

## Appendix 2: Final Panel Recommendations on Submissions and Further Submissions – PC49 Variation 1 (Silverstream Spur)

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
S1.1 Bob Alkema	Support	The adoption of Variation 1 to Plan Change 49.	Accept in part	Amendments to Variation 1 provisions are recommended in response to other submissions.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S1.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Need to zone Spur as Natural Open Space as part of east/west corridor.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S1.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support in part	Oppose the adoption of Plan Change 49 Variation 1 in its entirety. Disagree with provision of infrastructure including a transport corridor through the Spur.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S1.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support in part	Oppose the adoption of Plan Change 49 Variation 1 in its entirety. Disagree with provision of infrastructure including a transport corridor through the Spur.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S1.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S1.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Any future use of the Spur must be consistent with its zoning as Natural Open Space. This includes recreational uses such as walking and/or cycling, but excludes any road or infrastructure associated with any neighbouring land.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S1.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S1.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support in part	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S1.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		purposes. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.			
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support in part	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S1.1 above.	n/a
S2.1 Doug Fauchelle	Support with amendment	To dismiss Kiln Street access as an option to the Spur and the SGA and to provide access off Reynolds Bach Drive. To make every effort to mitigate the visual effects of the Reynolds Bach Drive access from State Highway 2, Fergusson Drive, and Eastern Hutt Rd.	Reject	The submission does not request amendments to the provisions. The submission is seeking decisions that would be relevant to a resource consent process.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation on S2.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Congestion of traffic in Silverstream area will have adverse effect on accessibility. Loss of indigenous vegetation. Reynolds Bach Road is viable alternative access road. Silverstream Spur icon properties retained.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation on S2.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support in part	Agree with the submission that access to the SGA through the Spur from Kiln Street should be removed from this Plan Change but disagree with the submission's suggestion of any alternative routes to the SGA because the SGA is a private development proposed by Guildford Timber Company (GTC) and as such the onus should be on GTC to propose access routes for its development through a Private Plan Change of its own, not through this publicly-financed Plan Change by Council.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation on S2.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support in part	Agree with the submission that access to the SGA through the Spur from Kiln Street should be removed from this Plan Change but disagree with the submission's suggestion of any alternative routes to the SGA because the SGA is a private development proposed by Guildford Timber Company (GTC) and as such the onus should be on GTC to propose access	Reject	See reasons for recommendation on S2.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		routes for its development through a Private Plan Change of its own, not through this publicly-financed Plan Change by Council.			
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation on S2.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Inc	Oppose	Enabling any form of road/infrastructure corridor on any part of the Silverstream spur is inconsistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and rezoning as Natural Open Space. Utilising Reynolds Bach Drive will still require the Spur to be used to gain access to the SGA and will cause the destruction of native habitat, storm water issues and many of the other issues raised by submissions. Reynolds Bach Drive is more remote from public transport meaning the SGA will be locked in as a car dependant suburb for ever. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they already own several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept	Accept on the basis that submission S2.1 does not request amendments to the provisions, and is therefore recommended to be rejected.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support in part	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation on S2.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support in part	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation on S2.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
S3.1 Stuart Grant	Support	To retain the Variation as it currently reads and do not amend to remove future access through the Silverstream Spur to any future residential development on the hills around Pinehaven.	Reject	The provisions proposed to specifically provide for future access through the Silverstream Spur to potential future residential development on the hills around Pinehaven are not the most effective or efficient method to achieve the objective of the variation and are recommended for deletion. The Variation did not include all amendments to existing District Plan provisions that manage the provision of roading and infrastructure, and therefore the variation provisions could not function as intended due to rule conflicts, and policy conflicts with proposed PC49 provisions for the Natural Open Space Zone.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Oppose	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S3.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Oppose	No access to Southern Growth Area through Silverstream Spur is acceptable. Residential development not needed. Infrastructure too costly and provision for road/ transport corridor too damaging to indigenous vegetation and potential for native reserve. Do not need a road to achieve this. Can be achieved by car park & walkway with walking/biking trails through Spur. Who will pay cost for infrastructure? Developer?? Damage to Spur will be extensive for transport corridor and other infrastructure. Does Silverstream need residential development? People live there because of "village" atmosphere. Agree on negative impact of further traffic in area. There will be a need to provide a large new area for transport related car parking. Irrelevant to Spur iconic nature.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S3.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Oppose	Disagree with submission's reasons.