

No	Name	Heard	Submission	Main Points
1.	Kevin Shaw	Y	<p>Oppose in part Road & entrance – subdivision rule Water supply Hope fault fracture Mangamaunu residents want to be treated fairly and honestly Lives at 1517 SH1 since 2000 Seen by all as significant landscape and treated as such Not suburban area – current owners of subject site do not have local feel for Mangamaunu & Kaikōura & natural hazards – coastline becoming overburdened Want to sell & make a profit – they are entitled to</p> <p>Road & entrance – statistics show it is a deadly & dangerous road – needs to be addressed as that – other subdivisions already caused problems – need to be considered by Waka Kotahi [New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA)] and Kaikōura District Council [KDC]. Road needs to be slowed to 50km per hour. Newly proposed double entrance is unsafe and poorly designed. Enough area on either side of the Highway is required to safely pull over and stop to allow traffic to continue and allow safe. Submitter also stops 100m in either direction when entering their property New entrance will require more space & culverts to create safer area to enter. A slower highway speed would also assist greatly – it is time to act on this.</p> <p>Subdivision rules and size – combined area of both lots is only 4274m² which is just over an acre. Has been told the necessary size for subdivision of rural land needed to be greater than 5 acres. Lot 1 has always been farmed as rural land – will this be a new standard or a case by case ruling</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Road safety – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o unsafe accesses proposed o speed limit - Subdivision rules & sizes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o New standards or case by case? - Water supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Spring feed creek is slow and at times dry o No historic water supply title o Formerly farmed rural land - Geotech report & Hope Fault <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Old, inaccurate imagery provided in Geotech report o UC Lidar imager

			<p>Water supply – submitters water supply is from the same spring fed creek – it is slow and sometimes dry – submitter needs to be careful with it – has a historic supply title that was with property – same for 1516 [subject site] SH1 – Lot 1 which has always been farmland does not have the historic title – similar with others in new bay subdivisions – a bore was necessary to supply water. Potentially possible in Lot 1. Is there potable water underground at Lot 1? Or why were other new residences unable to connect to others historical water supplies?</p> <p>Geotech report and Hope Fault – questions about info supplied – aerial images are pre-earthquake there were many changes as a result of the quake – therefore, not accurate – imagery provided by University of Canterbury [UC] LIDAR images show the Hope Fault dissects submitters property in two places – the lower of these runs down and across the Highway and through Lot 1 of proposed subdivision</p>	
2.	Jessica Mangoes (Now Lydia Shirley) on behalf of FENZ (Fire and Emergency New Zealand)	Y	<p>Neutral</p> <p>Decision-makers must have regard to health & safety of people and communities – Duty to avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on environ.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) have responsibility under FENZ Act (2017) to provide for firefighting activities to prevent or limit damage to people, property, and environment. Rural subdivisions in unreticulated areas pose greater fire risk due to need for alternative firefighting water supply. Water supply needs to be considered as part of the application and has not been.</p> <p>Due to location of proposed lots without sufficient firefighting water supply, could result in total loss of the structure & significant fire spread to surrounding property including rail</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Duty to health and Safety - Risk of fire spread - No water supply considered in the application

			<p>assets. As property is approx. 18km from Kaikōura Fire Station, eta response time 25 minutes</p> <p>Additional water supply would be required if no firefighting water supply provided therefore risk of spread would be greater in circumstance – best solution to provide water supplies on site as per NZ firefighting water supplies code of practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 table 1 with either FW1 or FW2</p> <p>Requests Consent notices:</p> <p><i>1. All owners and subsequent owners of Lots 1 and 2 DP XXXXX are advised of the following: All habitable dwellings shall be provided with a firefighting water supply and access to that supply that will comply with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008, which must thereafter be maintained</i></p> <p>The submitter is in Neutral provided the above consent notice is imposed</p>	
3.	Shona Crafar	-	<p>Oppose in full</p> <p>No further comments</p>	N/A
4.	Moana Thompsett	-	<p>Oppose in full</p> <p>Area of subdivision within the rural zone</p>	-
5.	Starkey-King Whanau Trust	Y	<p>Oppose in full</p> <p>Subdivision of rural zoned land – not complying</p> <p>The hope fault factors</p> <p>Water spring tapu taonga – water easement from spring</p> <p>Historic environment area</p> <p>Impact onto neighbour properties</p> <p>Nohoanga (dwelling/settlement) Sites</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Zoning standards - Hope fault - Water spring - Archaeology - Neighbour effects
6.	Douglas Poharama	Y	<p>Oppose in full</p> <p>Area of subdivision within rural zone</p> <p>Water supply</p> <p>Traffic hazard issue</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Location - Water - Traffic - Neighbour impacts

