Appendix 1 – Table of Submission Points

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
TOPIC 1: Silverstream Spur Requested Zoning						
Submissions						
S1.1	Graham Bellamy	Oppose		Rezone the Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space.	Reject as out of scope of plan change and addressed via Variation 1.	Section 5
FS1 Duncan Stuart		Support	S1.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS5 Pat Van Berkel		Support	S1.1	As housing expands in Upper Hutt, we will need more natural open space for citizens such as the Silverstream Spur. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS6 John D O'Malley		Support	S1.1	Concurs with all that has been written.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS10 Beatrice Serrao		Support	S1.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS12 Tony Chad		Support	S1.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS14 Save our Hills		Support	S1.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS17 Craig Thorn		Support	S1.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS18	Michelle Browning	Support	S1.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS20	Darryl Longstaffe	Support	S1.1	No reason stated.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS22	Pinehaven Progressive Association	Support	S1.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS23	Stephen Pattinson	Support	S1.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS24	Guildford Timber Company	Support in part	S1.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS26	Janice Carey	Support	S1.1	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 as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS31 Douglas William Dunn		Support	S1.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS32 Colin Buckett		Support	S1.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS48 Sue Pattinson – late		Support	S1.1	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 full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS50 Clint Bennett - late		Support	S1.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
S3.1	Jonathan Board	Oppose		Rezone the Silverstream Spur as Open Space.	Reject as out of scope of plan change and addressed via Variation 1.	Section 5
FS6 John D O'Malley		Support	S3.1	Concurs with all that has been written.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS10 Beatrice Serrao		Support	S3.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS12 Tony Chad		Support	S3.1	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'. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS14 Save our Hills		Support	S3.1	The Silverstream Spur should be protected from residential development and be for conservation and recreational use.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS17 Craig Thorn		Support	S3.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS18 Michelle Browning		Support	S3.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS22 Pinehaven Progressive Association		Support	S3.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS23 Stephen Pattinson		Support	S3.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS24 Guildford Timber Company		Support in part	S3.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS26 Janice Carey		Support	S3.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS32 Colin Buckett		Support	S3.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS48 Sue Pattinson - late		Support	S3.1	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 full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS50 Clint Bennett - late		Support	S3.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
S4.1	Doug Fauchelle	Oppose		Rezone the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space.	Reject as out of scope of plan change and addressed via Variation 1.	Section 5
FS3 Peter Ross		Support	S4.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS6 John D O'Malley		Support	S4.1	Concurs with all that has been written.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor		Support	S4.1	This is an iconic landscape that defines the entry to Upper Hutt.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS10 Beatrice Serrao		Support	S4.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS12 Tony Chad		Support	S4.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS14 Save our Hills		Support	S4.1	This is an iconic landscape that defines the entry to Upper Hutt.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS17 Craig Thorn		Support	S4.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS18 Michelle Browning		Support	S4.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS22 Pinehaven Progressive Association		Support	S4.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS23 Stephen Pattinson		Support	S4.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS24 Guildford Timber Company		Support in part	S4.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS26 Janice Carey		Support	S4.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS32 Colin Buckett		Support	S4.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS48 Sue Pattinson - late		Support	S4.1	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 full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS50 Clint Bennett - late		Support	S4.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
S6.1	Sean Kusel	Oppose		Rezone the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space.	Reject as out of scope of plan change and addressed via Variation 1.	Section 5
FS3 Peter Ross		Support	S6.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS6 John D O'Malley		Support	S6.1	Concurs with all that has been written.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor		Support	S6.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS10 Beatrice Serrao		Support	S6.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS12 Tony Chad		Support	S6.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS14	Save our Hills	Support	S6.1	Protect the Spur.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS17	Craig Thorn	Support	S6.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS18	Michelle Browning	Support	S6.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS22	Pinehaven Progressive Association	Support	S6.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS23	Stephen Pattinson	Support	S6.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS24	Guildford Timber Company	Support in part	S6.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS32	Colin Buckett	Support	S6.1	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 as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS48 Sue Pattinson - late		Support	S6.1	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 full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS50 Clint Bennett - late		Support	S6.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
S7.1	Cameron Seay	Oppose		Rezone the Silverstream Spur as Open Space.	Reject as out of scope of plan change and addressed via Variation 1.	Section 5