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S3.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Oppose	Disagree with submission's reasons.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S3.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Oppose	SGA could be even more directly connected to Eastern Hutt Road via Reynolds Bach Drive. These could be accessed by other means unrelated to developing the	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S3.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		<p>SGA. Direction and policy from central and regional govern favours building up, not out. If we build the same number of houses up instead of out there will be the same level of demand, supporting the case for additional service infrastructure. Based on the current state of submissions, these development opportunities are neither wanted nor needed. This is a moot point - if the SGA is developed there will be traffic in Silverstream from those shopping, dropping kids off at school etc. Traffic will be an issue when car-dependant infrastructure is built - which is why the SGA should not be developed. The SGA will be the size of Pinehaven and Silverstream combined. It is common sense that destroying habitats will have some impact on biodiversity - and that previous biodiversity was lost in previous development.</p>			
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Oppose	<p>Road access is not required in any other local reserves, including, but not only Wi Tako Reserve, and Keith George Memorial Park. It is disingenuous to suggest that the road will allow a "wider diversity of people to experience the flora and fauna it contains" when the road will alter the area and remove most of the current ecological aspects from around the roading corridor, meaning people would still have to get out of their vehicles to experience the Spur. This type of experience is possible without severing the Spur in half for the sake of a road. New planning rules for intensified houses will make the case for additional infrastructure, without relying on a newly created greenfield development remote from the existing areas to be used as a case for new infrastructure. The owners of the SGA have stated in UHCC documents that the SGA development can go ahead without the use of the Spur. Funnelling the entire SGA traffic load through one street would have a far greater impact on safety, congestion and would be very close to the school zone in Silverstream. It is estimated traffic in Silverstream would double, based on the number of houses doubling, if this were all directed down one street to one roundabout to the only exit then massive congestion would be the only result. It is likely the SGA will need to be drastically scaled back to mitigate these factors, no matter where the traffic is</p>	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S3.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		directed. Loss of biodiversity from urban development is well documented including in other submissions to this plan change.			
FS20 Caleb Scott	Oppose	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S3.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Oppose	Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. Reasons: Access to the Southern Growth Area can be achieved through multiple other areas including Reynolds Bach Drive. SGA will not provide the kind of housing sought through the NPS UD, e.g., affordable housing along existing infrastructure and transportation corridors. With increased housing intensification as per the NPS UD and UHCC IPI it will be essential to maintain dedicated Natural Open Space near these developments for the well-being of the community and environment. The community has asked that the Silverstream Spur be included in PC 49 as Natural Open Space. The community has not asked for an infrastructure corridor to be part of this plan change. The Spur is an area that forms a natural gateway into Upper Hutt, a flora and fauna corridor and was originally designated reserve land. The Spur has the potential to be restored to native forest and increase local biodiversity as per the UHCC Sustainability Strategy Goal 2 - "We will prioritise protecting and enhancing our natural environment." Prioritising commercial development of this natural area over biodiversity protection and restoration may have been popular last century but we know better now. The Silverstream Spur must be zoned as Natural Open Space in its entirety.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S3.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Oppose	Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. Reasons: Access to the Southern	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S3.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		<p>Growth Area can be achieved through multiple other areas including Reynolds Bach Drive. SGA will not provide the kind of housing sought through the NPS UD, e.g., affordable housing along existing infrastructure and transportation corridors. With increased housing intensification as per the NPS UD and UHCC IPI it will be essential to maintain dedicated Natural Open Space near these developments for the well-being of the community and environment. The community has asked that the Silverstream Spur be included in PC 49 as Natural Open Space. The community has not asked for an infrastructure corridor to be part of this plan change. The Spur is an area that forms a natural gateway into Upper Hutt, a flora and fauna corridor and was originally designated reserve land. The Spur has the potential to be restored to native forest and increase local biodiversity as per the UHCC Sustainability Strategy Goal 2 - "We will prioritise protecting and enhancing our natural environment." Prioritising commercial development of this natural area over biodiversity protection and restoration may have been popular last century but we know better now. The Silverstream Spur must be zoned as Natural Open Space in its entirety.</p>			
S4.1 Caroline Woollams	Support with amendment	<p>That access to the Southern Growth Area does not need to go through the Spur or Silverstream at all. Access to use the existing forest roads to Reynolds Bach Drive.</p>	Accept in part	<p>The specific Variation 1 provisions intended to enable a road corridor through the site to the Southern Growth Area are recommended for deletion as they not the most effective or efficient method to achieve the objective of the variation. The Variation did not include all amendments to existing District Plan provisions that manage the provision of roading and infrastructure, and therefore the variation provisions could not function as intended due to rule conflicts, and policy conflicts with proposed PC49 provisions for the Natural Open Space Zone.</p> <p>The Variation provisions do not prevent future roading access through the site. Access to the</p>	No

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
				Southern Growth Area may occur through the Silverstream Spur if all resource consenting requirements are met, and the adverse effects on the environment are appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated in accordance with the RMA.	
