E. Email non form	Franklin Local Board	Charles	Ma		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.6 Don't know/NA	
168	E. Email non form	Franklin Local Board	Charles	Ma		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.20 Future Urban Areas - Drury West Stage 1	
168	E. Email non form	Franklin Local Board	Charles	Ma		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.20.3 Future Urban Areas - Drury West Stage 1 Disagree - Taking too long	
168	E. Email non form	Franklin Local Board	Charles	Ma		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.20.5 Future Urban Areas - Drury West Stage 1 Disagree - Areas included	The submitter reasons that the cost of this infrastructure means that more homes need to be delivered earlier to cover the additional infrastructure costs. The submitter requests that around 65-70ha of land adjoining the existing Bremner Road SHA at Drury West be brought forward. The submitter does not consider that the proposed extension for more homes on 65-70ha at Drury West 1 will impact on the outcomes that may be sought through a comprehensive structure planning exercise for the whole of the Drury/Opaheke area identified by Council.
172	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Catherine	Reaburn	Kiwi Property Group Limited	1. Q1. Overall support	1.6 Don't know/NA	Requests that the timing of approximately 140ha of land within the Drury/Opaheke area be brought forward to first half decade one 2018-2022. Enabling urbanisation of the land will provide for the logical connection between the existing Drury urban area and Drury South industrial and residential precincts. This would provide for more efficient infrastructure benefits as a technically and economically feasible solution to providing water and wastewater infrastructure to the proposed town centre site has been developed, following discussions with Watercare, Drury South Ltd. and Auranga. The solution is not reliant on any unfunded or broader capacity upgrades. The submitter considers there is therefore no fundamental infrastructure constraint to enabling development. Further, the submitter argues that it would be an efficient use of physical resources to leverage from the infrastructure currently being provided to the Drury South development, by ensuring it is sized to service the subject land, rather than require retrospective upgrades later. The submitter considers identifying this land as development ready in 2018-2022 will enable the detailed structure planning of this environment to take place alongside the Auranga land. The submitter considers this land to be a desirable location for a town centre, and that earlier timing will be a catalyst for the Drury Train Station and associated projects including electrification of the NIMT and provision of a bus interchange and park and ride facility, with will provide for development in the broader Drury West/Drury/Opaheke areas. Furthermore, the submitter considers that there are no fundamental environmental or natural hazard constraints to development; from a technical or economic perspective.
172	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Catherine	Reaburn	Kiwi Property Group Limited	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.6 Don't know/NA	
172	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Catherine	Reaburn	Kiwi Property Group Limited	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.19 Future Urban Areas - Opaheke-Drury	
172	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Catherine	Reaburn	Kiwi Property Group Limited	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.19.3 Future Urban Areas - Opaheke-Drury Disagree - Taking too long	
78	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Euan	Williams	Fulton Hogan	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.19.3 Future Urban Areas - Opaheke-Drury	Requests that Opaheke-Drury be brought forward in the sequencing and immediately live zoned. The submission includes analysis by specialists that believe that there are no transportation, ecological, or economic impediments to commence the Drury East structure planning and plan change process in Decade 1.
78	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Euan	Williams	Fulton Hogan	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.19.2 Future Urban Areas - Opaheke-Drury Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Believes that there are no bulk water or wastewater infrastructure constraints to restrict the residential land being brought forward for immediate live zoning and development. Also notes that there are there are sufficient stormwater management solutions available to support the immediate development of the Drury East area earlier than planned.
78	A. Online form	Not Supplied	Euan	Williams	Fulton Hogan	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.19.5 Future Urban Areas - Opaheke-Drury Disagree - Areas included	

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
174	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Ian	Blundell	Mark Wheeler	1. Q1. Overall support	1.6 Don't know/NA	Requests that the timing of the Drury/Opaheke Future Urban Zone be brought forward to Decade 1 first half (2018-2022), or the land bordered by Opaheke road to the north and Sutton road to the south be brought forward to decade 1 - First Half (2018-2022). Key reasons being that 201 Opeaheke Road has: -There is existing transport infrastructure, - Existing water and wastewater reticulation servicing the submission site - Excellent drainage, geology and topography, - An ability to support the large employment areas in Opaheke and Drury South - Lower land values while being infrastructure ready, ideal for quality/affordable housing. (see full submission for more details)
174	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Ian	Blundell	Mark Wheeler	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.6 Don't know/NA	
174	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Ian	Blundell	Mark Wheeler	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.19 Future Urban Areas - Opaheke-Drury	
174			Ian	Blundell	Mark Wheeler	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.19.3 Future Urban Areas - Opaheke-Drury Disagree - Taking too long	
174	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Ian	Blundell	Mark Wheeler	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.19.5 Future Urban Areas - Opaheke-Drury Disagree - Areas included	
174	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Ian	Blundell	Mark Wheeler	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.19.2 Future Urban Areas - Opaheke-Drury Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
174	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Ian	Blundell	Mark Wheeler	6. General comments not in scope of questions	6.2 Housing affordability	Notes that the adjacent Opaheke Park defined in the Strategy Refresh as 'Existing Urban Area' still has no confirmed wastewater and water reticulation time frame. This seems at odds with the significant demand for the Park by the existing local communities and sports groups who wish to use the park as its base. The submitter would like the Council to consider bringing reticulation for the park forward, to align with the recommended 2018 – 2022 sequencing.
174	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Ian	Blundell	Mark Wheeler			Considers that there will remain a significant shortage of affordable housing in the southern growth areas for another decade with the current strategy as planned. Drury West FUZ has been brought forward to Decade 1 and is being fast tracked for release via the Bremner Rd Special Housing Area. However, the submitter argues that given its [Bremner Rd Special Housing Area's] market attractiveness it is unlikely to provide any affordable housing.

