

## Appendix 1 – Final Panel Recommendations on Submissions and Further Submissions on PC49

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
<b>TOPIC 1: Silverstream Spur Requested Zoning</b>					
S1.1 Graham Bellamy	Oppose	Rezone the Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space.	Reject	The submission is out of scope of the plan change. The Council has addressed the Silverstream Spur site via Variation 1 to PC49.	No
FS1 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all aspects of the submission. I also support all other submissions that are requesting the Silverstream Spur be rezoned as open space and agree with their reasons. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S1.1 above.	n/a
FS5 Pat Van Berkel	Support	As housing expands in Upper Hutt, we will need more natural open space for citizens such as the Silverstream Spur. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S1.1 above.	n/a
FS6 John D O'Malley	Support	Concurs with all that has been written.	Reject	See reasons under S1.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Beatrice Serrao	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S1.1 above.	n/a
FS12 Tony Chad	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S1.1 above.	n/a
FS14 Save our Hills	Support	That the Silverstream Spur has the potential to be of ecological importance, providing a link between the Western and Eastern sides of the Hutt Valley, the area should be a native fauna reserve for the future public use.	Reject	See reasons under S1.1 above.	n/a
FS17 Craig Thorn	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S1.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Michelle Browning	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S1.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Darryl	Support	No reason stated.	Reject	See reasons under S1.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
Longstaffe					
FS22 Pinehaven Progressive Association	Support	PPA agrees with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and PPA requests that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S1.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Stephen Pattinson	Support	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and PPA requests that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S1.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Guildford Timber Company	Support in part	GTC opposes those parts of submissions which seek to prevent any development whatsoever on the Silverstream Spur. GTC supports 'in part' the submission points below, that relate to the Silverstream Spur and submitters seeking to have it rezoned as open space. GTC's 'in part' support is only provided on the basis that any rezoning of the Spur to open space does not compromise the ability to provide for a future road and associated infrastructure through / on the Spur, to enable potential future residential development at Silverstream Forest. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S1.1 above.	n/a
FS26 Janice Carey	Support	This area is an attractive gateway to our city. Want to keep as much natural open space that's still left close by for the people in this area. It is up to us to preserve.	Reject	See reasons under S1.1 above.	n/a
FS31 Douglas William Dunn	Support	Agree with all points made in submission. The spur should be protected as a natural open space for future generations. There are too many cars on Silverstream roads, we don't need more cars, pollution, and people.	Reject	See reasons under S1.1 above.	n/a
FS32 Colin Buckett	Support	I support to rezone the Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space because it is a reserve, also we don't want the land swap to go ahead for poor land.	Reject	See reasons under S1.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
FS48 Sue Pattinson – late	Support	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and I request that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S1.1 above.	n/a
FS50 Clint Bennett - late	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S1.1 above.	n/a
S3.1 Jonathan Board	Oppose	Rezone the Silverstream Spur as Open Space.	Reject	The submission is out of scope of the plan change. The Council has addressed the Silverstream Spur site via Variation 1 to PC49.	No
FS6 John D O'Malley	Support	Concurs with all that has been written.	Reject	See reasons under S3.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Beatrice Serrao	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S3.1 above.	n/a
FS12 Tony Chad	Support	Agreed with the submission 'Protect the Silverstream Spur from residential development and develop it for conservation and recreation'. Agreed that: 'Silverstream Spur should be protected and developed as an open space for recreation.' The submitter should be asking for zoning as 'natural open space' not 'open space'. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S3.1 above.	n/a
FS14 Save our Hills	Support	The Silverstream Spur should be protected from residential development and be for conservation and recreational use.	Reject	See reasons under S3.1 above.	n/a
FS17 Craig Thorn	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S3.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Michelle Browning	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S3.1 above.	n/a
FS22 Pinehaven Progressive Association	Support	PPA agrees with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and PPA requests that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S3.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
FS23 Stephen Pattinson	Support	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and PPA requests that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S3.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Guildford Timber Company	Support in part	GTC opposes those parts of submissions which seek to prevent any development whatsoever on the Silverstream Spur. GTC supports 'in part' the submission points below, that relate to the Silverstream Spur and submitters seeking to have it rezoned as open space. GTC's 'in part' support is only provided on the basis that any rezoning of the Spur to open space does not compromise the ability to provide for a future road and associated infrastructure through / on the Spur, to enable potential future residential development at Silverstream Forest. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S3.1 above.	n/a
FS26 Janice Carey	Support	This area is an attractive gateway to our city. Want to keep as much natural open space that's still left close by for the people in this area. It is up to us to preserve.	Reject	See reasons under S3.1 above.	n/a
FS32 Colin Buckett	Support	I support to rezone the Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space because it is a reserve, also we don't want the land swap to go ahead for poor land.	Reject	See reasons under S3.1 above.	n/a
FS48 Sue Pattinson - late	Support	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and I request that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S3.1 above.	n/a
FS50 Clint Bennett - late	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S3.1 above.	n/a
S4.1 Doug Fauchelle	Oppose	Rezoned the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space.	Reject	The submission is out of scope of the plan change. The Council has addressed the Silverstream Spur site via Variation 1 to PC49.	No

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
FS3 Peter Ross	Support	I support all those submissions detailed above which support the retaining of Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space (ie with an official designation as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977).	Reject	See reasons under S4.1 above.	n/a
FS6 John D O'Malley	Support	Concurs with all that has been written.	Reject	See reasons under S4.1 above.	n/a
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	This is an iconic landscape that defines the entry to Upper Hutt.	Reject	See reasons under S4.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Beatrice Serrao	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S4.1 above.	n/a
FS12 Tony Chad	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S4.1 above.	n/a
FS14 Save our Hills	Support	This is an iconic landscape that defines the entry to Upper Hutt.	Reject	See reasons under S4.1 above.	n/a
FS17 Craig Thorn	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S4.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Michelle Browning	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S4.1 above.	n/a
FS22 Pinehaven Progressive Association	Support	PPA agrees with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and PPA requests that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S4.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Stephen Pattinson	Support	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and PPA requests that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S4.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Guildford Timber Company	Support in part	GTC opposes those parts of submissions which seek to prevent any development whatsoever on the Silverstream Spur. GTC supports 'in part' the submission points below, that relate to the Silverstream Spur and submitters seeking to have it	Reject	See reasons under S4.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
		rezoned as open space. GTC's 'in part' support is only provided on the basis that any rezoning of the Spur to open space does not compromise the ability to provide for a future road and associated infrastructure through / on the Spur, to enable potential future residential development at Silverstream Forest. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>			
FS26 Janice Carey	Support	This area is an attractive gateway to our city. Want to keep as much natural open space that's still left close by for the people in this area. It is up to us to preserve.	Reject	See reasons under S4.1 above.	n/a
FS32 Colin Buckett	Support	I support to rezone the Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space because it is a reserve, also we don't want the land swap to go ahead for poor land.	Reject	See reasons under S4.1 above.	n/a
FS48 Sue Pattinson - late	Support	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and I request that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S4.1 above.	n/a
FS50 Clint Bennett - late	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S4.1 above.	n/a
S6.1 Sean Kusel	Oppose	Rezone the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space.	Reject	The submission is out of scope of the plan change. The Council has addressed the Silverstream Spur site via Variation 1 to PC49.	No
FS3 Peter Ross	Support	I support all those submissions detailed above which support the retaining of Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space (ie with an official designation as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977).	Reject	See reasons under S6.1 above.	n/a
FS6 John D O'Malley	Support	Concurs with all that has been written.	Reject	See reasons under S6.1 above.	n/a
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	MOU has been withdrawn and Silverstream Spur is available to be included in PC49. Areas of high biodiversity values must be protected and enhanced/restored.	Reject	See reasons under S6.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
FS10 Beatrice Serrao	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S6.1 above.	n/a
FS12 Tony Chad	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S6.1 above.	n/a
FS14 Save our Hills	Support	Protect the Spur.	Reject	See reasons under S6.1 above.	n/a
FS17 Craig Thorn	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S6.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Michelle Browning	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S6.1 above.	n/a
FS22 Pinehaven Progressive Association	Support	PPA agrees with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and PPA requests that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S6.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Stephen Pattinson	Support	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and PPA requests that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S6.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Guildford Timber Company	Support in part	GTC opposes those parts of submissions which seek to prevent any development whatsoever on the Silverstream Spur. GTC supports 'in part' the submission points below, that relate to the Silverstream Spur and submitters seeking to have it rezoned as open space. GTC's 'in part' support is only provided on the basis that any rezoning of the Spur to open space does not compromise the ability to provide for a future road and associated infrastructure through / on the Spur, to enable potential future residential development at Silverstream Forest. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S6.1 above.	n/a
FS32 Colin	Support	I support to rezone the Silverstream Spur as a Natural	Reject	See reasons under S6.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
Buckettt		Open Space because it is a reserve, also we don't want the land swap to go ahead for poor land.			
FS48 Sue Pattinson - late	Support	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and I request that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S6.1 above.	n/a
FS50 Clint Bennett - late	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S6.1 above.	n/a
S7.1 Cameron Seay	Oppose	Rezone the Silverstream Spur as Open Space.	Reject	The submission is out of scope of the plan change. The Council has addressed the Silverstream Spur site via Variation 1 to PC49.	No
FS3 Peter Ross	Support	I support all those submissions detailed above which support the retaining of Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space (ie with an official designation as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977).	Reject	See reasons under S7.1 above.	n/a
FS6 John D O'Malley	Support	Concurs with all that has been written.	Reject	See reasons under S7.1 above.	n/a
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Zoned as an open space and left as is, to protect our environment. Though the submitter states Open Space, the definition provided points more to Natural Open Space.	Reject	See reasons under S7.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Beatrice Serrao	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S7.1 above.	n/a
FS12 Tony Chad	Support	Agreed with the submission that 'this land should be zoned as an open space and left as is, to protect our environment' but noted that the submitter should be asking for zoning as 'natural open space' not 'open space'. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S7.1 above.	n/a
FS14 Save our Hills	Support	Zone the Spur 'open space' to protect environment.	Reject	See reasons under S7.1 above.	n/a



Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
FS17 Craig Thorn	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S7.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Michelle Browning	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S7.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Darryl Longstaffe	Support	No reason stated.	Reject	See reasons under S7.1 above.	n/a
FS22 Pinehaven Progressive Association	Support	PPA agrees with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and PPA requests that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S7.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Stephen Pattinson	Support	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and PPA requests that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S7.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Guildford Timber Company	Support in part	GTC opposes those parts of submissions which seek to prevent any development whatsoever on the Silverstream Spur. GTC supports 'in part' the submission points below, that relate to the Spur and submitters seeking to have it rezoned as open space. GTC's 'in part' support is only provided on the basis that any rezoning of the Spur to open space does not compromise the ability to provide for a future road and associated infrastructure through / on the Spur, to enable potential future residential development at Silverstream Forest. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S7.1 above.	n/a
FS32 Colin Buckett	Support	I support to rezone the Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space because it is a reserve, also we don't want the land swap to go ahead for poor land.	Reject	See reasons under S7.1 above.	n/a
FS48 Sue Pattinson - late	Support	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and I request that Council allow in full	Reject	See reasons under S7.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
		the decisions requested by the above submitters. See <i>full submission for further details.</i>			
FS50 Clint Bennett - late	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S7.1 above.	n/a
S10.4 Mary Beth Taylor	Oppose	Rezone the Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space.	Reject	The submission is out of scope of the plan change. The Council has addressed the Silverstream Spur site via Variation 1 to PC49.	No
FS3 Peter Ross	Support	I support all those submissions detailed above which support the retaining of Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space (ie with an official designation as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977).	Reject	See reasons under S10.4 above.	n/a
FS6 John D O'Malley	Support	Concurs with all that has been written.	Reject	See reasons under S10.4 above.	n/a
FS10 Beatrice Serrao	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S10.4 above.	n/a
FS12 Tony Chad	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S10.4 above.	n/a
FS14 Save our Hills	Support	The Spur forms a natural gateway into Upper Hutt originally designated reserve land and has the potential to be restored to native forest as recreational Natural Open Space.	Reject	See reasons under S10.4 above.	n/a
FS15 Shelley Dixon	Support	Pinehaven is losing its natural resources and the infrastructure cannot cope with the increase in housing. Schools and roads are not fit for purpose for more residents. We must protect the natural habitats and resources including green spaces.	Reject	See reasons under S10.4 above.	n/a
FS17 Craig Thorn	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S10.4 above.	n/a
FS18 Michelle Browning	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S10.4 above.	n/a
FS19 Dominic Baron	Support	Agree that the Spur must be returned to the original status as reserve land. Must be returned as native forest as natural open space. Councils' decision in	Reject	See reasons under S10.4 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
		1991 to alter half the spur to residential zone must be reversed.			
FS20 Darryl Longstaffe	Support	No reason stated.	Reject	See reasons under S10.4 above.	n/a
FS23 Stephen Pattinson	Support	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and PPA requests that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S10.4 above.	n/a
FS24 Guildford Timber Company	Support in part	GTC opposes those parts of submissions which seek to prevent any development whatsoever on the Silverstream Spur. GTC supports 'in part' the submission points below, that relate to the Silverstream Spur and submitters seeking to have it rezoned as open space. GTC's 'in part' support is only provided on the basis that any rezoning of the Spur to open space does not compromise the ability to provide for a future road and associated infrastructure through / on the Spur, to enable potential future residential development at Silverstream Forest. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S10.4 above.	n/a
FS30 Sandra E Kenny	Support	Agree with all points made, especially that the council acknowledged that the residential zone on it was an error, and it would be corrected. Why did the council not action this at the time?	Reject	See reasons under S10.4 above.	n/a
FS32 Colin Buckett	Support	I support to rezone the Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space because it is a reserve, also we don't want the land swap to go ahead for poor land.	Reject	See reasons under S10.4 above.	n/a
FS48 Sue Pattinson - late	Support	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and I request that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S10.4 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
FS50 Clint Bennett - late	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S10.4 above.	n/a
S13.1 Tony Chad	Oppose	Rezone the Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space.	Reject	The submission is out of scope of the plan change. The Council has addressed the Silverstream Spur site via Variation 1 to PC49.	No
FS3 Peter Ross	Support	I support all those submissions detailed above which support the retaining of Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space (ie with an official designation as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977).	Reject	See reasons under S13.1 above.	n/a
FS6 John D O'Malley	Support	Concurs with all that has been written.	Reject	See reasons under S13.1 above.	n/a
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	The Spur is historically a reserve and biodiversity needs to be protected and restored across the city.	Reject	See reasons under S13.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Beatrice Serrao	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S13.1 above.	n/a
FS14 Save our Hills	Support	The Spur occupies a natural ecological corridor between the Western and Eastern Hills.	Reject	See reasons under S13.1 above.	n/a
FS17 Craig Thorn	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S13.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Michelle Browning	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S13.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Darryl Longstaffe	Support	No reason stated.	Reject	See reasons under S13.1 above.	n/a
FS22 Pinehaven Progressive Association	Support	PPA agrees with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and PPA requests that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S13.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Stephen Pattinson	Support	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and PPA requests that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters.	Reject	See reasons under S13.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
		<i>See full submission for further details.</i>			
FS24 Guildford Timber Company	Support in part	GTC opposes those parts of submissions which seek to prevent any development whatsoever on the Silverstream Spur. GTC supports 'in part' the submission points below, that relate to the Silverstream Spur and submitters seeking to have it rezoned as open space. GTC's 'in part' support is only provided on the basis that any rezoning of the Spur to open space does not compromise the ability to provide for a future road and associated infrastructure through / on the Spur, to enable potential future residential development at Silverstream Forest. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S13.1 above.	n/a
FS32 Colin Buckettt	Support	I support to rezone the Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space because it is a reserve, also we don't want the land swap to go ahead for poor land.	Reject	See reasons under S13.1 above.	n/a
FS48 Sue Pattinson - late	Support	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and I request that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S13.1 above.	n/a
FS49 James Hill - late	Support	Ecological corridor between western and eastern hills. Ecological return of forests and rainfall.	Reject	See reasons under S13.1 above.	n/a
FS50 Clint Bennett - late	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S13.1 above.	n/a
S14.1 Save our Hills	Oppose	Rezone the Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space.	Reject	The submission is out of scope of the plan change. The Council has addressed the Silverstream Spur site via Variation 1 to PC49.	No
FS3 Peter Ross	Support	I support all those submissions detailed above which support the retaining of Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space (ie with an official designation as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977).	Reject	See reasons under S14.1 above.	n/a
FS6 John D	Support	Concurs with all that has been written.	Reject	See reasons under S14.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
O'Malley					
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Council must rectify the omission of the Silverstream Spur from this Plan Change 49 by including the Silverstream Spur in its entirety (approx. 35ha) to be zoned as "Natural Open Space".	Reject	See reasons under S14.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Beatrice Serrao	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S14.1 above.	n/a
FS12 Tony Chad	Support	Support the submitters tireless efforts to save the spur and the hills. SOH requests that council rectify the omission of the Silverstream Spur from the plan change 49 by including the Silverstream Spur in its entirety (approx. 35ha) to be zoned as 'Natural Open Space'.	Reject	See reasons under S14.1 above.	n/a
FS16 Patricia Duncan	Support	Agreed with all points in their submission. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S14.1 above.	n/a
FS17 Craig Thorn	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S14.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Michelle Browning	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S14.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Darryl Longstaffe	Support	No reason stated.	Reject	See reasons under S14.1 above.	n/a
FS21 Natasha Colbourne	Support	The majority of people of Upper Hutt who have made submissions want the Spur protected from any development. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S14.1 above.	n/a
FS22 Pinehaven Progressive Association	Support	PPA agrees with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and PPA requests that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S14.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Stephen Pattinson	Support	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and PPA requests that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters.	Reject	See reasons under S14.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
		<i>See full submission for further details.</i>			
FS24 Guildford Timber Company	Support in part	GTC opposes those parts of submissions which seek to prevent any development whatsoever on the Silverstream Spur. GTC supports 'in part' the submission points below, that relate to the Spur and submitters seeking to have it rezoned as open space. GTC's 'in part' support is only provided on the basis that any rezoning of the Spur to open space does not compromise the ability to provide for a future road and associated infrastructure through / on the Spur, to enable potential future residential development at Silverstream Forest. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S14.1 above.	n/a
FS32 Colin Buckett	Support	I support to rezone the Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space because it is a reserve, also we don't want the land swap to go ahead for poor land.	Reject	See reasons under S14.1 above.	n/a
FS48 Sue Pattinson - late	Support	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and I request that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S14.1 above.	n/a
FS50 Clint Bennett - late	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S14.1 above.	n/a
S17.3 A. G. Spiers	Oppose	Rezone the Spur as Natural Open Space.	Reject	The submission is out of scope of the plan change. The Council has addressed the Silverstream Spur site via Variation 1 to PC49.	No
FS3 Peter Ross	Support	I support all those submissions detailed above which support the retaining of Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space (ie with an official designation as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977).	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS6 John D O'Malley	Support	Concurs with all that has been written.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS8 Mary Beth	Support	Designate more areas across the city as Open Space,	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
Taylor		particularly as Natural Open Space, creating a network of such areas linking all our parks. Restore biodiversity/plantings in these areas.			
FS9 Kylee Taramai	Support	To reserve this natural open space for nativity and public use.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS10 Beatrice Serrao	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS12 Tony Chad	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS14 Save our Hills	Support	Zoning the spur as Natural Open Space will meet the original purpose of the Spur when purchased by Council and have positive ecological and amenity effects.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS17 Craig Thorn	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS18 Michelle Browning	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS20 Darryl Longstaffe	Support	No reason stated.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS22 Pinehaven Progressive Association	Support	PPA agrees with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and PPA requests that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS23 Stephen Pattinson	Support	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and PPA requests that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS24 Guildford Timber Company	Support in part	GTC opposes those parts of submissions which seek to prevent any development whatsoever on the Silverstream Spur. GTC supports 'in part' the submission points below, that relate to the Silverstream Spur and submitters seeking to have it	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a



Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
		rezoned as open space. GTC's 'in part' support is only provided on the basis that any rezoning of the Spur to open space does not compromise the ability to provide for a future road and associated infrastructure through / on the Spur, to enable potential future residential development at Silverstream Forest. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>			
FS25 Doug Drinkwater	Support	My support for submitter 17 re The Silverstream Spur was purchased by UHCC as a natural open space and should never be utilized for any other purpose.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS26 Janice Carey	Support	This area is an attractive gateway to our city. Want to keep as much natural open space that's still left close by for the people in this area. It is up to us to preserve.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS27 Anthony Carey	Support	It appears the new council is disregarding the original purpose to purchase the land as green space for the community.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS32 Colin Buckett	Support	I support to rezone the Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space because it is a reserve, also we don't want the land swap to go ahead for poor land.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS48 Sue Pattinson - late	Support	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and I request that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS50 Clint Bennett - late	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS3 Peter Ross	Support	I support all those submissions detailed above which support the retaining of Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space (ie with an official designation as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977).	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS6 John D O'Malley	Support	Concurs with all that has been written.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS8 Mary Beth	Support	Designate more areas across the city as Open Space,	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
Taylor		particularly as Natural Open Space, creating a network of such areas linking all our parks. Restore biodiversity/plantings in these areas.			
FS10 Beatrice Serrao	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS12 Tony Chad	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS14 Save our Hills	Support	The Spur is appropriate to be zoned as Natural Open Space as a bird corridor and reserve.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS17 Craig Thorn	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS18 Michelle Browning	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS20 Darryl Longstaffe	Support	No reason stated.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS23 Stephen Pattinson	Support	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and PPA requests that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS24 Guildford Timber Company	Support in part	GTC opposes those parts of submissions which seek to prevent any development whatsoever on the Silverstream Spur. GTC supports 'in part' the submission points below, that relate to the Silverstream Spur and submitters seeking to have it rezoned as open space. GTC's 'in part' support is only provided on the basis that any rezoning of the Spur to open space does not compromise the ability to provide for a future road and associated infrastructure through / on the Spur, to enable potential future residential development at Silverstream Forest. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS26 Janice	Support	This area is an attractive gateway to our city. Want to	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
Carey		keep as much natural open space that's still left close by for the people in this area. It is up to us to preserve.			
FS28 Leonie Belmont	Support	Everyone (especially those in positions of power and authority) have a responsibility to improve and protect the environment. We also have a responsibility to future generations to preserve the natural environment.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS29 Marion Rough	Support	The spur is a fantastic natural open space for native flora and fauna. a bird corridor and reserve for this wonderful eastern hill's valley. it's a native paradise for native tree restoration and native bird nesting grounds as well as many other native animals, insects, and soil types.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS32 Colin Buckett	Support	I support to rezone the Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space because it is a reserve, also we don't want the land swap to go ahead for poor land.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS48 Sue Pattinson - late	Support	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and I request that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. See <i>full submission for further details</i> .	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
FS50 Clint Bennett - late	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S17.3 above.	n/a
S27.1 Silver Stream Railway	Oppose	Amend zoning so that the Silverstream Spur (Legal Description SO34755) is included in Upper Hutt City Councils Plan Change 49 and is rezoned in its entirety as Natural Open Space with an official designation as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.	Reject	The submission is out of scope of the plan change. The Council has addressed the Silverstream Spur site via Variation 1 to PC49.	No
FS3 Peter Ross	Support	I support all those submissions detailed above which support the retaining of Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space (ie with an official designation as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977).	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS6 John D O'Malley	Support	Concurs with all that has been written.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	The intention for the Silverstream Spur was originally as a public reserve. Indigenous biodiversity on the Spur is already regenerating. The people of Upper Hutt now and in the future deserve to be able to enjoy our Spur as the gateway to Upper Hutt.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Beatrice Serrao	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS12 Tony Chad	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission, especially relief sought. Silver Stream Railway request that the Silverstream Spur is included in Upper Hutt City Council's Plan Change 49 and is rezoned in its entirety as Natural Open Space with an official designation as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Seeking that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS14 Save our Hills	Support	Zone the Spur as Natural Open Space, as it was always meant to be a reserve.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS17 Craig Thorn	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Michelle Browning	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Darryl Longstaffe	Support	No reason stated.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS22 Pinehaven Progressive Association	Support	PPA agrees with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and PPA requests that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Stephen Pattinson	Support	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and PPA requests that Council allow in	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
		full the decisions requested by the above submitters. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>			
FS24 Guildford Timber Company	Support in part	GTC opposes those parts of submissions which seek to prevent any development whatsoever on the Silverstream Spur. GTC supports 'in part' the submission points below, that relate to the Silverstream Spur and submitters seeking to have it rezoned as open space. GTC's 'in part' support is only provided on the basis that any rezoning of the Spur to open space does not compromise the ability to provide for a future road and associated infrastructure through / on the Spur, to enable potential future residential development at Silverstream Forest. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS26 Janice Carey	Support	This area is an attractive gateway to our city. Want to keep as much natural open space that's still left close by for the people in this area. It is up to us to preserve.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS32 Colin Buckett	Support	I support to rezone the Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space because it is a reserve, also we don't want the land swap to go ahead for poor land.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS33 Jason Durry	Support	Support all parts, and in particular the rezoning of the Spur to its originally intended designation as Natural Open Space and as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. it is about time this was done as intended, it was not intended, even in part to be given to a private developer.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS34 Benjamin Michael Jones	Support	Designate Silverstream Spur as a reserve. To retain this important area for the future.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS35 Gerry Bealing	Support	Rezoning the spur to natural open space as this was the original reason the land was purchased.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS36 Caleb Scott	Support	Designate Silverstream Spur as a reserve as per the Reserves Act 1977. Land was purchased by UHCC in	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
		1990 using reserve funds. Spur should be used as a reserve as originally intended.			
FS37 Rhys Lloyd	Support	Designate Silverstream Spur as a reserve as per the Reserves Act 1977. Land was purchased by UHCC in 1990 using reserve funds. Spur should be used as a reserve as originally intended.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS38 Nadine Ebbett	Support	Keeping the entire Silver Stream Railway Spur as a reserve. To protect this area for future generations.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS39 Katelin Hardgrove	Support	Retention of the entire Silverstream Spur free from ANY development including a road. Land was purchased by UHCC as a reserve and should not be used to allow access to a subdivision to line a developer's pocket.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS40 Tommy Mortimer	Support	Retain the Silverstream Spur as a reserve. It is public land and no part of it should be given away for development or a road.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS41 Jennifer Durry	Support	Rezone the whole Silverstream Spur as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. The Spur was rezoned in error and should be corrected.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS42 John Durry	Support	Retain the Silverstream Spur without a road or infrastructure corridor. Designate the whole area as a reserve and natural open space. The spur was bought for the whole community as a reserve and needs to be honoured.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS43 Trevor Richardson	Support	Silverstream Spur must be kept by rezoning as a natural area for future generations. Spur acts as a natural backdrop to the railway and forms a natural gateway to Upper Hutt.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS44 David Grant-Taylor	Support	Rezoning the Silverstream spur as a natural space. This was the original purpose of the purchase. The spur forms a natural attractive entry to Upper Hutt (and Lower Hutt). Forms a nature corridor across the valley.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
FS45 Nick Moylan	Support	Silverstream Spur to be rezoned in its entirety as a natural open space and officially designated as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. Land was originally purchased by UHCC for the purpose of making it a reserve. Any development cutting into the spur such as a road would reduce its ecological effectiveness as a corridor and would need to stay intact as a reserve.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS46 Fraser Robertson	Support	Retain the Silverstream Spur as a reserve. It is public land and no part of it should be given away for development or a road.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS47 Ian Price	Support	Rezone the entire Silverstream Spur as a natural space. This was the reason the spur was purchased. To prevent developers from building out the native bush and green boundary of the city. part separation from Lower Hutt City.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS48 Sue Pattinson – late	Support	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters, and I request that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. See <i>full submission for further details</i> .	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
FS50 Clint Bennett - late	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S27.1 above.	n/a
<b>TOPIC 2: Open Space and Recreation Requested Zoning</b>					
S1.2 Graham Bellamy	Oppose	Rezone the Mangaroa Wetland to Natural Open Space.	Reject	It is considered that it is generally not appropriate to rezone private land as Natural Open Space Zone that is not accessible by the public and has no clear alignment with Natural Open Space Zones. Although the submitter's desire to see the Mangaroa peatland formally recognised and given some form of protection is understood, it is considered that rezoning the site to Natural Open Space Zone would not be the most appropriate method to achieve this. The Panel is mindful that affected property owners have not agreed to the requested rezoning, and that rezoning the land may have an	No

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
				impact on their ability to use their properties.	
FS7 GWRC	Oppose	GWRC notes that it is unusual to zone private land as open space, and the implications for existing Mangaroa residents would need to be understood and mitigated. Rezoning is probably not the right mechanism to protect wetlands. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Accept	See reasons under S1.2 above.	n/a
FS5 Pat Van Berkel	Support	The Mangaroa Peatland is a treasure of Upper Hutt being one of its kind and size of peatland in the lower North Island. Sadly, it has been treated with disdain for decades. Fortunately, though it can be restored. The first step is recognising its rarity and worth by designating it as a Natural Open Space. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Reject	See reasons under S1.2 above.	n/a
FS12 Tony Chad	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S1.2 above.	n/a
S5.1 Helen Chapman	Oppose	Amend proposed zoning to rezone Lot 2 DP 55611 WN25C/378 [land adjacent to Kurth Crescent Reserve] from sport and active recreation Natural Open Space zone.	Reject	It is considered that the proposed Sport and Active Recreation Zone is the most appropriate zone for this parcel as this aligns with the activities occurring on the site. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more detail.	No
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	The site is steep and unusable for recreational use, and it is abundant with native flora and fauna, so should be protected for future generations. This land may be subject to PC47 Hazards.	Reject	See reasons under S5.1 above.	n/a
S20.1 Wooster & Teasdale Families	Oppose	Amend the planning maps to replace the proposed Open Space and Recreation Zone's from the parts of Lot 2 Deposited Plan 52807; Pt Lot 2 Deposited Plan 58853; Lot 1 Deposited Plan 58853; Pt Lot 2 Deposited Plan 17413; Lot 1 Deposited Plan 10580; Lot 2 Deposited Plan 10580 (150 and 146 Gillespies Road) that are not currently within the active bed of the Hutt River and rezone this land a different zone which enables outlined provisions. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Accept in part	The Panel recommends the additional small area of land on the southern boundary of Pt Lot 2 DP 58853 on the southern edge of the river be rezoned to General Rural Zone as shown in Appendix 3. This land is not within the river corridor. The Panel does not consider it would be appropriate to rezone any other parts of the site to a different zone due to potential natural hazard risk, and the lack of planning evidence specifying what a more appropriate zone would be. See the Panel's recommendation report for more detail.	Yes



Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
FS7 GWRC	Oppose	GWRC opposes the requested re-zoning of land that is zoned as Natural Open Space along Te Awa Kairangi. Any areas outside the active riverbed but within the floodplain of Te Awa Kairangi are high hazard. This land is flood and erosion- prone and could be subject to ongoing fluvial processes (see Appendix 1). The only appropriate land use is open space.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S20.1 above.	n/a
S20.2 Wooster & Teasdale Families	Oppose	Amend the planning maps to limit the extent of the Natural Open Space Zone so that it is contained within the currently active bed of the Hutt River and rezone the balance land (outside the active channel/bed) to a different zone (namely the zone sought in S20.1 above) to enable the matters described in S20.1 to be undertaken on the site. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Accept in part	The Panel recommends the additional small area of land on the southern boundary of Pt Lot 2 DP 58853 on the southern edge of the river be rezoned to General Rural Zone as shown in Appendix 3. This land is not within the river corridor. The Panel does not consider it would be appropriate to rezone any other parts of the site to a different zone due to potential natural hazard risk, and the lack of planning evidence specifying what a more appropriate zone would be. The Panel notes the list of activities and development the submission requests to be 'enabled', could be sought via resource consent under the proposed zoning. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more detail.	Accept in part
FS7 GWRC	Oppose	GWRC opposes the requested re-zoning of land that is currently zoned as Natural Open Space along Te Awa Kairangi. Any areas outside the active riverbed but within the floodplain of Te Awa Kairangi are high hazard. This land is flood and erosion-prone and could be subject to ongoing fluvial processes (see Appendix 1). The only appropriate land use is open space.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S20.2 above.	n/a
S23.1 Forest & Bird	Oppose	We would like Upper Hutt City Council to commission an independent report to identify additional land to be zoned under the Natural Open Space Zone.	Reject	It is generally not considered appropriate to zone private land as Natural Open Space Zone. No need has been demonstrated for an independent report to identify additional land to be zoned Natural Open Space. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more detail.	No
FS2 Graham Bellamy	Support	Protect and enhance natural environment. eg: Silverstream Spur.	Reject	See reasons under S23.1 above.	n/a
FS12 Tony Chad	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission. Support Forest and Bird as experts in this area. A very comprehensive	Reject	See reasons under S23.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
		submission (parts 1-29)			
FS10 Beatrice Serrao	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S23.1 above.	n/a
FS17 Craig Thorn	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S23.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Michelle Browning	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S23.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Darryl Longstaffe	Support	No reason stated.	Reject	See reasons under S23.1 above.	n/a
FS50 Clint Bennett - late	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S23.1 above.	n/a
S23.2 Forest & Bird	Oppose	Apply the Natural Open Space zone to private land where appropriate.	Accept in part	It is considered appropriate to zone private land as Natural Open Space in very limited circumstances with landowner agreement or within an active river corridor. No amendments are recommended in response to this submission point.	No
S23.5 Forest & Bird	Oppose	Rezone the existing Valley Floor Sub-zone of Mangaroa Valley to Natural Open Space Zone.	Reject	The Panel considers that it is generally not appropriate to rezone private land as Natural Open Space Zone that is not accessible by the public and has no clear alignment with Natural Open Space Zones. Although the Panel understands submitter's desire to see the Mangaroa peatland formally recognised and given some form of protection, the Panel considers that rezoning the site to Natural Open Space Zone would not be the most appropriate method to achieve this. The Panel is mindful that affected property owners have not agreed to the requested rezoning, and that rezoning the land may have an impact on their ability to use their properties.	No
FS7 GWRC	Oppose	GWRC notes that it is unusual to zone private land as open space, and the implications for existing Mangaroa residents would need to be understood and mitigated. Re-zoning is probably not the right mechanism to protect wetlands. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Accept	See reasons under S23.5 above.	n/a
FS2 Graham	Support	Mangaroa peatland is geomorphologically unique and	Reject	See reasons under S23.5 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
Bellamy		needs protection and be protected from further farming and degradation. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>			
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Designate more areas across the city as Open Space, particularly as Natural Open Space, creating a network of such areas linking all our parks. Restore biodiversity/plantings in these areas.	Reject	See reasons under S23.5 above.	n/a
S23.29 Forest & Bird	Oppose	Oppose zoning of General Industrial because there is clearly a component that should be zoned NOS. Split the zone to carve out the forested hill area as Natural Open Space.	Reject	It is generally not considered appropriate to zone private land as open space. The landowner has not requested this zoning.  As the site has already been rezoned via the Council's operative IPI since PC49 was notified, the Panel recommends the Council formally withdraws the site from PC49 via Clause 8D of Schedule 1 of the RMA before making decisions on the plan change. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S10.1 Mary Beth Taylor	Oppose	Amend to increase the area of Open Space.	Accept in part	It is generally not considered appropriate to zone private land as Natural Open Space. However, additional parcels have been identified since the notification of PC49, and these are recommended to be included and rezoned as part of PC49.	Yes
S17.1 A. G. Spiers	Oppose	Amend to increase the area of Open Space in Plan Change 49, providing connectivity between our parks, and all along the hills from north to south, including the Spur.	Accept in part	It is generally not considered appropriate to zone private land as Natural Open Space. However, additional parcels have been identified since the notification of PC49, and these are recommended to be included and rezoned as part of PC49.	Yes
FS12 Tony Chad	Support	Support this eloquent, professional, knowledgeable submission "please increase the area of open space in plan change 49, providing connectivity between our parks, and all along the hills from north to south, including the Spur. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Accept in part	See reasons under S17.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Beatrice Serrao	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons under S17.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
FS17 Craig Thorn	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons under S17.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Michelle Browning	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons under S17.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Darryl Longstaffe	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons under S17.1 above.	n/a
FS50 Clint Bennett - late	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons under S17.1 above.	n/a
S17.4 A. G. Spiers	Oppose	Consider including the Mangaroa Peatland in future plans as a 'flagship wetland' for Upper Hutt. See submission for further details.	Reject	The Panel considers that it is generally not appropriate to rezone private land as Natural Open Space Zone that is not accessible by the public and has no clear alignment with Natural Open Space Zones. Although the Panel understands submitter's desire to see the Mangaroa peatland formally recognised and given some form of protection, the Panel considers that rezoning the site to Natural Open Space Zone would not be the most appropriate method to achieve this. The Panel is mindful that affected property owners have not agreed to the requested rezoning, and that rezoning the land may have an impact on their ability to use their properties.	No
FS7 GWRC	Oppose	GWRC notes that it is unusual to zone private land as open space, and the implications for existing Mangaroa residents would need to be understood and mitigated. Re-zoning is probably not the right mechanism to protect wetlands. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>	Accept	See reasons under S17.4 above.	n/a
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Designate more areas across the city as Open Space, particularly as Natural Open Space, creating a network of such areas linking all our parks. Restore biodiversity/plantings in these areas.	Reject	See reasons under S17.4 above.	n/a
FS12 Tony Chad	Support	Please consider including the Mangaroa Peatland in future plans as a "flagship wetland" for Upper Hutt.	Reject	See reasons under S17.4 above.	n/a
FS10 Beatrice Serrao	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S17.4 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
FS17 Craig Thorn	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S17.4 above.	n/a
FS18 Michelle Browning	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S17.4 above.	n/a
FS20 Darryl Longstaffe	Support	No reason stated.	Reject	See reasons under S17.4 above.	n/a
FS50 Clint Bennett - late	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons under S17.4 above.	n/a
S25.1 CBDI Limited	Support	Retain the removal of the Open Space zoning from the hill at the rear of 27 Blenheim Street and rezone the hill to General Industrial.	Accept	As the site has already been rezoned via the Council's operative IPI since PC49 was notified, the Panel recommends the Council formally withdraws the site from PC49 via Clause 8D of Schedule 1 of the RMA before making decisions on the plan change. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S25.2 CBDI Limited	Oppose	That the existing operative zoning of the remainder of the site (excluding the hill) at 27 Blenheim Street is retained and is not rezoned by Proposed Plan Change 49.	Reject	The Panel notes the remainder of the site was not proposed to be rezoned by PC49. The zone change shown on the notified PC49 maps reflected changes to the zone made by the Council via a separate process to give effect to the National Planning Standards.	No
<b>TOPIC 3: Biodiversity and Sustainability Provisions</b>					
S26.2 GWRC	Oppose	Recommend that all Natural Open Space Zone matters for control and matters of discretion should be amended to include consideration of indigenous biodiversity values.	Accept	It is considered appropriate to amend provisions to include consideration of indigenous biodiversity values. Various amendments are recommended to include reference to the consideration of indigenous biodiversity values.	Yes
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Designate more areas across the city as Open Space, particularly as Natural Open Space. Restore indigenous biodiversity in these areas.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S26.2 above.	n/a
S26.3 GWRC	Oppose	The submitter requests amendments on the basis that the Operative District Plan does not currently provide sufficient protection of indigenous biodiversity, including failing to give effect to the relevant Policies within the Regional Policy Statement.	Accept in part	Current provisions go some way to protect indigenous biodiversity which are to be reviewed through PC48B. Amendments are recommended to the subdivision provisions to include reference to indigenous biodiversity values as a matter of control/discretion. Other provisions with respect to indigenous biodiversity are also recommended to be amended in response to other	Yes

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
				submissions points by GWRC.	
S26.4 GWRC	Seeks amendment	The submitter seeks an amendment to the proposed wording to indirectly provide reference to the relevant park management plan.  Amendment sought is: ...(Reserves Act 1977). <u>Any activities within a Regional Park will also need to comply with the park management plan.</u>	Accept	It is considered appropriate to amend the NOSZ preamble to clarify that activities in a regional park must also comply with the requirements of the park management plan.	Yes
S26.5 GWRC	Seeks amendment	The submitter proposes an amendment to the wording of the proposed objective NOSZ-O2 to give effect to Regional Policy Statement Policy 47.  Amendment sought is the addition of <u>indigenous biodiversity values</u> and removal of <u>with associated natural and ecological value.</u>	Accept in part	It is considered appropriate to amend NOSZ-O2 to include reference to indigenous biodiversity values. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for additional details.	Yes
S26.6 GWRC	Seeks amendment	The submitter proposes an amendment to the wording of the proposed objective NOSZ-O3 to give effect to Regional Policy Statement Policy 47. Amendment sought is the addition of <u>indigenous biodiversity.</u>	Accept	It is considered appropriate to amend NOSZ-O3 to include reference to indigenous biodiversity values.	Yes
S26.7 GWRC	Seeks amendment	The submitter proposes an amendment to the wording of the proposed policy NOSZ-P1 to give effect to Regional Policy Statement Policy 47. Amendment sought is the addition of <u>indigenous biodiversity.</u>	Accept	It is considered appropriate to amend NOSZ-P1 to include reference to indigenous biodiversity values.	Yes
S26.8 GWRC	Seeks amendment	The submitter proposes an amendment to the wording of the proposed policy NOSZ-P2 to give effect to Regional Policy Statement Policy 47. Amendment sought is the addition of <u>indigenous biodiversity.</u>	Accept	It is considered appropriate to amend NOSZ-P2 to include reference to indigenous biodiversity values.	Yes
S26.9 GWRC	Seeks amendment	The submitter proposes an amendment to the wording of the proposed policy NOSZ-P3 to give effect to Regional Policy Statement Policy 47. Amendment sought is the addition of <u>indigenous biodiversity and indigenous biodiversity values.</u>	Accept	It is considered appropriate to amend NOSZ-P3 to include reference to indigenous biodiversity values.	Yes
S26.10 GWRC	Seeks amendment	The submitter requests an amendment to the wording of the proposed policy NOSZ-P4 to give effect to Regional Policy Statement Policy 47. Amendment sought is the addition of <u>indigenous biodiversity and</u>	Accept	It is considered appropriate to amend NOSZ-P4 to include reference to indigenous biodiversity and dark sky.	Yes