FS3 Peter Ross		Support	S7.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS6 John D O'Malley		Support	S7.1	Concurs with all that has been written.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor		Support	S7.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS10 Beatrice Serrao		Support	S7.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS12 Tony Chad		Support	S7.1	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'. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS14 Save our Hills		Support	S7.1	Zone the Spur 'open space' to protect environment.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS17 Craig Thorn		Support	S7.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS18	Michelle Browning	Support	S7.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS20	Darryl Longstaffe	Support	S7.1	No reason stated.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS22	Pinehaven Progressive Association	Support	S7.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS23	Stephen Pattinson	Support	S7.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS24	Guildford Timber Company	Support in part	S7.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS32	Colin Buckett	Support	S7.1	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 as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS48 Sue Pattinson - late		Support	S7.1	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 full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS50 Clint Bennett - late		Support	S7.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
S10.4	Mary Beth Taylor	Oppose		Rezone the Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space.	Reject as out of scope of plan change and addressed via Variation 1.	Section 5
FS3 Peter Ross		Support	S10.4	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 as above.	Section 5
FS6 John D O'Malley		Support	S10.4	Concurs with all that has been written.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS10 Beatrice Serrao		Support	S10.4	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS12 Tony Chad		Support	S10.4	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS14 Save our Hills		Support	S10.4	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 as above.	Section 5
FS15 Shelley Dixon		Support	S10.4	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 as above.	Section 5
FS17 Craig Thorn		Support	S10.4	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS18	Michelle Browning	Support	S10.4	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS19	Dominic Baron	Support	S10.4	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 1991 to alter half the spur to residential zone must be reversed.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS20	Darryl Longstaffe	Support	S10.4	No reason stated.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS23	Stephen Pattinson	Support	S10.4	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS24	Guildford Timber Company	Support in part	S10.4	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS30	Sandra E Kenny	Support	S10.4	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 as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS32 Colin Buckett		Support	S10.4	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 as above.	Section 5
FS48 Sue Pattinson - late		Support	S10.4	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 full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS50 Clint Bennett - late		Support	S10.4	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
S13.1	Tony Chad	Oppose		Rezone the Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space.	Reject as out of scope of plan change and addressed via Variation 1.	Section 5
FS3 Peter Ross		Support	S13.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS6 John D O'Malley		Support	S13.1	Concurs with all that has been written.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor		Support	S13.1	The Spur is historically a reserve and biodiversity needs to be protected and restored across the city.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS10 Beatrice Serrao		Support	S13.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS14 Save our Hills		Support	S13.1	The Spur occupies a natural ecological corridor between the Western and Eastern Hills.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS17 Craig Thorn		Support	S13.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS18 Michelle Browning		Support	S13.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS20 Darryl Longstaffe		Support	S13.1	No reason stated.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS22 Pinehaven Progressive Association		Support	S13.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS23 Stephen Pattinson		Support	S13.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS24 Guildford Timber Company		Support in part	S13.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS32 Colin Buckett		Support	S13.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS48 Sue Pattinson - late		Support	S13.1	I agree with the points made by all the above-mentioned submitters for the same reasons as given by the submitters,	Reject as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				and I request that Council allow in full the decisions requested by the above submitters. *See full submission for further details.*		
FS49 James Hill - late		Support	S13.1	Ecological corridor between western and eastern hills. Ecological return of forests and rainfall.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS50 Clint Bennett - late		Support	S13.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
S14.1	Save our Hills	Oppose		Rezone the Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space.	Reject as out of scope of plan change and addressed via Variation 1.	Section 5
FS3 Peter Ross		Support	S14.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS6 John D O'Malley		Support	S14.1	Concurs with all that has been written.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor		Support	S14.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS10 Beatrice Serrao		Support	S14.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS12 Tony Chad		Support	S14.1	Support this 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 as above.	Section 5
FS16 Patricia Duncan		Support	S14.1	Agreed with all points in their submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				See full submission for further details.		
FS17 Craig Thorn		Support	S14.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS18 Michelle Browning		Support	S14.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS20 Darryl Longstaffe		Support	S14.1	No reason stated.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS21 Natasha Colbourne		Support	S14.1	The majority of people of Upper Hutt who have made submissions want the Spur protected from any development. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS22 Pinehaven Progressive Association		Support	S14.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS23 Stephen Pattinson		Support	S14.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS24 Guildford Timber Company		Support in part	S14.1	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	Reject as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Spur, to enable potential future residential development at Silverstream Forest. *See full submission for further details.*		
FS32 Colin Buckett		Support	S14.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS48 Sue Pattinson - late		Support	S14.1	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 full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS50 Clint Bennett - late		Support	S14.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
S17.3	A. G. Spiers	Oppose		Rezone the Spur as Natural Open Space.	Reject as out of scope of plan change and addressed via Variation 1.	Section 5
FS3 Peter Ross		Support	S17.3	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 as above.	Section 5
FS6 John D O'Malley		Support	S17.3	Concurs with all that has been written.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor		Support	S17.3	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 as above.	Section 5