Pukekohe Paerata

51	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Derek	Smith		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.25 Future Urban Areas - Pukekohe	Concerned that Pukekohe should be bought forward and sequenced the same time as Paerata.
51	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Derek	Smith		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.25.3 Future Urban Areas - Pukekohe Disagree - Taking too long	
53	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Mark	Tregidga		1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	Requests Pukekohe be bought forward. These comments specifically relate to Grace James Road and William Andrew Road. Applicant states that water, waste water and stormwater services is all already there. The roads are the highest quality in all of Pukekohe, the area has all the main school bus routes and public transport routes, due to being close to Pukekohe township there are sufficient employment opportunities, the area requires low investment from Council.
53	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Mark	Tregidga		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
53	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Mark	Tregidga		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.24 Future Urban Areas - Paerata	
53	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Mark	Tregidga		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.25.2 Future Urban Areas - Paerata Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
53	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Mark	Tregidga		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.25.3 Future Urban Areas - Paerata Disagree - Taking too long	
53	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Mark	Tregidga		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.25.3 Future Urban Areas - Paerata Disagree - Taking too long	
54	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Grant Wayne	Fausett		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	Requests Pukekohe be brought forward. These comments specifically relate to Grace James Road and William Andrew Road areas. The applicant states there are already all the services available for development, school bus routes and close to schools, it is believe to be an attractive place to live, the area requires low investment from Council.
54	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Grant Wayne	Fausett		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	
54	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Grant Wayne	Fausett		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.25 Future Urban Areas - Pukekohe	
54	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Grant Wayne	Fausett		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.25.3 Future Urban Areas - Pukekohe Disagree - Taking too long	
60	E. Email non form	Franklin Local Board	Craig	Forrester		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	Applicant owns 2ha of land there which is ready to be developed.
60	E. Email non form	Franklin Local Board	Craig	Forrester		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	Requests Pukekohe be brought forward. These comments relate specifically to Grace James Road and William Andrew Road. States the area is already developed and requires little investment from Council.
60	E. Email non form	Franklin Local Board	Craig	Forrester		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.25 Future Urban Areas - Pukekohe	
60	E. Email non form	Franklin Local Board	Craig	Forrester		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.25.3 Future Urban Areas - Pukekohe Disagree - Taking too long	
60	E. Email non form	Franklin Local Board	Craig	Forrester		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.25.3 Future Urban Areas - Pukekohe Disagree - Taking too long	

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
128	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Ian	McAlley		1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	
128	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Ian	McAlley		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
128	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Ian	McAlley		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.25 Future Urban Areas - Pukekohe	
128	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Ian	McAlley		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.25.3 Future Urban Areas - Pukekohe Disagree - Taking too long	Requests that Pukekohe be brought forward.
								States that services are already available and that if it is rezoned how it is proposed, given the processes such as subdivision consent processes, earthworks, and other physical works, titles would not be available until 2029 at the earliest which is too far away.
128	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Ian	McAlley		5. Background	5.3 Council shouldn't be doing this	Proposes that Council should undertake better analysis and identify areas of land which are immediately adjacent to existing developed areas which already have service connections. Proposes Council work with developers and landowners to ensure provision of infrastructure in the short-term without making service provision to larger greenfield areas more uneconomical.
171	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Ash	Rainsford	Oteriti Limited	1. Q1. Overall support	1.6 Don't know/NA	
171	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Ash	Rainsford	Oteriti Limited	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.6 Don't know/NA	
171	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Ash	Rainsford	Oteriti Limited	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.24 Future Urban Areas - Paerata	
171	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Ash	Rainsford	Oteriti Limited	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	6.13 Out of scope - other	Requests that the subject land at Ostrich Farm Road be included within Decade One 1st half (2018-2022) in the FULSS. The submitter argues that there is potential to leverage from infrastructure being constructed to service the Wesley SHA. There are no fundamental infrastructure, environmental or natural hazards constraints. The submitters request is out of scope as the area concerned is not zoned Future Urban.
171	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Ash	Rainsford	Oteriti Limited	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.24.2 Future Urban Areas - Paerata Disagree - Infrastructure issues	The submitter notes that challenges exist in providing wastewater and water supply to Wesley.
173	A. Online form	Not Supplied	William	Birch	property owners of North West Pukekohe	1. Q1. Overall support	1.6 Don't know/NA	
173	A. Online form	Not Supplied	William	Birch	property owners of North West Pukekohe	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.6 Don't know/NA	
173	A. Online form	Not Supplied	William	Birch	property owners of North West Pukekohe	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.25 Future Urban Areas - Pukekohe	
173	A. Online form	Not Supplied	William	Birch	property owners of North West Pukekohe	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.25.3 Future Urban Areas - Pukekohe Disagree - Taking too long	Requests that the timing of a number of properties within the Pukekohe northwest future urban area be brought forward into the first half of decade one (2018-2022). The key reasons are: - There is existing transport infrastructure (Heights Road, SH22, train line, bus routes providing a direct connection to Pukekohe Train Station). - Existing water and wastewater reticulation servicing past the submission site, with capacity to support immediate development with only minor upgrades. - The submission area is largely supported by the Pukekohe North Catchment Management Plan. The area is not reliant on wide spread catchment modelling. - Strategic location, being an obvious expansion of the existing urban fringe. - The development can be done with no [financial] burden on the council or its CCO's. Any upgrades can be privately funded. An earlier timing will assist to rectify what the submitter sees as an imbalance of employment to residential land in Pukekohe.
173	A. Online form	Not Supplied	William	Birch	property owners of North West Pukekohe	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.24 Future Urban Areas - Paerata	
173	A. Online form	Not Supplied	William	Birch	property owners of North West Pukekohe	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.24.3 Future Urban Areas - Paerata Disagree - Taking too long	The submitter requests that the timing of a number of properties within the Pukekohe northwest future urban area be brought forward into the first half of decade one (2018-2022). The key reasons are: - There is existing transport infrastructure (Heights Road, SH22, train line, bus routes providing a direct connection to Pukekohe Train Station). - Existing water and wastewater reticulation servicing past the submission site, with capacity to support immediate development with only minor upgrades. - The submission area is largely supported by the Pukekohe North Catchment Management Plan. The area is not reliant on wide spread catchment modelling. - Strategic location, being an obvious expansion of the existing urban fringe. - The development can be done with no [financial] burden on the council or its CCO's. Any upgrades can be privately funded. An earlier timing will assist to rectify what the submitter sees as an imbalance of employment to residential land in Pukekohe.
181	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Simon	Watson		1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	
181	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Simon	Watson		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
181	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Simon	Watson		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.25 Future Urban Areas - Pukekohe	
181	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Simon	Watson		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.25.3 Future Urban Areas - Pukekohe Disagree - Taking too long	Believes that the current sequencing is too slow and that a faster, more accelerated program to free up land for housing needs to be implemented
181	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Simon	Watson		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.25.5 Future Urban Areas - Pukekohe Disagree - Areas included	Requests that future urban zoned land on Grace James Road (Pukekohe) brought forward from the second half of decade one to the first half of decade one to be consistent with Paerata