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
		<u>dark sky, indigenous biodiversity.</u>			
S26.11 GWRC	Seeks amendment	The submitter requests an amendment to the proposed policy NOSZ-P5 to add 'orchards' as an enabled activity to align with the Toitū Te Whenua Parks Network Plan 2020-30. Amendment sought is the addition of <u>orchards</u> as an enabled activity.	Accept	It is considered appropriate to amend provisions to include orchards in NOSZ-P5.	Yes
S26.12 GWRC	Seeks amendment	The submitter requests an amendment to the wording of the proposed standard NOSZ-S1 to give effect to Regional Policy Statement Policy 47. Amendment sought is the addition of <u>indigenous biodiversity values.</u>	Accept	It is considered appropriate to amend provisions to include indigenous biodiversity values in NOSZ-S1.	Yes
GWRC	Seeks amendment	The submitter proposes an amendment to the wording of the proposed standard NOSZ-S2 to give effect to Regional Policy Statement Policy 47. Amendment sought is the addition of <u>indigenous biodiversity values.</u>	Accept	It is considered appropriate to amend provisions to include indigenous biodiversity values in NOSZ-S2.	Yes
S26.14 GWRC	Seeks amendment	The submitter proposes an amendment to the wording of the proposed standard NOSZ-S3 to give effect to Regional Policy Statement Policy 47. Amendment sought is the addition of <u>indigenous biodiversity values.</u>	Accept	It is considered appropriate to amend provisions to include indigenous biodiversity values in NOSZ-S3.	Yes
S26.15 GWRC	Seeks amendment	The submitter proposes an amendment to the proposed matters of control and matters of discretion to give effect to Regional Policy Statement Policy 47.	Accept	It is considered appropriate to amend provisions to include indigenous biodiversity values in matters of control and discretion.	Yes
S23.3 Forest & Bird	Oppose	Forest & Bird would like to support provisions that restrict public access to protect natural values and private property as appropriate. This may require a distinction between Natural Open Space on private versus publicly owned land.	Reject	It is recommended that the requested approach would not be consistent with the intent of the zone which is to allow for a range of recreation activities in areas with natural values. It is noted that protection of natural values is not the primary purpose of the Natural Open Space Zone.	No
FS10 Beatrice Serrao	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation on S23.3 above.	n/a
FS12 Tony Chad	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission. Support Forest and Bird as experts in this area. A very comprehensive	Reject	See reasons for recommendation on S23.3 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
		submission (parts 1-29).			
FS17 Craig Thorn	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation on S23.3 above.	n/a
FS18 Michelle Browning	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation on S23.3 above.	n/a
FS20 Darryl Longstaffe	Support	No reason stated.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation on S23.3 above.	n/a
FS50 Clint Bennett - late	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation on S23.3 above.	n/a
S23.4 Forest & Bird	Oppose	Amend the purpose of the natural open space zone such that retention of natural environment is the primary focus and by removing the enabling approach towards recreation or other uses.	Reject	It is considered that the requested approach would not be consistent with the intent of the zone which is to allow for a range of recreation activities in areas with natural values. It is noted that protection of natural values is not the primary purpose of the Natural Open Space Zone. Please note that an amendment is recommended to NOSZ-O3 in response to submission S23.19 to remove the term 'enable'.	No
S23.7 Forest & Bird	Support	The submitter states that they support these amendments as they are appropriate.		Accept as the proposed amendments have been supported.	
S23.8 Forest & Bird	Seeks amendment	The submitter states that the Open Space and Natural Open Space zones have been conflated throughout the proposed plan change, and that the strategic objectives need to reflect the differences between the two zones, including the difference between Natural Open Space on private and publicly owned land.	Reject	The strategic objectives are considered as outcomes for all zones.	No
S23.9 Forest & Bird	Seeks amendment	The submitter seeks the addition of references to matters of consideration for the proposed open space and recreation zones.	Reject	Current provisions go some way to protect indigenous biodiversity which are being reviewed through PC48B. It is noted that matters for consideration are not matters of discretion, and do not sit within objective, policies or rules.	No
S23.10 Forest & Bird	Seeks amendment	The submitter seeks the addition of references to matters of consideration for the proposed open space and recreation zones.	Reject	Current provisions go some way to protect indigenous biodiversity which are being reviewed through PC48B. It is noted that matters for consideration are not matters of discretion, and do not sit within objective, policies	No



Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
				or rules.	
S23.11 Forest & Bird	Support	The submitter states that they support the amendment as it is appropriate.	Accept	Support noted.	No
S23.12 Forest & Bird	Support	The submitter states that they support the amendment as it is appropriate.	Accept	Support noted.	No
S23.13 Forest & Bird	Support	The submitter states that they support the amendment as it is appropriate.	Accept	Support noted.	No
S23.14 Forest & Bird	Seeks amendment	The submitter states that there is no delineation between the subdivision provisions for the Open Space and Natural Open Space Zones, and requests the amendment sought to clarify differences between the two zones, including considering subdivision in the Natural Open Space Zone which is incompatible with the natural environment.	Reject	The approach is to restrict subdivision across all open space zones. Therefore the subdivision provisions do not require differentiation between the zones. Policy direction for each open space zone will apply under s.104 of the RMA.	No
S23.15 Forest & Bird	Support	The submitter states that they support the amendment as it is appropriate.	Accept	Support noted.	No
S23.16 Forest & Bird	Oppose	The submitter contends that the Natural Open Space Zone provisions are not appropriate in light of the above submission points. The submitter requests that if Natural Open Space Zone occurs on private land, then provisions should clearly state that access is a privilege and not an expectation, and the submitter states that this zone has not been well incorporated into the rest of the plan.	Reject	It is noted that the Natural Open Space Zone does not usually occur on private land, and access would be by permission of the landowner or via established public access routes such as via the riverbed.	No
S23.17 Forest & Bird	Seeks amendment	The submitter states that the proposed NOSZ-O1 is not consistent with the national planning standards and is inconsistent with the Regional Policy Statement and part 2 of the RMA. Amendment sought is the addition of <u>retains natural environmental values and provides opportunities for and where appropriate.</u>	Accept in part	Accept in part as it is considered appropriate to partially amend provisions to NOSZ-O1 as requested, but not to delete reference to 'ancillary structures' because these can support recreation and other activities, including conservation and customary activities within the Natural Open Space Zone.	Yes
S23.18 Forest & Bird	Seeks amendment	The submitter states that the proposed NOSZ-O2 is not consistent with the national planning standards and is inconsistent with the Regional Policy Statement and	Accept in part	It is considered appropriate to partially amend provisions to NOSZ-O2 to refer to protecting indigenous biodiversity. It is considered 'indigenous biodiversity' adequately captures	Yes

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
		part 2 of the RMA. The submitter states that objective should be clearer with regards to character and amenity values, and that the purpose of the matters listed in the objective is unclear, as is the definition of appropriate activities. Amendment sought is the addition of <u>protects indigenous species, their habitats and ecosystem functions and appropriately located.</u>		species, habitats, and functions.	
S23.19 Forest & Bird	Seeks amendment	The submitter states that enabling is not appropriate for proposed NOSZ-O3 and is not appropriate where the purpose and character of the zone is not clearly set out. Amendment sought is the removal of <u>Enable a diverse range .....</u> and addition of <u>Regional Parks.</u>	Accept in part	It is agreed that the term 'enable' is not appropriate for this objective. The proposed objective acknowledges that Regional Parks will have diverse activities, and it is recommended that this is retained within the objective. Please see the recommendation report for more detail.	Yes
FS7 GWRC	Oppose	GWRC considers that the opportunities for a diverse range of activities in the Regional Parks as part of the natural open space zone, including recreational opportunities, are important. We consider that the natural open space zone should be about people being able to access and enjoy natural open spaces, as recognised in Toitū te Whenua Parks Network Plan 2020-2030.	Accept in part	See recommendation for S23.19 above.	n/a
S23.20 Forest & Bird	Seeks amendment	The submitter reasons that the activities should be provided for rather than enabled as Council will not play an active role in enabling activities on private land. The Submitter also requests the matters in the proposed objective NOSZ-O2 should be included in this policy. Amendment sought is the addition of <u>provide for and location.</u>	Accept in part	It is considered appropriate to amend NOSZ-P1, albeit in an alternative layout to that requested by the submission regarding 'location'. Please see the recommendation report for more details.	Yes
S23.21 Forest & Bird	Seeks amendment	The submitter states that not all matters listed in the proposed NOSZ-P2 may be appropriate, and that the policy is not limited to the matters listed. Amendment sought is the removal of <u>provide for consider providing.</u>	Reject	It is considered that the requested amendment would not be consistent with the rules and standards for the Natural Open Space Zone, as policy NOSZ-P2 is also the policy that underpins permitted activity rules and standards. It is also considered that the policy includes sufficient clarity to decision makers on resource consent applications, as the activities listed in the policy are only enabled where they will not adversely affect the natural character and amenity	No

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
				values of the Natural Open Space Zone. Please also see proposed policy NOSZ-P3 which must also be considered as part of the resource consent process.	
S23.22 Forest & Bird	Oppose	The submitter seeks clarification on NOSZ-P3-2 to ensure that conservation activities are not avoided where they inhibit recreation, and the submitters seeks amendments to ensure the policy can be applied to private land and Regional Parks. Amendment sought is the removal of <u>inhibit for that are not</u> and change to <u>activities that result in.</u>	Accept in part	It is considered appropriate to amend provisions to NOSZ-P3 as this will improve clarity of the intended policy direction. Please see the recommendation report for more detail.	Yes
S23.23 Forest & Bird	Seeks amendment	The submitter states that it is not appropriate to enhance the activities and values in NOSZ-P4 over protection of natural values, and states that this is inconsistent with Part 2 (s6) of the RMA. Amendment sought is the addition of <u>where appropriate and where consistent with the protection if significant indigenous biodiversity and preservation of natural character.</u>	Accept in part	It is considered appropriate to amend NOSZ-P4 to achieve the outcomes requested by the submission, but alternative wording and positioning of amended text is recommended, Please see the recommendation report for more detail.	Yes
S23.24 Forest & Bird	Seeks amendment	The submitter opposes the specific enablement of activities in NOSZ-P5, within the Regional Parks, stating that Council should retain discretion to decline activities in the Regional Parks. The submitter specifically states that quarrying and bee keeping may not be appropriate activities due to potential loss of indigenous biodiversity and new access requirements. The submitter also highlights how the National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry overrides the District Plan considerations, but the District Plan can still consider indigenous biodiversity. Amendment sought is the removal of <u>enable and plantation forestry.</u>	Reject	It is considered that that it is appropriate that primary production activities are enabled within the specified regional parks, as these activities are best managed by the Regional Council via the Toitū te Whenua Parks Network Plan 2020-2030. It is noted that that regional councils have functions under s31 of the RMA, including the maintenance of indigenous biodiversity. This may address some of the concerns expressed by the submission.	No
FS7 GWRC	Oppose	GWRC opposes the wording changes suggested in this policy, as consider that these activities are appropriately managed through Toitū te Whenua Parks Network Plan 2020-2030. Bee keeping and small-scale	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on submission S23.24 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
		quarrying are restricted activities in all Regional Parks which require all applications to have Assessments of Environmental Effects. Similarly, GWRC opposes the deletion of plantation forestry from this policy, as this activity is managed through the Toitū te Whenua Parks Network Plan 2020-2030 and the NES Plantation Forestry. There is a designation for the plantation forestry areas in the UHCC District Plan. We would support replacing 'enable' with 'provide for' or 'allow for', as requested by the submitter in other submission points. This approach would be consistent with OSZ-P2 in the Porirua City Proposed District Plan, where primary production is 'allowed for' in the Battle Hill Farm Forest Park and Belmont Regional Park.			
S23.25 Forest & Bird	Seeks amendment	The submitter states that active management is required to control pest animals and pest plants. Amendment sought is the addition of UHCC ensures there are management plans in place to control pest animals and pest plants on UHCC natural open spaces.	Reject	Although the importance of the management of pests is acknowledged, the preparation of management plans for the control of pests is not a district plan matter. Please see the recommendation report for more detail.	No
FS7 GWRC	Support in part	GWRC supports ensuring pest management occurs in the natural open space zone. It is not clear which pieces of land are being referred to in this request (i.e. parks and reserves belonging to or managed by UHCC, and not already in a KNE plan?), and what a 'management plan' means.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S23.25 above.	n/a
S23.26 Forest & Bird	Support	The submitter states that they support the amendment as it is appropriate.	Accept	Support is noted.	No
S23.27 Forest & Bird	Support	The submitter states that the proposed Open Space Zone provisions are appropriate as they apply to the Open Space Zone and not the Natural Open Space Zone, but the submitter seeks the provisions to better reflect the open and natural feeling of the zone which people enjoy.	Reject	The Open Space Zone provision seeks to maintain a sense of openness while allowing for appropriate activities. It is noted the submission does request any specific wording amendments.	No