FS9 Kylee Taramai		Support	S17.3	To reserve this natural open space for nativity and public use.	Reject as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS10 Beatrice Serrao		Support	S17.3	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS12 Tony Chad		Support	S17.3	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS14 Save our Hills		Support	S17.3	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 as above.	Section 5
FS17 Craig Thorn		Support	S17.3	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS18 Michelle Browning		Support	S17.3	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS20 Darryl Longstaffe		Support	S17.3	No reason stated.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS22 Pinehaven Progressive Association		Support	S17.3	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS23 Stephen Pattinson		Support	S17.3	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS24 Guildford Timber Company		Support in part	S17.3	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	Reject as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				future road and associated infrastructure through / on the Spur, to enable potential future residential development at Silverstream Forest. *See full submission for further details.*		
FS25 Doug Drinkwater		Support	S17.3	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 as above.	Section 5
FS26 Janice Carey		Support	S17.3	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 as above.	Section 5
FS27 Anthony Carey		Support	S17.3	It appears the new council is disregarding the original purpose to purchase the land as green space for the community.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS32 Colin Buckett		Support	S17.3	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 as above.	Section 5
FS48 Sue Pattinson - late		Support	S17.3	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 full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS50 Clint Bennett - late		Support	S17.3	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
S23.6	Forest & Bird	Oppose		Zone Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space Zone.	Reject as out of scope of plan change and addressed via Variation 1.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS3	Peter Ross	Support	S23.6	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 as above.	Section 5
FS6	John D O'Malley	Support	S23.6	Concurs with all that has been written.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS8	Mary Beth Taylor	Support	S23.6	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 as above.	Section 5
FS10	Beatrice Serrao	Support	S23.6	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS12	Tony Chad	Support	S23.6	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS14	Save our Hills	Support	S23.6	The Spur is appropriate to be zoned as Natural Open Space as a bird corridor and reserve.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS17	Craig Thorn	Support	S23.6	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS18	Michelle Browning	Support	S23.6	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS20	Darryl Longstaffe	Support	S23.6	No reason stated.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS23	Stephen Pattinson	Support	S23.6	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS24	Guildford Timber Company	Support in part	S23.6	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,	Reject as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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. *See full submission for further details.*		
FS26 Janice Carey		Support	S23.6	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 as above.	Section 5
FS28 Leonie Belmont		Support	S23.6	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 as above.	Section 5
FS29 Marion Rough		Support	S23.6	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 as above.	Section 5
FS32 Colin Buckett		Support	S23.6	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 as above.	Section 5
FS48 Sue Pattinson - late		Support	S23.6	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 full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS50 Clint Bennett - late		Support	S23.6	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
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 as out of scope of plan change and addressed via Variation 1.	Section 5
FS3 Peter Ross		Support	S27.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS6 John D O'Malley		Support	S27.1	Concurs with all that has been written.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor		Support	S27.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS10 Beatrice Serrao		Support	S27.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS12 Tony Chad		Support	S27.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS13 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated		Support	S27.1	Seeking that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Reject as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS14	Save our Hills	Support	S27.1	Zone the Spur as Natural Open Space, as it was always meant to be a reserve.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS17	Craig Thorn	Support	S27.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS18	Michelle Browning	Support	S27.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS20	Darryl Longstaffe	Support	S27.1	No reason stated.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS22	Pinehaven Progressive Association	Support	S27.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS23	Stephen Pattinson	Support	S27.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS24	Guildford Timber Company	Support in part	S27.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS26	Janice Carey	Support	S27.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS32	Colin Buckett	Support	S27.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS33	Jason Durry	Support	S27.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS34	Benjamin Michael Jones	Support	S27.1	Designate Silverstream Spur as a reserve. To retain this important area for the future.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS35	Gerry Bealing	Support	S27.1	Rezoning the spur to natural open space as this was the original reason the land was purchased.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS36	Caleb Scott	Support	S27.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS37	Rhys Lloyd	Support	S27.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS38	Nadine Ebbett	Support	S27.1	Keeping the entire Silver Stream Railway Spur as a reserve. To protect this area for future generations.	Reject as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS39	Katelin Hardgrove	Support	S27.1	Retention of the entire Silverstream Spur free from ANY development including a road. Land was purchased by UHCC as a reserve and show not be used to allow access to a subdivision to line a developer's pocket.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS40	Tommy Mortimer	Support	S27.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS41	Jennifer Durry	Support	S27.1	Rezone the whole Silverstream Spur as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. The Spur was rezoned in error and should be corrected.	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS42	John Durry	Support	S27.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS43	Trevor Richardson	Support	S27.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS44	David Grant-Taylor	Support	S27.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS45	Nick Moylan	Support	S27.1	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	Reject as above.	Section 5