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
187	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Allan	Bell		1. Q1. Overall support	1.6 Don't know/NA	Notes that views of the local paper and politicians highlight that Papakura Town Centre is underutilised and requires upgrading to ensure it is a desirable shopping area.
187	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Allan	Bell		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.6 Don't know/NA	
187	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Allan	Bell		6. General comments not in scope of questions	6.3 Politics	
187	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Allan	Bell		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.29 Future Urban Areas - General South-West	Notes that significant infrastructure investment is required to enable development in the Clevedon area. The submitter identifies concerns with the provision of water, public transport, roading, schools and community facilities. Submitter highlights that the Unitary Plan decision did not allow expansion east of Papakura despite Papakura Town Centre being the closet destination for shopping and district facilities. Development here could contribute to the revitalisation of the town centre.
187	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Allan	Bell		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.28.2 Future Urban Areas - General South-West Disagree - Infrastructure Issues	
187	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Allan	Bell		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.28.5 Future Urban Areas - General South-West Disagree - Areas included	
189	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Nigel	Hosken		4 Q4 Disagree- Future Urban Areas	4.18.6 Future Urban Areas - Hingaia - Disagree anticipated dwelling capacity	Believes that Hingaia 3 Precinct on its own will achieve in excess of 20 Households per hectare. Notes that contractor about to commence work on water and wastewater networks for 1500 dwellings via Hayfield SHA Limited. Service operational target October 2017 provided Council assists with winter works. The yield numbers identified in strategy not correct.
189	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Nigel	Hosken		4 Q4 Disagree- Future Urban Areas	4.18.12 Future Urban Areas - Hingaia - Disagree infrastructure	Notes that it is unclear if the provision of water and wastewater by Hayfield SHA Limited is included or excluded from your budgets.
189	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Nigel	Hosken		4 Q4 Disagree- Future Urban Areas	4.25.6 Future Urban Areas - Pukekohe - Disagree - anticipated dwelling capacity	Notes that the original planning document identified a development yield of 720 new dwellings from the Belmont Structure Plan Area excluding the land set aside for the Primary School and Neighbourhood Centre at a yield target of 13 Households per hectare.
189	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Nigel	Hosken		4 Q4 Disagree- Future Urban Areas	4.17.6 Future Urban Areas - Takinini - Disagree - anticipated dwelling capacity	Believes that the proposed dwelling numbers are understated. Notes that The original Takanini Structure Plan Area 1A is achieving 20 Households per hectare through the PDC Residential 8 provisions.
189	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Nigel	Hosken		4 Q4 Disagree- Future Urban Areas	4.17.3 Future Urban Areas - Takinini - Disagree - taking too long	Notes earlier plans, such as the The Auckland Regional Growth Strategy 1999 and the Southern Sector Agreement that identified the Takanini Land to be released in 2 stages, has led to expectation of earlier development. Notes high level of investment that has already occurred in the area including provision of water and wastewater capacity (Watercare provision to Takanini 2a 2b installed on time in 2009 when 2a2b plan change went operational).
189	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Nigel	Hosken		4 Q4 Disagree- Future Urban Areas	4.17.2 Future Urban Areas - Takinini - Disagree - infrastructure issues	Believes that Council's current methodology for stormwater provision (to Takanini Area 2a and 2b) is the most expensive of the alternatives and marginal in terms of ecological benefits. The land cost on its own is in excess of \$25million before construction. Notes that the original application based on a piped system in road reserves vested at the time of subdivision by the developer at no cost to Council.
189	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Nigel	Hosken		6 General Comments not in scope	6.9 Public consultation	Recommends a reconsideration of Council's current methodology. Notes that the infrastructure budgets and dwelling numbers put forward for consultation convey very little information and are impossible to either check or verify.

Rural Settlements

North

11	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Heather	Burnan		1. Q1. Overall support	1.3 Neutral	Believes proposed motorway by Wellsford will leave many people homeless and the area will need more rural blocks made available for these people so that they are not be forced out of their town; and the area urgently needs more land/housing developments.
11	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Heather	Burnan		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.3 Neutral	
11	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Heather	Burnan		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	
11	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Heather	Burnan		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.8 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Other	
34	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Malcolm	Lea		1. Q1. Overall support	1.5 Strongly agree	Concerned that the strategy should recognise that developers are the driving force as to where development occurs.
34	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Malcolm	Lea		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.3 Neutral	
34	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Malcolm	Lea		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.30 Future Urban Areas - Other comment	
34	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Malcolm	Lea		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	Concerned that development should not occur until wastewater, water and transport is confirmed.
34	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Malcolm	Lea		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.2 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
40	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Trevor	Johnston		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	Concerned with lack of transport infrastructure.
40	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Trevor	Johnston		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
40	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Trevor	Johnston		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.17 Rural Settlements General North	
40	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Trevor	Johnston		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.17.2 Rural Settlements General North Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
40	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Trevor	Johnston		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26 Future Urban Areas - General North	States we need a high speed train from areas of growth into Auckland CBD .
40	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Trevor	Johnston		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26.2 Future Urban Areas - General North Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
40	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Trevor	Johnston		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26.8 Future Urban Areas - General North Disagree - Other	Concerned with lack of affordable housing built in the general north area and lack of transport infrastructure.