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
S23.28 Forest & Bird	Seeks amendment	The submitter states that nature and naturalness are important characteristics of the open space zone and the proposed OSZ-O2 needs to reflect this. Amendment sought is the addition of <u>naturalness and</u> to the objective.	Reject	The provision seeks to maintain a sense of openness while allowing for appropriate activities. It is considered that naturalness is more relevant to the proposed Natural Open Space Zone.	No
S10.2 Mary Beth Taylor	Oppose	Amend PC49 to make stronger connections between the Sustainability Strategy and make it less humancentric.	Reject	Reject as Goal 3 is not a relevant for this Plan Change as it is infrastructure specific. The Panel does not consider that additional amendments are necessary to make stronger connections to the Sustainability Strategy. It is noted that not all aspects of the Strategy can be given effect to via PC49. The Panel also notes that it would require additional planning advice to identify and recommend potential additional changes to the District Plan if Council considered it desirable or necessary to deliver additional components of the Strategy via the District Plan. Further, it is the Panel's understanding that Goal 3 of the Sustainability Strategy is specific to infrastructure, and would therefore best be addressed via other methods or a potential future plan change as part of the wider District Plan rolling review.	No
FS10 Beatrice Serrao	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation on submission S10.2 above.	n/a
FS17 Craig Thorn	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation on submission S10.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Michelle Browning	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation on submission S10.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Darryl Longstaffe	Support	No reason stated.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation on submission S10.2 above.	n/a
FS50 Clint Bennett - late	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation on submission S10.2 above.	n/a
S10.3 Mary Beth Taylor	Oppose	Amend to include provisions for environmental care and biodiversity protection and restoration of open spaces in PC49.	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended to include reference to biodiversity values in response to other submissions.	No
FS12 Tony	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on submission S10.3	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
Chad				above.	
S17.2 A. G. Spiers	Oppose	Amend so that Plan Change 49 better covers UHCC's responsibilities to protect existing biodiversity and restore degraded environments.	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended to include reference to biodiversity values in response to other submissions.	No
FS10 Beatrice Serrao	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on submission S17.2 above.	n/a
FS17 Craig Thorn	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on submission S17.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Michelle Browning	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on submission S17.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Darryl Longstaffe	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on submission S17.2 above.	n/a
FS12 Tony Chad	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on submission S17.2 above.	n/a
FS50 Clint Bennett - late	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on submission S17.2 above.	n/a
<b>TOPIC 4: Hutt Valley Clay Target Club Provisions</b>					
S9.1 Mangaroa Farms	Oppose	Retain the current number of operating days for the Hutt Valley Clay Target Club at 80 days.	Accept	The Panel does not consider it appropriate to increase the number of annual shooting days in the absence of an evidence base that identifies the actual and potential effects of this on the surrounding environment. The Panel considers that, based on the evidence before it, any increase in the number of annual shooting days would most appropriately be sought via the resource consent process. Please see the Panel's report for more details.	Yes
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Population growth in the area, new zoning "Settlement Area" as well as rural amenity values indicate that increasing the number of shooting days is not warranted.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on submission S9.1 above.	n/a
S12.1 John Hill	Oppose	Oppose changes to number of shooting days for Upper Hutt Clay Target club, retain the current number of operating days for the Hutt Valley Clay Target Club at 80 days.	Accept	The Panel does not consider it appropriate to increase the number of annual shooting days in the absence of an evidence base that identifies the actual and potential effects of this on the surrounding environment. The Panel considers	Yes

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
				that, based on the evidence before it, any increase in the number of annual shooting days would most appropriately be sought via the resource consent process. Please see the Panel's report for more details.	
<b>TOPIC 5: Royal Wellington Golf Club Provisions</b>					
S19.1 Royal Wellington Golf Club	Oppose	The submission states the proposed policy SUB-OSRZ-P1 is overly restrictive on the ability for privately owned open space land to be able to subdivide, and that an identified deficit of open space land should be addressed through public means as opposed to a restriction in subdivision for private open space. Therefore, the submitter requests that the policy refer only to public open space.	Accept	It is considered appropriate to differentiate between public and private open space in SUB-OSRZ-P1 on account of private open spaces not forming part of the publicly accessible open space network. Please see the recommendation report for more detail.	Yes
S19.2 Royal Wellington Golf Club	Seeks amendment	The submission supports the principle of the proposed objective SARZ-O2 but requests an amendment to the proposed wording on the basis that sub-objective (1) is difficult to interpret, and that the reference to spaces being accessible is too broad, and that some spaces are not appropriate to be accessible to the public in private open spaces.	Accept	It is considered appropriate to amend the word 'spaces' to 'public open spaces' for clarification in SARZ-O2. This helps clarify that access arrangements to private open space is not the same as for public open space.	Yes
S19.3 Royal Wellington Golf Club	Support	The submission supports the proposed objective SARZ-O3 as it recognises the contribution that privately owned sports clubs make to the open space network.	Accept	The submission supports objective SARZ-O3. No amendments are recommended to this objective in response to other submissions.	No
S19.4 Royal Wellington Golf Club	Seeks amendment	The submitter supports the proposed policy SARZ-P2 in general but suggests an amendment in the wording of the Policy as the submitter states that the proposed wording may have the effect of precluding development that supports the recreational use of the zone and its broader recreational character.	Accept	It is considered appropriate to amend the word 'protect' to 'support' for clarification in SARZ- P2. It is considered that supporting the recreational character of the Sport and Active Recreation Zone is more appropriate than protecting it due to the existence of Sport and Active Recreation zoned sites that are privately owned	Yes
S19.5 Royal Wellington	Support	The submitter supports the proposed policy SARZ-P5 as it recognises the contribution that privately owned sports clubs make to the open space network.	Accept	Support is noted.	No

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
Golf Club					
S19.6 Royal Wellington Golf Club	Oppose	The submitter opposes this proposed standard SARZ-S2 on the basis that it is less than the existing District Plan provisions allow for, and this could restrict any future rebuilding of the clubhouse if the existing structure was damaged or destroyed, as the current clubhouse exceeds the permitted standard. Furthermore, the submitter is concerned that minor alterations would trigger non-compliances with this standard. The submitter states that SARZ-R5 (height control planes) would manage the effects of building height in relation to surrounding sites.	Reject	Buildings over 15m are not considered appropriate in all instances within the Sport and Active Recreation Zone. It is considered appropriate that buildings of this height are considered on a case-by-case basis via the resource consent process.  Note: It is recommended that the Royal Wellington Golf Club site is formally withdrawn from PC49 via Clause 8D of Schedule 1 of the RMA, and that the rezoning of the site is carried out via the future Special Activity Zone plan change as signalled in the s32 evaluation report. Please see the recommendation report for more details.	No
S19.7 Royal Wellington Golf Club	Oppose	The submitter opposes this standard SARZ-S3 on the basis that the setback is an increase from the existing provisions, and that this would restrict development in vicinity of the existing clubhouse. The submitter states that the height control planes should be relied upon to control the bulk and location of any development.	Accept	It is considered appropriate to amend the building setback standard as the height control plane standard will manage effects on neighbouring residential amenity, including sunlight access.	Yes
S19.8 Royal Wellington Golf Club	Oppose	The submitter opposes this proposed standard SARZ-S4, stating that it does not take into account the nature and scale of the buildings required to operate the club, including the potential restriction of being able to redevelop if existing buildings were damaged or destroyed.	Reject	The proposed 300m <sup>2</sup> gross floor area limit is considered to be an appropriate permitted limit with respect to the character of the zone. It is considered appropriate that larger buildings and structures should be considered on a case-by-case basis via the resource consent process.  Note: It is recommended that the Royal Wellington Golf Club site is formally withdrawn from PC49 via Clause 8D of Schedule 1 of the RMA, and that the rezoning of the site is carried out via the future Special Activity Zone plan change as signalled in the s32 evaluation report.	No
S19.9 Royal Wellington Golf Club	Oppose	The submitter opposes this proposed standard SARZ-S6 and recommends amendments on the basis that the proposed rule does not account for the ability for any caretaker to accommodate their household within the dwelling. The submitter states that the proposed amendment would still result in a standard that manages the effects of caretaker accommodation	Accept in part	It is considered appropriate to amend provisions related to caretaker accommodation in SARZ-S6 to increase the gross floor area and to enable the family of caretakers to also be in residence.	Yes



Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
		within the zone. The submitter specifically mentions points related to the standards. <i>See full submission for further details.</i>			
<b>TOPIC 6: Transport</b>					
S16.1 Waka Kotahi	Support	The submitter supports the separation of motorised recreation from other recreation activities.	Accept	The submission does not request amendments to PC49.	No
S16.2 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter supports the intent of the proposed definition for passive recreation but suggests an amended definition to better differentiate between the forms of recreation and their effects, by clearly excluding organised sports.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.3 Waka Kotahi	Support	The submitter supports this definition and the distinction that motorised recreation is a separate activity.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.4 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter has suggested revised wording to include consideration of the effect on the wider environment by enabled activities.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.5 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter supports the proposed provision and activity status as it enables the management of effects on the transport network, however the submitter states that the reference to the chapter in the reformatted District Plan should be removed and the reference should be made to the standards within the operative District Plan.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.6	Seeks	The submitter supports the proposed provision and	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to	No

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
Waka Kotahi	amendment	activity status as it enables the management of effects on the transport network, however the submitter states that the reference to the chapter in the reformatted District Plan should be removed and the reference should be made to the standards within the operative District Plan.		this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	
S16.7 Waka Kotahi	Support	The submitter supports the approach of restricting subdivision except for listed exceptions.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.8 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter considers that limited notification should not be precluded for subdivisions with a controlled activity status due to the potential adverse effects on the state highway. Waka Kotahi should be consulted with and notified where subdivision may result in adverse effects to the state highway.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.9 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter states that the reference to the chapter in the reformatted District Plan should be removed and the reference should be made to the standards within the operative District Plan.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.10 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter suggests amendment to the proposed objective to include consideration of effects on the wider environment beyond the sites within the zone, including the transport network.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.11	Seeks amendment	The submitter supports the proposed policy but suggests amendment to the proposed policy to	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works	No

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
Waka Kotahi		include consideration of effects on the wider environment beyond the sites within the zone.		collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	
S16.12 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter supports the intent of the proposed policy but considers there is the potential for activities within the zone to have adverse effects on the state highway, and that these should be included within this proposed policy. See full submission for further details.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.13 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter is concerned that enabled activities within the proposed policy could impact on the safety and functionality of State Highway 2, and therefore requests a trip generation trigger to address any potential impacts on the transport network.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
FS7 GWRC	Oppose	This policy feeds into rule NOSZ-R12 (1), which provides for primary production activities being permitted within the Regional Parks. GWRC does not consider that the enabled activities within the proposed policy NOSZ-P5 will have impacts on the safety and functionality of State Highway 2.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S16.13 above.	n/a
S16.14 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter states that reference should only be made to the operative District Plan provisions and not to the rehoused plan provisions.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.15 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter suggests that the proposed rules have the potential to have significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network, especially those activities which are of a larger scale and directly	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood	No