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				ecological effectiveness as a corridor and would need to stay intact as a reserve.		
FS46 Fraser Robertson		Support	S27.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS47 Ian Price		Support	S27.1	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 as above.	Section 5
FS48 Sue Pattinson – late		Support	S27.1	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 full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 5
FS50 Clint Bennett - late		Support	S27.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 5
TOPIC 2: Open Space and Recreation Requested Zoning						
Submissions						
S1.2	Graham Bellamy	Oppose		Rezone the Mangaroa Wetland to Natural Open Space.	Reject as zoning private land as NOS is not appropriate for land that is not accessible by the public and has no clear alignment with Natural Open Space Zones.	Section 6

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS7 GWRC		Oppose	S1.2	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Accept as above.	Section 6
FS5 Pat Van Berkel		Support	S1.2	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 6
FS12 Tony Chad		Support	S1.2	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 6
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 as the parcel is proposed to be zoned Sport and Active Recreation to align with the activity occurring on the site.	Section 6
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor		Support	S5.1	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 as above.	Section 6
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;	Accept in part – see body of report for full details.	Section 6

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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. *See full submission for further details.*		
FS7 GWRC		Oppose	S20.1	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 body of report for full details.	Section 6
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. *See full submission for further details.*	Accept in part – see body of report for full details.	Section 6
FS7 GWRC		Oppose	S20.2	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 body of report for full details.	Section 6
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 as it is generally not considered appropriate to zone	Section 6

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
					private land as open space. No need has been demonstrated for an independent report.	
FS2 Graham Bellamy		Support	S23.1	Protect and enhance natural environment. eg: Silverstream Spur.	Accept in part. Refer to Topic 1 regarding the Silverstream Spur and Variation 1.	Section 6
FS12 Tony Chad		Support	S23	Agreed with all points in the submission. Support Forest and Bird as experts in this area. A very comprehensive submission (parts 1-29)	Accept or reject in line with original submission points.	Section 6
FS10 Beatrice Serrao		Support	S23	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept or reject in line with original submission points.	Section 6
FS17 Craig Thorn		Support	S23	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept or reject in line with original submission points.	Section 6
FS18 Michelle Browning		Support	S23	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept or reject in line with original submission points.	Section 6
FS20 Darryl Longstaffe		Support	S23	No reason stated.	Accept or reject in line with original submission points.	Section 6
FS50 Clint Bennett - late		Support	S23	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept or reject in line with original submission points.	Section 6

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
S23.2	Forest & Bird	Oppose		Apply the Natural Open Space zone to private land where appropriate.	Accept in part as it is appropriate to zone private land as Natural Open Space in very limited circumstances with landowner agreement or within an active river corridor.	Section 6
S23.5	Forest & Bird	Oppose		Rezone the existing Valley Floor Sub-zone of Mangaroa Valley to Natural Open Space Zone.	Reject as zoning private land as NOS is not appropriate for land that is not accessible by the public and has no clear alignment with Natural Open Space Zones.	Section 6
FS7 GWRC		Oppose	S23.5	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Accept as above.	Section 6
FS2 Graham Bellamy		Support	S23.5	Mangaroa peatland is geomorphologically unique and needs protection and be protected from further farming and degradation. *See full submission for further details.*	Reject as above.	Section 6
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor		Support	S23.5	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 as above.	Section 6

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
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 as it is generally not considered appropriate to zone private land as open space. The landowner has not requested this zoning.	Section 6
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. Additional parcels have been identified since the notification of PC49.	Section 6
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. Additional parcels have been identified since the notification of PC49.	Section 6
FS12 Tony Chad		Support	S17.1	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Accept in part as above.	Section 6