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
40	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Trevor	Johnston		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.17.8 Rural Settlements General North Disagree - Other	

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
63	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Roger and Laureen	Farr		1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	
63	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Roger and Laureen	Farr		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
63	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Roger and Laureen	Farr		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	
63	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Roger and Laureen	Farr		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.8 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Other	Concerned with the residential zoning of "Corry Block" in Wellsford. States that the sale-yard block on Centennial Park Road in Corry Block is an important link with the rural sector of the community and vital to Wellsford's economy.
70	A. Online form	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	Peggy	Steele		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
70	A. Online form	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	Peggy	Steele		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
70	A. Online form	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	Peggy	Steele		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	
70	A. Online form	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	Peggy	Steele		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.8 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Other	Requests development areas in Wellsford are reconsidered and that green space close to town needs to be set aside with any residential development. States that now the motorway route is going to the East, development should be East. Requests that Centennial Park Road and Corry Blocks should be kept and joined up with other green spaces.
70	A. Online form	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	Peggy	Steele		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26 Future Urban Areas - General North	
70	A. Online form	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	Peggy	Steele		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26.2 Future Urban Areas - General North Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Concerned that town sewage and water needs to be upgraded as soon as possible.
70	A. Online form	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	Peggy	Steele		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26.8 Future Urban Areas - General North Disagree - Other	Requests Council looks at providing elderly housing areas.
98	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Lynette	Gubb	Wellsford Districts Sport & Recreation Collective Inc	1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
98	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Lynette	Gubb	Wellsford Districts Sport & Recreation Collective Inc	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
98	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Lynette	Gubb	Wellsford Districts Sport & Recreation Collective Inc	3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	
98	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Lynette	Gubb	Wellsford Districts Sport & Recreation Collective Inc	3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.8 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Other	Concerned that Corry Block should be kept as green space and not zoned as residential and subject to a road linking SH1 onto Centennial Park Road making Centennial Park as the eastern boundary. States that there is lack of green space in Wellsford and that Corry Block is a good area for recreational pursuits. Concerned with zoning of Sale-yard block on Centennial Park Road to residential as they are an important link with the rural sector of the community and vital to Wellsford economy. States there is the potential for it to be a future tourism site due to its uniqueness and closeness to Auckland City. Note: has support from 8 local organisations and individuals.
99	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Wendy	Crow-Jones		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
99	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Wendy	Crow-Jones		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
99	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Wendy	Crow-Jones		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	
99	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Wendy	Crow-Jones		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.3 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Taking too long	Requests Wellsford be brought forward. States that the motorway will be coming soon and people want to start moving to Wellsford. Also concerned though about lack of employment opportunities and that there should be more industrial zones.
99	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Wendy	Crow-Jones		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.2 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
99	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Wendy	Crow-Jones		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.8 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Other	Requests that Corry Block should be kept as green space as it is a popularly used green space. Requests that Sale Yards be kept the same as they are an imporant part of their rural community and could potentially attract tourism as being the only one in Auckland.
100	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Christine	McPherson		1. Q1. Overall support	1.3 Neutral	
100	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Christine	McPherson		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.3 Neutral	
100	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Christine	McPherson		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	
100	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Christine	McPherson		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.8 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Other	Concerned that Sale-yards should be kept the same as they are important to the community. Requests Centennial Park be kept as a green space. Requests that small lifestyle blocks east of Wellsford between the new motorway and south of Wellsford be developed.
102	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Anne	Beecher		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
102	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Anne	Beecher		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
102	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Anne	Beecher		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	
102	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Anne	Beecher		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.8 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Other	Requests the sale-yards be kept the same and not zoned as urban. States that this area is important to Wellsford and part of Wellsford's identity. Requests that Corry Land be kept as greenspace as it is perfect for a sports complex, and other recreational activities.

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
104	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Gerda	Bouwman		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
104	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Gerda	Bouwman		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
104	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Gerda	Bouwman		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	Requests the sales-yards be kept the same and not zoned as urban.
104	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Gerda	Bouwman		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.8 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Other	States it is important for employment opportunities / job creation. Requests that Corry Land be kept as greenspace for recreation as there is nothing else like it around.
105	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Sarah	Lindsay		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
105	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Sarah	Lindsay		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
105	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Sarah	Lindsay		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	Requests that Centennial Park be zoned as greenspace/recreational.
105	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Sarah	Lindsay		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.8 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Other	States it is important for recreation. Concerned that the bridge at the top of SH1 needs pedestrian access to support any growth.
110	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Raj	Kesha		1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	
110	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Raj	Kesha		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
110	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Raj	Kesha		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	
110	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Raj	Kesha		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.2 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Concerned with lack of infrastructure to support more development. States there should be better sewage systems, better roading quality, more industry and commercial businesses so that people that live there can also work there and not need to come into Auckland CBD. Requests Centennial Park be kept as green space.
110	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Raj	Kesha		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.8 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Other	
130	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Lionel	Foster		1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	
130	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Lionel	Foster		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
130	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Lionel	Foster		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	
130	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Lionel	Foster		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.8 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Other	Requests Wellsford be brought forward. States that people in Wellsford are relocating because they are in the way of the motorway but have nowhere else to go.
130	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Lionel	Foster		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26 Future Urban Areas - General North	
130	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Lionel	Foster		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26.2 Future Urban Areas - General North Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Concerned that by adding a motorway up to Wellsford, more people will live there and therefore will be increased development pressure. Concerned that Auckland Council is not living up to its 'goals' around affordable housing.
130	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Lionel	Foster		5. Background	5.3 Council should'nt be doing this	Concerned that any development plans should be hand in hand with the transport plans i.e. motorway up to Wellsford.
134	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Lionel	Don		1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	
134	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Lionel	Don		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
134	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Lionel	Don		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	
134	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Lionel	Don		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.8 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Other	Requests that Wellsford is looked at further to help accommodate with the Auckland overflow.
135	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Jackie	Don		1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	
135	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Jackie	Don		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	Requests that Wellsford needs to be pushed forward in the sequencing and structure planning start immediately for rezoning of land becoming available. Concern that there is already a shortage of land in Wellsford and Te Hana and this needs to be addressed before Wellsford RoNs.
135	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Jackie	Don		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	
135	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Jackie	Don		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.8 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Other	Acknowledges that a structure plan is needed for the Future Urban zoned land in Wellsford now but suggests that undertake a plan review in synergy with the planning of the designation for the Warkworth to Wellsford section of the Puhoi to Wellsford RoNs project. This would include the north side of Warkworth (eastwards) then from the proposed Wellsford interchange to the Te Hana interchange (westwards). A Council planner in his recommendation to the Unitary Plan foresaw this need.
135	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Jackie	Don		5. Background	5.2 Council should be doing this	Believes that Auckland Council needs to honour its goals of affordable living. Notes that apart from Auckland central, North shore is at an all-time high at 10.63 and is the next highest to Auckland Central.
135	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Jackie	Don		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.2 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Concern that RoNs will act as a release of the North Shore development pressure which will be passed on not only to Warkworth, but to Wellsford.
137	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Russell	Don		1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	
137	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Russell	Don		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	Requests that Wellsford needs to be pushed forward in the sequencing and structure planning start immediately for rezoning of land becoming available. Concern that there is already a shortage of land in Wellsford and Te Hana and this needs to be addressed before Wellsford RoNs.
137	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Russell	Don		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	
137	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Russell	Don		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.8 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Other	Acknowledges that a structure plan is needed for the Future Urban zoned land in Wellsford now but suggests that undertake a plan review in synergy with the planning of the designation for the Warkworth to Wellsford section of the Puhoi to Wellsford RoNs project. This would include the north side of Warkworth (eastwards) then from the proposed Wellsford interchange to the Te Hana interchange (westwards). A Council planner in his recommendation to the Unitary Plan foresaw this need.
137	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Russell	Don		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26 Future Urban Areas - General North	