			Development impact to neighbour properties Historic environment area Archaeology of Māori settlements – Noho sites	- Archaeology – Noho (settlement) sites
7.	Karen Starkey	Y	Oppose in full Water easement 15 years previous – from spring (Wahi tapu taonga) Nohoanga site, historical sites (red zone) Impact on neighbours	
8.	Maraea Tanerau-King & Suzanne King on behalf of: Charlene Mere King, Graeme Maurice King, Lawrence Reihana King, Robert Rua Charles King, Te wera Edwin King Rawiri Powhiri Love, King Whanau Trust (Suzanne Marguerite King, Tani Raymond King and Cheryl Ivy Priest), Anne Marie Meldrum, Atarau Minhinnick, Cory Tanerau King and Mark Galbraith	Y	Neutral Cultural Heritage Archaeology: - Test-pit – smart alliance photo exposing archaeology – Ref. Darren Kerei-Keepa email - Archaeology Risk zone – property is located in the red zone (high risk) – Heritage NZ & Te Rūnanga o Kaikōura (TRoK) Environment Plan 2005 - TRoK not notified of resource consent – Kaikōura District Plan - LOT 25 DP 381400 – cedar properties decision notice 30/08/2006 – Karaka Tree - LOT 27 DP 381400 – cedar properties decision notice 30/08/2006 – Waipuna (springs), Wai Maori (freshwater resource) – other issues will be raised at the resource consent hearing - Mitigation – archaeology assessment, TRoK accidental discovery protocol, TRoK to be notified of Resource Consent applications for land use activity in Red zone, TRoK cultural monitor engaged for all ground/earth works, Other mitigation measures will be explored during resource consent hearing, KDC district plan Water:	- Heritage & archaeology concerns - Water supply - Wastewater – obtaining ECAN consent or alternative – no contamination to foreshore or neighbours - Stormwater management - Rooding & access - Climate change - Landscape & visual assessment – peer review - KDC district plan – Māori purpose zoning - Other matters – effects on neighbours

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mangamaunu Farm park – increase demands on water supply – assessment of Landscape & visual effects - Cumulative effect of take on other potential and current groundwater users particularly Mangamaunu Marae and Maori land blocks - Effects of inefficient water use - Lot 27 Wai Maori & Waipuna – Cedar properties Decision Notice 30/8/3006 - Other water collection devices not considered - Potential silt and contaminants entering Neighbour block [submitters property] - Lot 1 & 2 property irrigation system reliance on Mangamaunu Farm Park (Cedar properties) - Other issues will be raised at Resource Consent Hearing - Mitigation – water tanks, allocation and takes, peer review of assessment of landscape and visual effects, Future-proof Maori Land blocks for development of Papakainga , Implement Maori purpose zone from Waipapa to Oaro, other mitigation measures during Resource Consent Hearing <p>Roading & Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SH1 high traffic volume and speed limits - Lot 2 SH1 traffic visibility is poor at the entrance - Mitigation – lot 2 compliance existing access permanently closed after new access made, vegetation both sides of driveway access is maintained to ensure visibility <p>Effluent disposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lot 1 primary treatment units - No ECan Resource consent - Other issues will be raised 	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mitigation – Ecan consent – consult with submitters, other suitable disposal systems e.g., septic tanks, other to be explored at hearing <p>Stormwater disposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lot 2 existing network is poor - Lot 1 existing open channels/swales - Overflow onto submitters property - Poor control over storm water discharge, building construction, earthworks & storm surge - Others raised at hearing - Mitigation – peer review [Geotech report?], drains, stormwater controls incl. at building, no discharge of contaminated stormwater to foreshore & submitters land, others explored at hearing <p>Climate Change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ECan flood hazard assessment & debris inundation not attached to application - Changes in rainfall, temps, and sea level rise - General warming & extreme warm events - Storm surge, others raised at hearing - Mitigation – Ecan flood assessment & debris inundation assessment, managing storm surge, other to be explored at hearing <p>Landscape:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No peer review of Assessment of Landscape & visual effects - Other to be raised at hearing - Mitigation – peer review, northern boundary screening after consultation & agreement with submitters and other neighbouring owners, landscape incorporate indigenous 	
--	--	---	--

			<p>biodiversity (MfE 2019 He Kuratau Koiora I Nokia), other to be explored at hearing</p> <p>KDC District Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No Māori purpose zones (NPS-Highly productive land [HPL]) – info on changing status of Māori Land and rezoning land for Māori purpose zone – Timaru District plan - No papakainga zones – Christchurch City District Plan – four (4) papakainga zones – national planning standards - Other issues to be raised at hearing - Mitigation – consent is based on assumption Māori purpose zone has been implemented – future proof Mangamaunu 2 9A 2A (submitters land) for development of Papakainga, other to be explored at hearing <p>Other matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One dwelling & ancillary unit per lot - 8m max. building height - No further subdivision shall occur on either - No encroachment on submitters block during construction of building platforms, infrastructure & driveway - Submitters block not to be used for storage, rubbish or vehicle parking - Other issues to be raised at hearing 	
9.	Elizabeth McElhinney	Y	<p>Oppose in full</p> <p>Impact on Marae Traffic speed restrictions Rural Zone subdivision restrictions being smaller sizes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Marae - Traffic safety - Rural subdivision standards