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS10 Beatrice Serrao		Support	S17.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part as above.	Section 6
FS17 Craig Thorn		Support	S17.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part as above.	Section 6
FS18 Michelle Browning		Support	S17.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part as above.	Section 6
FS20 Darryl Longstaffe		Support	S17.1	No reason stated.	Accept in part as above.	Section 6
FS50 Clint Bennett - late		Support	S17.1	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part as above.	Section 6
S17.4	A. G. Spiers	Oppose		Consider including the Mangaroa Peatland in future plans as a 'flagship wetland' for Upper Hutt.	Reject as zoning private land as NOS is not appropriate for land that is not accessible by the public and has no clear alignment with Natural Open Space Zones.	Section 6
FS7 GWRC		Oppose	S17.4	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. *See full submission for further details.*	Support as above.	Section 6
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor		Support	S17.4	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 as above.	Section 6

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS12 Tony Chad		Support	S17.4	Please consider including the Mangaroa Peatland in future plans as a "flagship wetland" for Upper Hutt.	Reject as above.	Section 6
FS10 Beatrice Serrao		Support	S17.4	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 6
FS17 Craig Thorn		Support	S17.4	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 6
FS18 Michelle Browning		Support	S17.4	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 6
FS20 Darryl Longstaffe		Support	S17.4	No reason stated.	Reject as above.	Section 6
FS50 Clint Bennett - late		Support	S17.4	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 6
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. See body of report for full details.	Section 6
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.	Accept. See body of report for full details.	Section 6
TOPIC 3: Biodiversity and Sustainability Provisions						
SUBMISSIONS						
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 as it is considered appropriate to amend provisions to include consideration of	Section 7

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
					indigenous biodiversity values.	
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor		Support	S26.2	Designate more areas across the city as Open Space, particularly as Natural Open Space. Restore indigenous biodiversity in these areas.	Accept in part. Additional NOS parcels have been identified since the notification of PC49.	Section 7
S26.3	GWRC	Oppose		The submitter provides the recommendation 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 as current provisions go some way to protect indigenous biodiversity which are being reviewed through PC48B.	Section 7
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). Any activities within a Regional Park will also need to comply with the park management plan.	Accept as it is considered appropriate to amend provisions for activities in a Regional Park comply with the requirements of the park management plan.	Section 7
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 indigenous biodiversity values and removal of with associated natural and ecological value.	Accept in part as it is considered appropriate to amend provisions to include indigenous biodiversity values in NOSZ-O2.	Section 7

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
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 indigenous biodiversity.	Accept as it is considered appropriate to amend provisions to include indigenous biodiversity in NOSZ-O3.	Section 7
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 indigenous biodiversity.	Accept as it is considered appropriate to amend provisions to include indigenous biodiversity in NOSZ-P1.	Section 7
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 indigenous biodiversity.	Accept as it is considered appropriate to amend provisions to include indigenous biodiversity NOSZ-P2.	Section 7
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 indigenous biodiversity and indigenous biodiversity values.	Accept as it is considered appropriate to amend provisions to include indigenous biodiversity and indigenous biodiversity values in NOSZ-P3.	Section 7
S26.10	GWRC	Seeks amendment		The submitter proposes 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 indigenous biodiversity and dark sky, indigenous biodiversity.	Accept as it is considered appropriate to amend provisions to include indigenous biodiversity and dark sky in NOSZ-P4.	Section 7

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
S26.11	GWRC	Seeks amendment		The submitter proposes 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 orchards as an enabled activity.	Accept as it is considered appropriate to amend provisions to include orchards in NOSZ-P5.	Section 7
S26.12	GWRC	Seeks amendment		The submitter proposes 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 indigenous biodiversity values.	Accept as it is considered appropriate to amend provisions to include indigenous biodiversity values in NOSZ-S1.	Section 7
S26.13	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 indigenous biodiversity values.	Accept as it is considered appropriate to amend provisions to include indigenous biodiversity values in NOSZ-S2.	Section 7
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 indigenous biodiversity values.	Accept as it is considered appropriate to amend provisions to include indigenous biodiversity values in NOSZ-S3.	Section 7
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 as it is considered appropriate to amend provisions to include indigenous biodiversity values in matters of control and discretion.	Section 7

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
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. See body of report for full details.	Section 7
FS10 Beatrice Serrao		Support	S23	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept or reject in line with original submission points.	Section 7
FS12 Tony Chad		Support	S23	Agreed with all points in the submission. Support Forest and Bird as experts in this area. A very comprehensive submission (parts 1-29).	Accept or reject in line with original submission points.	Section 7
FS17 Craig Thorn		Support	S23	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept or reject in line with original submission points.	Section 7
FS18 Michelle Browning		Support	S23	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept or reject in line with original submission points.	Section 7
FS20 Darryl Longstaffe		Support	S23	No reason stated.	Accept or reject in line with original submission points.	Section 7
FS50 Clint Bennett - late		Support	S23	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept or reject in line with original submission points.	Section 7
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. See body of report for full details.	Section 7