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
137	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Russell	Don		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26.8 Future Urban Areas - General North Disagree - Other	Concern that RoNs will act as a release of the North Shore development pressure which will be passed on not only to Warkworth, but to Wellsford.
137	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Russell	Don		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.2 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Concern that RoNs will act as a release of the North Shore development pressure which will be passed on not only to Warkworth, but to Wellsford.
138	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Sally	Ware		1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	Requests that Wellsford needs to be pushed forward in the sequencing and structure planning start immediately for rezoning of land becoming available. Concern that there is already a shortage of land in Wellsford and Te Hana and this needs to be addressed before Wellsford RoNs.
138	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Sally	Ware		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
138	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Sally	Ware		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	Acknowledges that a structure plan is needed for the Future Urban zoned land in Wellsford now but suggests that undertake a plan review in synergy with the planning of the designation for the Warkworth to Wellsford section of the Puhoi to Wellsford RoNs project. This would include the north side of Warkworth (eastwards) then from the proposed Wellsford interchange to the Te Hana interchange (westwards). A Council planner in his recommendation to the Unitary Plan foresaw this need.
138	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Sally	Ware		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.8 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Other	
138	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Sally	Ware		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.2 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Concern that RoNs will act as a release of the North Shore development pressure which will be passed on not only to Warkworth, but to Wellsford.
138	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Sally	Ware		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26 Future Urban Areas - General North	Concern that RoNs will act as a release of the North Shore development pressure which will be passed on not only to Warkworth, but to Wellsford.
138	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Sally	Ware		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26.8 Future Urban Areas - General North Disagree - Other	
140	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Garry	Person		1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	Requests that Wellsford needs to be pushed forward in the sequencing and structure planning start immediately for rezoning of land becoming available. Concern that there is already a shortage of land in Wellsford and Te Hana and this needs to be addressed before Wellsford RoNs.
140	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Garry	Person		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
140	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Garry	Person		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	Concern that RoNs will act as a release of the North Shore development pressure which will be passed on not only to Warkworth, but to Wellsford.
140	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Garry	Person		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.2 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
140	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Garry	Person		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.8 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Other	Acknowledges that a structure plan is needed for the Future Urban zoned land in Wellsford now but suggests that undertake a plan review in synergy with the planning of the designation for the Warkworth to Wellsford section of the Puhoi to Wellsford RoNs project. This would include the north side of Warkworth (eastwards) then from the proposed Wellsford interchange to the Te Hana interchange (westwards). A Council planner in his recommendation to the Unitary Plan foresaw this need.
140	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Garry	Person		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26 Future Urban Areas - General North	Concern that RoNs will act as a release of the North Shore development pressure which will be passed on not only to Warkworth, but to Wellsford.
140	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Garry	Person		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26.8 Future Urban Areas - General North Disagree - Other	
141	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Alan	Stewart		1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	Requests that Wellsford needs to be pushed forward in the sequencing and structure planning start immediately for rezoning of land becoming available. Concern that there is already a shortage of land in Wellsford and Te Hana and this needs to be addressed before Wellsford RoNs.
141	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Alan	Stewart		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
141	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Alan	Stewart		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	Concern that RoNs will act as a release of the North Shore development pressure which will be passed on not only to Warkworth, but to Wellsford.
141	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Alan	Stewart		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.2 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
141	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Alan	Stewart		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.8 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Other	Acknowledges that a structure plan is needed for the Future Urban zoned land in Wellsford now but suggests that undertake a plan review in synergy with the planning of the designation for the Warkworth to Wellsford section of the Puhoi to Wellsford RoNs project. This would include the north side of Warkworth (eastwards) then from the proposed Wellsford interchange to the Te Hana interchange (westwards). A Council planner in his recommendation to the Unitary Plan foresaw this need.
141	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Alan	Stewart		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26 Future Urban Areas - General North	Concern that RoNs will act as a release of the North Shore development pressure which will be passed on not only to Warkworth, but to Wellsford.
141	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Alan	Stewart		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.26.8 Future Urban Areas - General North Disagree - Other	
143	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Dennis	Stewart		1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	Requests that Wellsford needs to be pushed forward in the sequencing and planning start immediately for bulk urban land becoming available. Concern that there is already a shortage of good residential family sized sections available.
143	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Dennis	Stewart		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
143	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Dennis	Stewart		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	
143	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Dennis	Stewart		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.3 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Taking too long	
143	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Dennis	Stewart		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.8 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Other	Believes that there there is land still zoned rural, which should be changed to urban immediately to encourage the town to grow and expand, especially with the Northern Motorway extension eminent. There is also the need for more commercial and industrial land development.
152	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Gerald	Person		1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	Requests that Structure Planning be undertaken now for Wellsford's future urban zones. Believes there is a need for much more urban zoned land due to potential dislocation of people from motorway and to ensure Wellsford and Te Hana can build an economically viable community well before the motorway is constructed and bypasses Wellsford and Te Hana.
152	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Gerald	Person		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
152	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Gerald	Person		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	
152	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Gerald	Person		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.8 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Other	
157	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Ngairi	Jones		1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	
157	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Ngairi	Jones		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
157	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Ngairi	Jones		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
157	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Ngaire	Jones		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.2 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Wellsford needs land set aside for walkways, cycleways and recreational areas. Concern that the area, in particular sewerage, has been neglected.
157	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Ngaire	Jones		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.8 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Other	Need elderly housing and a supermarket. Questions why saleyards were closed down.