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
		access the state highway. The submitter supports enabling these activities but requests the inclusion of trip generation thresholds as a permitted activity standard. The submitter also requests that permitted activities should be subject to compliance with Chapter 38 – Access Design Standards and Criteria to ensure safe access design to the state highway network.		that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel’s recommendation report for more details.	
FS7 GWRC	Oppose	GWRC opposes the application of this trip generation standard for Sports and Active Recreation (NOSZ-R4), Community Facilities (NOSZ-R7) and Parks Facilities and Management (NOSZ-R8), as these relate to maintaining public access to, and use of, open spaces. We also oppose the trip generation threshold for NOSZ-R10 (Commercial Activity), NOSZ-R11 (Visitor Accommodation), NOSZ-R12 (Primary Production enabled by Policy NOSZ-P5) and NOSZ-R13 (Motorised Recreation), which relate to activities in Regional Parks which are managed through Toitū te Whenua Parks Network Plan 2020-2030 and our license agreements.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S16.15 above.	n/a
S16.16 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter requests additional requirements for quarrying to be a permitted activity due to the potential significant adverse effects that the activity can have on the road network due to frequent heavy vehicle turning movement. The permitted status limits the ability of Waka Kotahi to manage road network effects. The submitter supports the approach of primary production being non-complying where the activity does not meet the requirements of NOSZ-R12.1, as it allows for the management of adverse effects on State Highway 2.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel’s recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.17 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter supports the proposed activity status for the activity but proposes an amendment to the proposed rule to include a matter of discretion to consider the safety and efficiency of the transport	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood	No

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
		network from tourism facilities.		that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	
S16.18 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter supports these activities as a discretionary activity as this provides for their impacts on the transport network to be considered and addressed.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.19 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter supports these activities as non-complying as this provides for their impacts on the transport network to be considered and addressed.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.20 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter requests the addition of this advice note to inform plan users of additional obligations which can be addressed through submitted resource consents, specifically the consideration of the Government Roding Powers Act 1989 which Waka Kotahi administer.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.21 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter states that the permitted activities can impact the safe and efficient operation of the transport network, and the submitter strongly recommends the inclusion of trip generation thresholds which when met or exceeded would need a consent as a restricted discretionary activity. The submitter seeks to work with Council to identify appropriate thresholds. The submitter also requests that permitted activities should be subject to compliance with Chapter 38 – Access Design Standards and Criteria to ensure safe access design to the state highway network.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
FS7 GWRC	Oppose	GWRC opposes the application of a trip generation standard for rules relating to recreation and public access of open spaces.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S16.21 above.	n/a
S16.22 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter suggests amendment to the proposed objective to include consideration of effects on the wider environment beyond the sites within the zone, including the transport network.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.23 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter supports the proposed policy but suggests amendment to the proposed policy to include consideration of effects on the wider environment beyond the sites within the zone.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.24 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter supports the intent of the proposed policy but considers there is the potential for activities within the zone to have adverse effects on the state highway, and that these should be included within this proposed policy. The submitter considers that adverse effects are possible because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Areas of the proposed Open Space Zone are opposite to the state highway</li> <li>- Permitted activities in the zone could result in high or conflicting traffic which can have effects on the traffic network.</li> </ul>	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.25 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter states that reference should only be made to the operative District Plan provisions and not to the rehoused plan provisions.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.26	Seeks	The submitter suggests that the proposed rules have	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to	No

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
Waka Kotahi	amendment	the potential to have significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network, especially those activities which are of a larger scale and directly access the state highway. The submitter supports enabling these activities but requests the inclusion of trip generation thresholds as a permitted activity standard. The submitter also requests that permitted activities should be subject to compliance with Chapter 38 – Access Design Standards and Criteria to ensure safe access design to the state highway network.		this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel’s recommendation report for more details.	
FS7 GWRC	Oppose	GWRC opposes the application of a trip generation standard for rules relating to recreation and public access of open spaces.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S16.26 above.	n/a
S16.27 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter supports the proposed activity status but requests an amendment to include the consideration of the safety and efficiency of the transport network.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel’s recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.28 Waka Kotahi	Support	The submitter supports these activities as a discretionary activity as this provides for their impacts on the transport network to be considered and addressed.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel’s recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.29 Waka Kotahi	Support	The submitter supports these activities as non-complying as this provides for their impacts on the transport network to be considered and addressed.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel’s recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.30	Seeks amendment	The submitter states that the permitted activities can impact the safe and efficient operation of the transport	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works	No

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
Waka Kotahi		network, and the submitter strongly recommends the inclusion of trip generation thresholds which when met or exceeded would need a consent as a restricted discretionary activity. The Submitter seeks to work with Council to identify appropriate thresholds. The submitter also requests that permitted activities should be subject to compliance with Chapter 38 – Access Design Standards and Criteria to ensure safe access design to the state highway network.		collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel’s recommendation report for more details.	
FS7 GWRC	Oppose	GWRC opposes the application of a trip generation standard for rules relating to recreation and public access of open spaces.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S16.30 above.	n/a
S16.31 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter requests the addition of this advice note to inform plan users of additional obligations which can be addressed through submitted resource consents, specifically the consideration of the Government Roading Powers Act 1989 which Waka Kotahi administer.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel’s recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.32 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter suggests amendment to the proposed objective to include consideration of effects on the wider environment beyond the sites within the zone, including the transport network.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel’s recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.33 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter suggests amendment to the proposed policy to include consideration of effects on the wider environment beyond the sites within the zone, including the transport network.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel’s recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.34 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter supports the intent of the proposed policy but considers there is the potential for activities within the zone to have adverse effects on the state highway, and that these should be included within this	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood	No



Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
		proposed policy. The submitter considers that adverse effects are possible because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Areas of the proposed Sport and Active Recreation Zone are opposite to the state highway</li> <li>- Permitted activities in the zone could result in high or conflicting traffic which can have effects on the traffic network.</li> </ul>		that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	
S16.35 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter states that reference should only be made to the operative District Plan provisions and not to the rehoused plan provisions.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.36 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter suggests that the proposed rules have the potential to have significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network, especially those activities which are of a larger scale and directly access the state highway. The submitter supports enabling these activities but requests the inclusion of trip generation thresholds as a permitted activity standard. The submitter also requests that permitted activities should be subject to compliance with Chapter 38 – Access Design Standards and Criteria to ensure safe access design to the state highway network.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
FS7 GWRC	Oppose	GWRC opposes the application of a trip generation standard for rules relating to recreation and public access of open spaces.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S16.36 above.	n/a
S16.37 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter supports the proposed activity status but requests an amendment to include the consideration of the safety and efficiency of the transport network.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
S16.38 Waka Kotahi	Support	The submitter supports these activities as a discretionary activity as this provides for their impacts on the transport network to be considered and addressed.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.39 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter states that the permitted activities can impact the safe and efficient operation of the transport network, and the submitter strongly recommends the inclusion of trip generation thresholds which when met or exceeded would need a consent as a restricted discretionary activity. Waka Kotahi seeks to work with Council to identify appropriate thresholds. The submitter also requests that permitted activities should be subject to compliance with Chapter 38 – Access Design Standards and Criteria to ensure safe access design to the state highway network.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
FS7 GWRC	Oppose	GWRC opposes the application of a trip generation standard for rules relating to recreation and public access of open spaces.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S16.39 above.	n/a
S16.40 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter requests the addition of this advice note to inform plan users of additional obligations which can be addressed through submitted resource consents, specifically the consideration of the Government Rounding Powers Act 1989 which Waka Kotahi administer.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.41 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter suggests that the proposed rules have the potential to have significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network. The submitter supports enabling these activities but requests the inclusion of trip generation thresholds as a permitted activity standard.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.42	Support	The submitter supports these activities as non-	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to	No

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
Waka Kotahi		complying as this provides for their impacts on the transport network to be considered and addressed.		this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	
S16.43 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter states that the permitted activities can impact the safe and efficient operation of the transport network, and the submitter strongly recommends the inclusion of trip generation thresholds which when met or exceeded would need a consent as a restricted discretionary activity. Waka Kotahi seeks to work with Council to identify appropriate thresholds. The submitter also requests that permitted activities should be subject to compliance with Chapter 38 – Access Design Standards and Criteria to ensure safe access design to the state highway network.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.44 Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	The submitter requests the addition of this advice note to inform plan users of additional obligations which can be addressed through submitted resource consents, specifically the consideration of the Government Roding Powers Act 1989 which Waka Kotahi administer.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
S16.45 – Waka Kotahi	Seeks amendment	That NOSZ-O2 is amended to add a new clause (4) as follows:  (4) Adverse effects on the wider environment and supporting infrastructure are managed appropriately.	Reject	No amendments are recommended to PC49 in response to this submission. It is recommended that the Council works collaboratively with the submitter to address this matter via a future comprehensive plan change. Note: it is understood that the submitter and Council officers have agreed to this approach. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
<b>TOPIC 7: Infrastructure</b>					
S21.1 Transpower NZ Limited	Support	The submitter supports the proposed rule NOSZ-R15 as it gives effect to Policy 10 and 11 of the National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission.	Accept	Support noted.	No

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
S21.2 Transpower NZ Limited	Support	The submitter supports the proposed rule NOSZ-R20 as it gives effect to Policy 10 and 11 of the National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission.	Accept	Support noted.	No
S21.3 Transpower NZ Limited	Support	On the basis proposed rules NOSZ-R15 and OSZ-R17 are included, Transpower supports the deletion of operative rule OSZ-R21.	Accept	Support noted.	No
S21.4 Transpower NZ Limited	Support	On the basis proposed Rules NOSZ-R20 and OSZ-R21 are included, Transpower supports the deletion of operative Rule OSZ-R26.	Accept	Support noted.	No
S21.5 Transpower NZ Limited	Support	The submitter supports the proposed rule NOSZ-R17 as it gives effect to Policy 10 and 11 of the National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission.	Accept	Support noted.	No
S21.6 Transpower NZ Limited	Support	The submitter supports the proposed rule OSZ-R21 as it gives effect to Policy 10 and 11 of the National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission.	Accept	Support noted.	No
S24.1 Fire & Emergency NZ	Support	The submitter supports this proposed objective NOSZ-O2 on the basis that the low scale of development and built form reduces fire hazard to people and property.	Accept in part	Support noted however amendments are recommended in response to other submissions.	No
S24.2 Fire & Emergency NZ	Support	The submitter supports this proposed policy NOSZ-P4 on the basis that the control of the scale and location of development reduces fire hazard to people and property.	Accept in part	Support is noted however amendments are recommended to NOSZ-P4 in response to other submissions.	No
S24.3 Fire & Emergency NZ	Amend	The submitter partly supports the proposed rule NOSZ-R1, considering the standards will have a reduced fire risk to people and buildings based on bulk and location standards. The submitter requests an amendment to add an additional standard for water supply to be provided to new buildings.	Accept in part	It is recommended to add a new standard, albeit in a more simplified form to that requested by the submission. Please see the recommendation report for more details.	Yes
S24.4 Fire & Emergency NZ	Seeks amendment	The submitter requests a new standard NOSZ-S4 be added to require firefighting water supply for buildings and structures, due to the risk that new buildings are not protected from fire hazard, which is especially	Accept in part	It is recommended to add a new standard, albeit in a more simplified form to that requested by the submission. Please see the recommendation report for more details.	Yes