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
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.	Section 7
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 as the strategic objectives are considered as outcomes for all zones.	Section 7
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.	Accept in part as current provisions go some way to protect indigenous biodiversity which are being reviewed through PC48B.	Section 7
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.	Accept in part as current provisions go some way to protect indigenous biodiversity which are being reviewed through PC48B.	Section 7
S23.11	Forest & Bird	Support		The submitter states that they support the amendment as it is appropriate.	Accept as the proposed amendment has been supported.	Section 7
S23.12	Forest & Bird	Support		The submitter states that they support the amendment as it is appropriate.	Accept as the proposed amendment has been supported.	Section 7

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
S23.13	Forest & Bird	Support		The submitter states that they support the amendment as it is appropriate.	Accept as the proposed amendment has been supported.	Section 7
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 as the approach is to restrict subdivision across all zones so does not require differentiation.	Section 7
S23.15	Forest & Bird	Support		The submitter states that they support the amendment as it is appropriate.	Accept as the proposed amendment has been supported.	Section 7
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 as NOS zoning does not usually occur on private land and access would be by permission of the landowner.	Section 7
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</u> and <u>where appropriate.</u>	Accept in part as it is considered appropriate to partially amend provisions to NOSZ-O1.	Section 7
S23.18	Forest & Bird	Seeks amendment		The submitter states that the proposed NOSZ-O2 is not consistent with the national planning standards and is	Accept in part as it is considered appropriate to	Section 7

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				inconsistent with the Regional Policy Statement and 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 protects indigenous species, their habitats and ecosystem functions and appropriately located.	partially amend provisions to NOSZ-O2.	
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 Enable a diverse range ..... and addition of Regional Parks.	Accept in part as agree that enable is not appropriate for this objective. The proposed objective acknowledges that Regional Parks will have diverse activities.	Section 7
FS7 GWRC		Oppose	S23.19	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 as above.	Section 7
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 provide for and location.	Accept in part as it is considered appropriate to partially amend provisions to NOSZ-P1.	Section 7

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
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 provide for consider providing.	Reject. See body of report for full details.	Section 7
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 inhibit for that are not and change to activities that result in.	Accept as it is considered appropriate to amend provisions to NOSZ-P3.	Section 7
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 where appropriate and where consistent with the protection if significant indigenous biodiversity and preservation of natural character.	Accept in part as it is considered appropriate to amend provisions to NOSZ-P4 with 'if' changed to 'of'.	Section 7
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	Reject. See body of report for full details.	Section 7

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				consider indigenous biodiversity. Amendment sought is the removal of enable and plantation forestry.		
FS7 GWRC		Oppose	S23.24	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 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.	Accept as above.	Section 7
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 as this is not a district plan matter.	Section 7
FS7 GWRC		Support in part	S23.25	GWRC supports ensuring pest management occurs in the natural open space zone.	Accept in part as above.	Section 7

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
S23.26	Forest & Bird	Support		The submitter states that they support the amendment as it is appropriate.	Accept as the proposed amendment has been supported.	Section 7
S23.27	Forest & Bird	Support		The submitter states these proposed 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 as the provision seeks to maintain a sense of openness while allowing for appropriate activities.	Section 7
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 naturalness and to the objective.	Reject as the provision seeks to maintain a sense of openness while allowing for appropriate activities.	Section 7
S10.2	Mary Beth Taylor	Oppose		Amend PC49 to make stronger connections between the Sustainability Strategy and make it less humancentric.	Reject as Goal 3 is not a relevant for this Plan Change as it is infrastructure specific.	Section 7
FS10 Beatrice Serrao		Support	S10.2	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 7
FS17 Craig Thorn		Support	S10.2	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 7
FS18 Michelle Browning		Support	S10.2	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 7

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS20 Darryl Longstaffe		Support	S10.2	No reason stated.	Reject as above.	Section 7
FS50 Clint Bennett - late		Support	S10.2	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject as above.	Section 7
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 as amendments have been made to include biodiversity values.	Section 7
FS12 Tony Chad		Support	S10.3	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part as above.	Section 7
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 as amendments have been made to include biodiversity values.	Section 7
FS10 Beatrice Serrao		Support	S17.2	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part as above.	Section 7
FS17 Craig Thorn		Support	S17.2	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part as above.	Section 7
FS18 Michelle Browning		Support	S17.2	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part as above.	Section 7
FS20 Darryl Longstaffe		Support	S17.2	No reason stated.	Accept in part as above.	Section 7
FS12 Tony Chad		Support	S17.2	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part as above.	Section 7
FS50 Clint Bennett - late		Support	S17.2	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part as above.	Section 7
TOPIC 4: Hutt Valley Clay Target Club Provisions						