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
160	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Beryl	Adamason	Wellsford R.S.A Womens Seltion	1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	Requests development be brought forward. Believes development of town's sewerage and water is urgent and develoment should follow this.
160	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Beryl	Adamason	Wellsford R.S.A Womens Seltion	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
160	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Beryl	Adamason	Wellsford R.S.A Womens Seltion	3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	
160	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Beryl	Adamason	Wellsford R.S.A Womens Seltion	3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.8 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Other	
161	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Shane	Hartley	Edward Henderson Family Trust	1. Q1. Overall support	1.6 Don't know/NA	Requests that Hatfields Beach is brought forward to the first half of Decade One: 2018 – 2022. Reasons are: the area is the last urban area to be developed in north Orewa; has adequate roading and services adjoining land that could be easily extended; development of the land would result in a relatively limited scale of residential development; possibly 200 to 400 dwelling; area is close to employment, recreation, retail and community activity. Believes existing roading and services could be easily extended.
161	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Shane	Hartley	Edward Henderson Family Trust	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
161	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Shane	Hartley	Edward Henderson Family Trust	3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.3 Rural Settlements North - Hatfields Beach	
161	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Shane	Hartley	Edward Henderson Family Trust	3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.3.3 Rural Settlements North - Hatfields Beach Disagree - Taking too long	
161	B. Post form	Rodney Local Board	Shane	Hartley	Edward Henderson Family Trust	3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.3.2 Rural Settlements North - Hatfields Beach Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
179	A. Online form	Upper Harbour Local Board	Burnette	Macnicol	Eiberg and Rapata Family Trusts	1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	Agrees with the timing of Albany Village but notes that the land can be developed at a higher denisty than currently provided for (Large Lot).
179	A. Online form	Upper Harbour Local Board	Burnette	Macnicol	Eiberg and Rapata Family Trusts	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.4 Agree	
179	A. Online form	Upper Harbour Local Board	Burnette	Macnicol	Eiberg and Rapata Family Trusts	3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.5 Rural Settlements North West - Albany Village	
179	A. Online form	Upper Harbour Local Board	Burnette	Macnicol	Eiberg and Rapata Family Trusts	3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.5.9 Rural Settlements North West - Albany Village Agree - Other	
183	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Joshua	Don		1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	Requests that structure planning for Wellsford's future urban zones begins now. There is not enough existing urban land and is becoming apparent as people are required to relocate to make way for the motorway. Believes Auckland Council needs to do more to address affordable housing noting that the existing house price to income multiple is 9.81. Requests that structure planning for Wellsford's future urban zones begins now given that the motorway will be completed in five years time
183	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Joshua	Don		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
183	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Joshua	Don		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	
183	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Joshua	Don		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.3 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Taking too long	
183	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Joshua	Don		6. General comments not in scope of questions	6.2 Housing affordability	
183	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Joshua	Don		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.2 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
184	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Steve	Wallace	AB Industries	1. Q1. Overall support	1.3 Neutral	Agrees with the identification of Wellsford but disagrees with the 'minimalist' approach compared with Warkworth. The submitter highlights that infrastructure provision (i.e water, gas, power sub-station, rail, state highway connections and an airstrip) is available in Wellsford and can therefore accommodate more growth than what Auckland Council are proposing.
184	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Steve	Wallace	AB Industries	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
184	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Steve	Wallace	AB Industries	3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford	
184	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Steve	Wallace	AB Industries	3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.1.2 Rural Settlements North - Wellsford Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
Rural Settlements South								
2	A. Online form	Not Supplied	John	McCaffery		1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	Believes Oruarangi Mangere should not proceed on cultural grounds (insult to Te Akitai Waiohau and the Ak Tainui confederation); believes will destroy Auckland's heritage of a World Heritage Site which needs to be protected into the future.
2	A. Online form	Not Supplied	John	McCaffery		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
2	A. Online form	Not Supplied	John	McCaffery		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.9 Rural Settlements South - Orurangi	
2	A. Online form	Not Supplied	John	McCaffery		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.9.8 Rural Settlements South - Orurangi Disagree - Other	
6	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Winter	Green		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.10 Rural Settlements South - Maraetai	Disagrees that the areas between Whitford to Beachlands/Maratai should be developed. States there is no schooling available and existing roading cannot cope with additional population in the area. States the public transport i.e. ferry services cannot cope with current population and that water and wastewater services are inadequate to cope with increase population. Suggests development occurs close to major railway hubs
6	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Winter	Green		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.19 Rural Settlements General South	
6	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Winter	Green		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.10.2 Rural Settlements South - Maraetai Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
24	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Elizabeth	Pemberton		1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	Need infrastructure in place, in particular, transport, before additional housing goes in.
24	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Elizabeth	Pemberton		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1 Strongly disagree	
24	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Elizabeth	Pemberton		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.7 Rural Settlements North West - Waimauku	
24	A. Online form	Rodney Local Board	Elizabeth	Pemberton		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.7.2 Rural Settlements North West - Waimauku Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
27	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Aaron & Owen	Yorke		1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	Strategy needs to specify who will be doing the structure planning/plan change, live zoning and provide necessary bulk infrastructure to make Glenbrook 2 land development ready by 2023-2027.
27	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Aaron & Owen	Yorke		2. Q2. Sequencing	2.4 Agree	
27	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Aaron & Owen	Yorke		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.20 Rural Settlements General South-West	
27	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Aaron & Owen	Yorke		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.20.9 Rural Settlements General South-West Agree - Other	