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
		important in the remote and inaccessible areas of the proposed Natural Open Space zone. The submitter also highlights how the existing UHCC engineering code of practice references the outdated SNA PAS 4509:2003.			
S24.5 Fire & Emergency NZ	Support	The submitter supports this proposed objective OSZ-O2 as spaces in the zone seek to positively contribute to health and wellbeing, and buildings and structures will be of a low density within the zone.	Accept	Support noted.	No
S24.6 Fire & Emergency NZ	Support	The submitter supports this proposed policy OSZ-P2 on the basis that the control of the scale and location of development reduces fire hazard to people and property.	Accept	Support noted.	No
S24.7 Fire & Emergency NZ	Amend	The submitter partly supports the proposed rule OSZ-R1 considering the standards will have a reduced fire risk to people and buildings based on bulk and location standards. The submitter requests an amendment to add an additional standard for water supply to be provided to new buildings. The submitter also highlights an error in the duplication of rule (1)(a)(i).	Accept in part	It is recommended to add a new standard, albeit in a more simplified form to that requested by the submission. Please see the recommendation report for more details.	Yes
S24.8 Fire & Emergency NZ	Seeks amendment	The submitter requests the addition of the new standard OSZ-S6 requiring the provision of firefighting water supply and access for buildings and structures, based on the uncertainty if this is addressed in the current District Plan.	Accept in part	It is recommended to add a new standard, albeit in a more simplified form to that requested by the submission. Please see the recommendation report for more details.	Yes
S24.9 Fire & Emergency NZ	Support	The submitter supports this proposed objective SARZ-O2 as spaces in the zone seek to positively contribute to health and wellbeing, and buildings and structures will be of a low density within the zone.	Accept in part	Support is noted however amendments are recommended in response to other submissions.	No
S24.10 Fire & Emergency NZ	Support	The submitter supports this proposed policy SARZ-P2 on the basis that the control of the scale and location of development reduces fire hazard to people and	Accept in part	Support for the policy is noted, however an amendment is recommended to SARZ-P2 in response to submission S19.4 – Royal Wellington Golf Club.	No

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
		property.			
S24.11 Fire & Emergency NZ	Seeks amendment	The submitter partly supports the proposed rule SARZ-R1 considering the standards will have a reduced fire risk to people and buildings based on bulk and location standards. The submitter requests an amendment to add an additional standard for water supply to be provided to new buildings. The submitter states that connections to reticulated water supplies will be easily achievable in most cases for this zone due to its largely urban location.	Accept in part	It is recommended to add a new standard, albeit in a more simplified form to that requested by the submission. Please see the recommendation report for more details.	Yes
S24.12 Fire & Emergency NZ	Seeks amendment	The submitter requests the addition of the new standard SARZ-S6 requiring the provision of firefighting water supply and access for buildings and structures, based on the uncertainty if this is addressed in the current District Plan.	Accept in part	It is recommended to add a new standard, albeit in a more simplified form to that requested by the submission. Please see the recommendation report for more details.	Yes
<b>TOPIC 8: General Submissions</b>					
S2.1 Pinehaven Tennis Club	Seeks amendment	Amend proposed zoning to rezone Pinehaven Tennis Club from Open Space to Sport and Active Residential Zone (sic).	Accept in part	The Pinehaven Tennis Club has been proposed to be zoned Sport and Active Recreation Zone. The Panel assumes the submission requesting the Sport and Active 'Residential' Zone is a typographical error.	No
FS11 Pinehaven Progressive Association	Support	We therefore request that the Pinehaven Tennis Club's request for the Pinehaven Reserve to be zoned as "Sport and Active Residential" be allowed in full. See full submission for further details.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S2.1 above.	n/a
S2.2 Pinehaven Tennis Club	Seeks amendment	Alternatively, if zoning is not changed, provisions be added to make an exception for the Pinehaven Tennis Club to enable existing light towers, and an increase in the allowable size limit for the structure of the clubhouse.	Reject	The Pinehaven Tennis Club is recommended to be rezoned as Sport and Active Recreation Zone.	No
S8.1 Donna Galbraith	Seeks amendment	Retain zoning of site as sport and active recreation but amend provisions to prevent the addition of a sports club / structure / building to the site.	Accept in part	The submission supports the zoning proposed by PC49. However, the proposed standards within the Sport and Active Recreation Zone are considered sufficient to maintain neighbouring amenity values. No amendments are recommended to PC49 provisions in response to this	No

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
				submission.	
S11.1 Hannah Stanfield	Seeks amendment	Amend to address errors within the objectives, policies, and rules so that there are no gaps for unintended consequences to occur. Any other changes that would achieve the above.	Accept	<p>Amendments are recommended across PC49 to correct errors, to improve clarity and to avoid unanticipated outcomes.</p> <p>It is recommended that all numbering, referencing and typographical errors, including those necessary to incorporate Variation 1 provisions into the Natural Open Space chapter, be corrected via this submission as an alternative to relying upon Clause 16(2) of Schedule 1 of the RMA.</p> <p>In the event that the omission of operative standard OSZ-S1 from the three proposed open space zone chapters is a drafting error, it is recommended that it be added to all three zones within Appendix 3 alongside all necessary consequential amendments via this submission. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.</p>	Yes
S11.2 Hannah Stanfield	Seeks amendment	Amend wording across the provisions to improve internal consistencies, correcting errors and making the provisions easier to interpret. Any other changes that would achieve the above.	Accept	Amendments are recommended across PC49 to correct errors and to make provisions easier to interpret. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	Yes
S11.3 Hannah Stanfield	Seeks amendment	Amend objectives and policies to make sure they achieve the best outcomes for our parks. Any other changes that would achieve the above.	Accept	Amendments are recommended to numerous objectives and policies to make improvements., Amendments are also recommended in response to other submissions. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	Yes
S11.4 Hannah Stanfield	Seeks amendment	The submitter seeks to improve the wording of the policies and outcomes to ensure positive outcomes are realised, including improving consistency across the use of the terms recreation and leisure. Any other changes that would achieve the above.	Accept	Amendments are recommended across PC49 to improve consistency across the use of terms. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	Yes
S15.1 Thane Walls	Seeks amendment	The submitter states that there is limited information on what will happen in the proposed Sport and Active Recreation Zone, and the submitter requests specific information on any changes to infrastructure at Whakatiki Park.	Reject	The submission raises a number of concerns the plan change does not address. The submission does not request any specific changes to PC49 provisions.	No

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
S15.2 Thane Walls	Seeks amendment	The submitter states that if there is no change to the current use of Whakatiki Park, they support the proposed change. However, if major change is proposed then they do not support the change. The submitter states that green spaces are a valuable asset to the community.	Accept in part	It is considered that the proposed zoning of Whakatiki Park as Open Space Zone reflects the current use and manages activities which are considered likely to occur within this space.	No
FS10 Beatrice Serrao	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on submission S15.2 above.	n/a
FS17 Craig Thorn	Support	In its entirety (35.14ha) as Natural Open Space in PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on submission S15.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Michelle Browning	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on submission S15.2 above.	n/a
FS50 Clint Bennett - late	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on submission S15.2 above.	n/a
S18.1 Heritage NZ Pouhere Taonga	Support	The submitter seeks to retain the proposed rule OSZ-R12, which was provided by the submitter during pre-notification engagement, as the rule manages activities at the Blockhouse in line with currently occurring activities.	Accept	Support noted.	No
S26.16 GWRC	Seeks amendment	The submitter requests an amendment to the proposed standards to include reference to a relevant lighting standard, with the intention being that the proposed standard will ensure that light pollution will be avoided by managing the selection and design of lighting provision.	Reject	The existing lighting provisions of the Operative District Plan will apply and these provisions will be reviewed as part of a separate future plan change.	No
S26.17 GWRC	Seeks amendment	Amend all references to 'Light spill from floodlighting' throughout to also include 'over lighting'.	Reject	The existing lighting provisions of the Operative District Plan will apply and these provisions will be reviewed as part of a separate future plan change.	No
S26.1 GWRC	Seeks amendment	The submitter seeks the proposed amendment to prevent any impact on the flood protection works which the submitter undertakes within the proposed Open Space and Recreation Zones while the Natural Hazards plan change is developed, and to prevent	Reject	Flood mitigation works are a permitted activity in the Operative District Plan and the activity does not rely on provisions being altered through this plan change. The relief requested by the submission is already provided by operative District Plan provisions.	No



Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
		inappropriate subdivision and development in areas of high flood risk to give effect to RPS Policy 51.			
S20.3 Wooster & Teasdale Families	Seeks amendment	Amend the provisions in the NOSZ as required to enable the outlined activities within the river-bed part of the site. See full submission for further details.	Reject	It is considered inappropriate to specifically provide for commercial and industrial activities within the riverbed which are not already managed via the Activities on the Surface of Water (ASW) chapter of the District Plan. Provisions within the ASW chapter of the District Plan are beyond the scope of the plan change. It is also noted that activities within the river bed itself are likely to fall under the jurisdiction of Greater Wellington Regional Council.	No
FS7 GWRC	Oppose	GWRC opposes any re-zoning of the Te Awa Kairangi riverbed away from natural open space zone. This is a very high-hazard area, so the only appropriate land use is open space.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on submission S20.3 above.	n/a
S20.4 Wooster & Teasdale Families	Seeks amendment	Some specific amendments to the NOSZ provisions could include the provided examples. See full submission for further details.	Reject	It is considered inappropriate to specifically provide for commercial and industrial activities within the riverbed which are not already managed via the Activities on the Surface of Water (ASW) chapter of the District Plan. Provisions within the ASW chapter of the District Plan are beyond the scope of the plan change. It is also noted that activities within the river bed itself will fall under the jurisdiction of Greater Wellington Regional Council. The 'avoidance', and 'protection' direction of policies for activities and development within the NOSZ are not recommended to be amended.	No
FS7 GWRC	Oppose	GWRC opposes any amendments to the proposed Natural Open Space Zone provisions that direct "avoidance" or "protection" outcomes. We consider this direction to be in keeping with the overall purpose of the Natural Open Space Zone. We also consider the proposed activity controls within this zone to be appropriate in considering effects on natural character, amenity, recreational, and/or cultural values.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on submission S20.4 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Requested / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to PC49?
S20.5 Wooster & Teasdale Families	Seeks amendment	Throughout PC49, some provisions could also be amended to improve clarity and avoid inadvertent misinterpretation, for example NOSZ-P3(3) (if retained) should be amended to say that “activities which result in large scale development within the zone, and a loss of natural character within the zone”.	Accept in part	Although not considered technical necessary, the policy is recommended to be amended as requested. However, other amendments are also recommended in response to other submissions.	Yes
S20.6 Wooster & Teasdale Families	Seeks amendment	Alternative amendments, including any such combination of provisions as may be appropriate, to address the matters raised in this submission, and to achieve the intent of this submission. Any similar, alternative, consequential and/or other relief as necessary to address the issues raised in this submission.	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended in response to submissions S20.1 and S20.2 above.	No
S22.1 Gary Sherwin	No decision sought	The submitter states that they would like more information on the potential impacts of the plan change on the residence of Te Marua relating to the Speedway.	Reject	No changes are requested by the submission. However, for the submitter’s information it is noted that the current provisions under the Operative District Plan for the Speedway are to be relocated from Open Space to Special Activity without any changes to the provisions themselves.	No
FS4 Ian Sherwin	Support	I am concerned about the Speedway – they operate under a set of rules designed to fit in with the neighbours and these rules have not always been adhered to. But in the main they are good neighbours as they comply to the consent rules.  Any relaxation of these rules will create problems. Any relaxation of these rules cannot be allowed.  See full submission for further details.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation on submission S22.1 above.	n/a