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
SUBMISSIONS						
S9.1	Mangaroa Farms	Oppose		Retain the current number of operating days for the Hutt Valley Clay Target Club at 80 days.	Accept in part as it is considered appropriate to increase the number of shooting days but not to the proposed 100.	Section 8
FS8 Mary Beth Taylor		Support	S9.1	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 in part as above.	Section 8
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 in part as it is considered appropriate to increase the number of shooting days but not to the proposed 100.	Section 8
TOPIC 5: Royal Wellington Golf Club Provisions						
SUBMISSIONS						
S19.1	Royal Wellington Golf Club	Oppose		The submitter 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 as it is considered appropriate to differentiate between public and private open space in SUB-OSRZ-P1.	Section 9

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
S19.2	Royal Wellington Golf Club	Seeks amendment		The submitter 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 as it is considered appropriate to amend the word 'spaces' to 'public open spaces' for clarification in SARZ-O2.	Section 9
S19.3	Royal Wellington Golf Club	Support		The submitter supports the proposed objective SARZ-O3 as it recognises the contribution that privately owned sports clubs make to the open space network.	Accept as proposed objective is supported.	Section 9
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 as it is considered appropriate to amend the word 'protect' to 'support' for clarification in SARZ-P2.	Section 9
S19.5	Royal Wellington Golf Club	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 as the proposed policy is supported.	Section 9
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)	Reject as buildings over 15m are not considered appropriate for the OSZ. Buildings of this height would be required to go through a resource consent process.	Section 9

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				would manage the effects of building height in relation to surrounding sites.		
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 – see body of report for full details.	Section 9
S19.8	Royal Wellington Golf Club	Oppose		The submitter opposes this proposed standard SARZ-P4, 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 as the proposed limit aligns with the character of the zone and larger buildings and structures can be achieved through the resource consent process.	Section 9
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 within the zone. The submitter specifically mentions points related to the standards. *See full submission for further details.*	Accept in part as it is considered appropriate to amend provisions related to caretaker accommodation in SARZ-S6.	Section 9

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
TOPIC 6: Transport						
SUBMISSIONS						
S16.1	Waka Kotahi	Support		The submitter supports the separation of motorised recreation from other recreation activities.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
S16.3	Waka Kotahi	Support		The submitter supports this definition and the distinction that motorised recreation is a separate activity.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
S16.6	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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
S16.7	Waka Kotahi	Support		The submitter supports the approach of restricting subdivision except for listed exceptions.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
S16.11	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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
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.*	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
FS7 GWRC		Oppose	S16.13	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 in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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 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	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Standards and Criteria to ensure safe access design to the state highway network.		
FS7 GWRC		Oppose	S16.15	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 in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				include a matter of discretion to consider the safety and efficiency of the transport network from tourism facilities.		
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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 Roading Powers Act 1989 which Waka Kotahi administer.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS7 GWRC		Oppose	S16.21	GWRC opposes the application of a trip generation standard for rules relating to recreation and public access of open spaces.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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: - Areas of the proposed Open Space Zone are opposite to the state highway - Permitted activities in the zone could result in high or conflicting traffic which can have effects on the traffic network.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
S16.26	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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
FS7 GWRC		Oppose	S16.26	GWRC opposes the application of a trip generation standard for rules relating to recreation and public access of open spaces.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
S16.30	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	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
FS7 GWRC		Oppose	S16.30	GWRC opposes the application of a trip generation standard for rules relating to recreation and public access of open spaces.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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 proposed policy. The submitter considers that adverse effects are possible	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				because: - Areas of the proposed Sport and Active Recreation Zone are opposite to the state highway - Permitted activities in the zone could result in high or conflicting traffic which can have effects on the traffic network.		
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
FS7 GWRC		Oppose	S16.36	GWRC opposes the application of a trip generation standard for rules relating to recreation and public access of open spaces.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
FS7 GWRC		Oppose	S16.39	GWRC opposes the application of a trip generation standard for rules relating to recreation and public access of open spaces.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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 Roading Powers Act 1989 which Waka Kotahi administer.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
S16.42	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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
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 Roading Powers Act 1989 which Waka Kotahi administer.	Accept in part as this issue will be addressed in a future plan change.	Section 10
TOPIC 7: Infrastructure						
SUBMISSIONS						
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 as the proposed rule has been supported.	Section 11