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
33	A. Online form	Manurewa Local Board	Jon	Maplesden		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.12 Rural Settlements South - Clevedon	
33	A. Online form	Manurewa Local Board	Jon	Maplesden		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.12.8 Rural Settlements South - Clevedon Disagree - Other	Concerned that Attachment D contains an error regarding the Rural Settlement of Clevedon.
33	A. Online form	Manurewa Local Board	Jon	Maplesden		5. Background	5.1 Text error/content/map	Request that content in the Executive Summary is revised.
								Concerned with the following:
								That Section 2 fails to identify that demographic advice in the Auckland Plan and that the indicative ability to accomodate this was based on a census from 2006.
								A statement in Section 3 fails to highlight that the ground work for the Unitary Plan was also based on the Auckland Plan.
								Comments in Section 4 are practical but fail to acknowledge the current demographic knowledge.
								That Section 5 fails to address how the funding for infrastructure can be provided.
								That Section 7 does not acknowledge land purchase and other funding put in place by the FULSS strategy adopted in November 2015.
								That Section 8 does not contain phases which are in 'plain English' as required by the Local Government Act.
								That The Unitary Plan has not universally been adopted as the Executive Summary states. In particular Crater Hill and Pukaki Road are under appeal.
								Takanini description "due to peat soils" is in error and requires correction.
77	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Carey	Pearce	WHITFORD FOREST HOLDINGS COMPANY	6. General comments not in scope of questions	6.8 Council process	
77	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Carey	Pearce	WHITFORD FOREST HOLDINGS COMPANY	3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.10 Rural Settlements South - Maraetai	
77	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Carey	Pearce	WHITFORD FOREST HOLDINGS COMPANY	3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.10.3 Rural Settlements South - Maraetai Disagree - Taking too long	Requests that Maraetai 2 be brought forward into Decade One.
								States that they are willing to engage in structure planning processes and a plan change within the next 24 months and have two parcels of land at the northern end of the Waiho Block ready for development.
79	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Rachel	Bilbe	Counties Power Ltd	1. Q1. Overall support	1.4 Agree	
79	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Rachel	Bilbe	Counties Power Ltd	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.3 Neutral	
79	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Rachel	Bilbe	Counties Power Ltd	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.28 Future Urban Areas - General South	
79	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Rachel	Bilbe	Counties Power Ltd	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.28.2 Future Urban Areas - General South Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Requests the FULSS includes network development requirements.
79	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Rachel	Bilbe	Counties Power Ltd	6. General comments not in scope of questions	6.8 Council process	Requests Counties Power be involved in the initial planning process to ensure adequate lead time to meet the requirements.
79	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Rachel	Bilbe	Counties Power Ltd	5. Background	5.1 Text error/content/map	Concerned that the load forecasts are based on information regarding number of dwellings, size and type of commercial activities and therefore Council needs to make sure these are 100% accurate and up to date to base this off.
79	A. Online form	Papakura Local Board	Rachel	Bilbe	Counties Power Ltd	6. General comments not in scope of questions	6.11 Supporting Growth	Concerned that the agreed infrastructure corridors from earlier plan changes in Kingseat have not been captured in the FULSS refresh.
								Questions whether electricity infrastructure will still be permitted in the identified utility corridors.
142	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Mary	Whitehouse	Clevedon Cares Incorporated	1. Q1. Overall support	1.1 Strongly disagree	
142	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Mary	Whitehouse	Clevedon Cares Incorporated	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.1.4 Strongly disagree	Disagrees with sequencing for Clevedon Waterways as will need a large number of consents and is likely to face local opposition as was defeated in the Environment Court.
142	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Mary	Whitehouse	Clevedon Cares Incorporated	3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.11 Rural Settlements South - Clevedon Waterways	
142	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Mary	Whitehouse	Clevedon Cares Incorporated	3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.11.8 Rural Settlements South - Clevedon Waterways Disagree - Other	Notes that the statistics and sequencing for Clevedon Village and Clevedon Waterways are inconsistent with the Unitary Plan and public understanding of development which may occur in the area. (Specific detail noted in submission)
142	A. Online form	Franklin Local Board	Mary	Whitehouse	Clevedon Cares Incorporated	3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.11.2 Rural Settlements South - Clevedon Waterways Disagree - Infrastructure issues	Concerned with lack of mention of infrastructure in Clevedon as Clevedon Village is contingent on wastewater, currently being discussed between landowners and Watercare. Waterways will also need the same provision. Also concerned with omission of roading upgrades and water and impact these have on timing.
166	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Brian William	Putt	Green Desert Ltd and D E Nakhle Investement Trust	3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.14 Rural Settlements South West - Kingseat	
166	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Brian William	Putt	Green Desert Ltd and D E Nakhle Investement Trust	3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.14.3 Rural Settlements South West - Kingseat Disagree - Taking too long	Requests that the timing of Kingseat be brought forward to first half decade one 2018-2022. The timing of the Clarks Beach wastewater treatment plant which will service the Kingseat area is now programmed by watercare. Evidence presented to the IHP supported an expansion of Kingseat as the best means of affording the necessary infrastructure to service the settlement.

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
187	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Allan	Bell		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.12 Rural Settlements South - Clevedon	<p>Submitter highlights that recent floods and lack of infrastructure provision provides a valid reason to not allow development in the Clevedon area.</p> <p>Notes that surrounding activities (i.e. Ardmore Airport, the Army training range and the motor cross) have resulted in lower land values making the Keri Hill area suitable for affordable housing.</p> <p>Although Keri Hill is next to an Army training range, the submitter highlights that urban living is now possible as modern munitions and guns now have a lower audible level and helicopters are much quieter.</p> <p>Submitter highlights that recent flooding events in Clevedon provide a valid reason to not allow development. Land east of Keri Hill (Ardmore) did not experience expansive flooding.</p> <p>Submitter highlights that land east of Keri Hill does not consist of high quality soils and is not a high production area.</p>
187	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Allan	Bell		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.12.2 Rural Settlements South - Clevedon Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
187	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Allan	Bell		6. General comments not in scope of questions	6.2 Housing affordability	
187	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Allan	Bell		6. General comments not in scope of questions	6.1 Environmental Considerations	
189	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Nigel	Hosken		1.1 Strongly Disagree	1.1.1 Strongly disagree - Text/xontent error	<p>Believes map for Clevedon is incorrect.</p> <p>Notes that the developers through CISL are funding the water and wastewater and it is unclear if this has been included in the background work of the refresh.</p> <p>Notes that PC 32 Area will not be in a position to provide any new dwellings until Q3 2019 at the earliest. The developers landowner group Clevedon Infrastructure Services Limited (CISL) is close to completing an agreement with Watercare that includes a mid Q3, 2019 service provision date provided it gets signed.</p> <p>Disagrees with the number of dwellings for Clevedon. Notes that as part of Clevedon PC 32 CISL has undertaken a planning assessment to confirm the number of House Units (HUE) as 1693 HUE for Clevedon PC 32</p> <p>Notes 350 HUE for Clevedon Waterways – Service Capacity provided 2043 HUE in the Clevedon Terminal Pump Station. FULSS provides for 162</p> <p>Notes Kingseat mapping error.</p> <p>Believes that the proposed timing is not possible. Development relies on the Watercare - Clarks Beach service which is not scheduled Operational until Q3 2021 plus requires funding for riser main service Clarks Beach to Kingseat (Advice from Watercare Asset Plan). Therefore no new dwellings until 2022 earliest assuming funding for riser is secured.</p> <p>Believes that the dwellings numbers are understated. Notes that the Unitary Plan Zones will permit higher densities, yield numbers identified in strategy not correct. Original Planning yield targets based on 10 households per hectare to provide the 1842 new dwellings.</p>
189	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Nigel	Hosken		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.12.1 Rural Settlements South - Clevedon Disagree - text/content error	
189	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Nigel	Hosken		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.12.12Rural Settlements South - Clevedon Disagree - infrastructure	
189	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Nigel	Hosken		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.12.4 Rural Settlements South - Clevedon Disagree - happening too quick	
189	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Nigel	Hosken		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.12.6 Rural Settlements South - Clevedon Disagree - anticipated dwelling capacity	
189	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Nigel	Hosken		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.11.6 Rural Settlements South - Clevedon Waterways Disagree - anticipated dwelling capacity	
189	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Nigel	Hosken		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.14.1 Rural Settlements South West - Kingseat Disagree - text/content error	
189	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Nigel	Hosken		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.11.4 Rural Settlements South West Kingseat Disagree - Happening too quick	
189	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Nigel	Hosken		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.14.6 Rural Settlements South West - Kingseat Disagree - anticipated dwelling capacity	
167	E. Email non form	Franklin Local Board	Nicola	Henshaw		5. Background	5.1 Text error/content/map	
167	E. Email non form	Franklin Local Board	Nicola	Henshaw		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.12 Rural Settlements South - Clevedon	<p>Requests that the 'development ready' timing of Clevedon be changed to 2019, as only limited development can occur until a wastewater connection, agreed to by watercare, is made in mid-2019. At which point the submitter anticipates most major developers will be releasing land for sale.</p> <p>Requests that the size of the wastewater service in dwelling units for all of Clevedon be included [in the background text] as much of the growth in Clevedon will be outside of future urban zoned areas. The proposed development around Clevedon is significant and must be accurately reflected in Council records to ensure that adequate support and resource is provided to this community as the growth occurs.</p>
167	E. Email non form	Franklin Local Board	Nicola	Henshaw		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.12.2 Rural Settlements South - Clevedon Disagree - Infrastructure issues	
167	E. Email non form	Franklin Local Board	Nicola	Henshaw		3. Q3. Disagree - Rural Settlements	3.12.6 - Rural Settlements South - Clevedon Disagree - Anticipated dwelling capacity	

Late Submissions

Late	E. Email non form	Papakura Local Board	Paul	Kenny		4 Q4 Disagree- Future Urban Areas	4.19.3 Future Urban Areas - Opaheke - Drury - Disagree - Taking too long	Requests that 55 Cosgrave Road, Papakura, be brought forward in the sequencing. Notes that the land has town water and sewer reticulation at both road boundaries with works due to begin in October to install Takinini storwater conveyance.
Late	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Michael and Keith	Parker	Estate of Sandra Mary Stanley-Hunt	1. Q1. Overall support	1.2 Disagree	<p>Requests that Wainui/Upper Orewa is brought forward in sequencing to Decade 1. Notes that area is well situated for a transport, social infrastructure and services perspective.</p> <p>Believes this area should be developed together, rather than sequenced seperately, which would enable infrastructure to be developed as a whole rather than piecemeal. Believes FULSS review needs to provide for more rapid growth in the northern areas of the region in order to meet expected demands.</p> <p>Believes bringing the sequencing of this area forward would be a proactive and practical approach to enable efficient use of the land resource, efficient use of infrastructure upgrades and achieve a compact urban form.</p>
Late	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Michael and Keith	Parker	Estate of Sandra Mary Stanley-Hunt	2. Q2. Sequencing	2.2 Disagree	
Late	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Michael and Keith	Parker	Estate of Sandra Mary Stanley-Hunt	4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.4.3 Future Urban Areas - Upper Orewa Disagree - Taking too long	
	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Sarah	Kingsnorth		4. Q4. Disagree - Future Urban Areas	4.6.9 Future Urban Areas - Silverdale - Dairy Flat (Business) Agree	
	E. Email non form	Not Supplied	Sarah	Kingsnorth		6. General comments not in scope of questions	6.13 Out of Scope - other	Requests that the whole of Blackbridge road be zoned countryside living. Notes that all household services ,water,septic, etc would be funded by the land owner and benefit the Auckland Council and the local people.

Submission Number	Submission Type	Local Board	FirstName	Surname	OrganisationName	Theme Name	Topic Name	Summary
								Note: This submission was considered to be within time due to incorrect spelling of mailbox.