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
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 as the proposed rule has been supported.	Section 11
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 as the proposed rules have been supported.	Section 11
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 as the proposed rules have been supported.	Section 11
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 as the proposed rule has been supported.	Section 11
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 as the proposed rule has been supported.	Section 11
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 as the proposed objective has been supported.	Section 11
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 as the proposed policy has been supported.	Section 11
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 as the rule has been amended.	Section 11

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
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 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.	Accept in part as a new standard has been included with amendment.	Section 11
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 as the proposed objective has been supported.	Section 11
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 as the proposed policy has been supported.	Section 11
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 as the rule has been amended.	Section 11
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 as a new standard has been included with amendment.	Section 11

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
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 as the proposed objective has been supported.	Section 11
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 property.	Accept as the proposed policy has been supported.	Section 11
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 as the rule has been amended.	Section 11
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 as a new standard has been included with amendment.	Section 11
TOPIC 8: General Submissions						
SUBMISSIONS						
S2.1	Pinehaven Tennis Club	Seeks amendment		Amend proposed zoning to rezone Pinehaven Tennis Club from Open Space to Sport and Active Recreation.	Accept as the Pinehaven Tennis Club has been proposed to be zoned	Section 12

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
					Sport and Active Recreation.	
FS11 Pinehaven Progressive Association		Support	S2.1	We therefore request that the Pinehaven Tennis Club's request for the Pinehaven Reserve to be zoned as "Sport and Active Recreation" be allowed in full. *See full submission for further details.*	Accept as above.	Section 12
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.	Accept as the Pinehaven Tennis Club has been proposed to be zoned Sport and Active Recreation.	Section 12
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 as zoning is supported but the proposed standards within the Sport and Active Recreation Zone are considered sufficient to maintain neighbouring amenity values.	Section 12
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.	Accept in part. See body of report for full details.	Section 12
S11.2	Hannah Stanfield	Seeks amendment		Amend wording across the provisions to improve internal consistencies, correcting errors and making the provisions easier to interpret.	Accept in part. See body of report for full details.	Section 12

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
S11.3	Hannah Stanfield	Seeks amendment		Amend objectives and policies to make sure they achieve the best outcomes for our parks.	Accept in part. See body of report for full details.	Section 12
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.	Accept in part. See body of report for full details.	Section 12
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 as the submission raises a number of concerns the plan change does not address.	Section 12
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 as the proposed new zoning is a better reflection of the current use and manages activities which are considered likely to occur within this space.	Section 12
FS10 Beatrice Serrao		Support	S15.2	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part as above.	Section 12
FS17 Craig Thorn		Support	S15.2	In its entirety (35.14ha) as Natural Open Space in PC49.	Accept in part as above.	Section 12
FS18 Michelle Browning		Support	S15.2	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part as above.	Section 12
FS50 Clint Bennett - late		Support	S15.2	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part as above.	Section 12

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
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 as the proposed rule has been supported.	Section 12
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 as the existing lighting provisions of the Operative District Plan will apply and these provisions will be reviewed as part of a separate plan change.	Section 12
S26.17	GWRC	Seeks amendment		Amend all references to 'Light spill from floodlighting' throughout to also include 'over lighting'.	Reject as the existing lighting provisions of the Operative District Plan will apply and these provisions will be reviewed as part of a separate plan change.	Section 12
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 inappropriate subdivision and development in areas of high flood risk to give effect to RPS Policy 51.	Reject as 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.	Section 12
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. Commercial and industrial activities are considered inappropriate. Activities on the surface of water are considered in	Section 12

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
					the ASW chapter of the District Plan that does not form part of this plan change.	
FS7 GWRC		Oppose	S20.3	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 in part as above.	Section 12
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. Commercial and industrial activities are considered inappropriate. Activities on the surface of water are considered in the ASW chapter of the District Plan that does not form part of this plan change.	Section 12
FS7 GWRC		Oppose	S20.4	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 in part as above as considered inappropriate to use the river corridor for development.	Section 12
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	Accept in part as the policy has been amended through another	Section 12

Submission number	Submitter	Support or oppose	Related Submission number	Submission Summary	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				within the zone, and a loss of natural character within the zone".	submission to improve clarity.	
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. Some provisions have been amended through the submission process.	Section 12
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.	Accept in part as current policies under the Operative District Plan are to relocate from Open Space to Special Activity without amendment. This means that no change to the rules is proposed.	Section 12
FS4 Ian Sherwin		Support	S22.1	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.*	Accept in part as above.	Section 12