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S4.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Access to SGA does not need to be through Spur.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S4.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support in part	Agree with submission that access to the SGA through the Spur from Kiln Street should be removed from this Plan Change but disagree with the submission's suggestion of any alternative routes to the SGA because the SGA is a private development proposed by Guildford Timber Company (GTC) and as such the onus should be on GTC to propose access routes for its development through a Private Plan Change of its own, not through this publicly-financed Plan Change by Council.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S4.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support in part	Agree with submission that access to the SGA through the Spur from Kiln Street should be removed from this Plan Change but disagree with the submission's suggestion of any alternative routes to the SGA because the SGA is a private development proposed by Guildford Timber Company (GTC) and as such the onus should be on GTC to propose access routes for its development through a Private Plan Change of its own, not through this publicly-financed Plan Change by Council.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S4.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S4.1 above.	n/a



Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Oppose	Enabling any form of road/infrastructure corridor on any part of the Silverstream spur is inconsistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and rezoning as Natural Open Space. Utilising Reynolds Bach Drive will still require the Spur to be used to gain access to the SGA and will cause the destruction of native habitat, storm water issues and many of the other issues raised by submissions. Reynolds Bach Drive is more remote from public transport meaning the SGA will be locked in as a car dependant suburb for ever. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they already own several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation on S4.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support in part	Support access to GTC from Reynolds Bach Drive provided any road does not cross the Silverstream Spur at any point.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S4.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support in part	Support access to GTC from Reynolds Bach Drive provided any road does not cross the Silverstream Spur at any point.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S4.1 above.	n/a
S5.1 Lynda Joines	Support	To include the entire 35.5 ha of the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space.	Accept	No changes are recommended to the proposed rezoning of the site.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S5.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Spur zoned as Natural Open Space.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S5.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S5.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S5.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S5.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Stuart					
FS17 Lynda Joines	Support	It is very important that the Council's original stated intention to make the entire Silverstream Spur a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977 is upheld for walking, cycling, and simple recreational use of the Spur.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S5.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	I want the spur to be made a formal reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S5.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S5.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S5.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S5.1 above.	n/a
S5.2 Lynda Joines	Oppose	To disallow any special zoning provisions for any road or infrastructure / transport corridor, or similar proposal, on the Silverstream Spur now and in the future.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and infrastructure are recommended to be deleted on the basis they are technically unworkable with respect to existing provisions of the District Plan, and those proposed by PC49 for the Natural Open Space Zone.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S5.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Disallow special zoning provisions for roading/transport corridor. Will damage special indigenous plant area.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S5.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S5.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S5.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S5.2 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Stuart					
FS17 Lynda Joines	Support	I do not want roading on the Spur. It is harmful to the environment, including wildlife and residents living in Pinehaven.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S5.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	I don't support a road to GTC land over the Spur.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S5.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S5.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S5.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	No road or infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur ever. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S5.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	No road or infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur ever. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S5.2 above.	n/a
S6.1 Stephen Butler	Support	To proceed with including all Silverstream Spur in Plan Change 49.	Accept	Recommended to be accepted on the understanding that the submission is requesting the extent of the Silverstream Spur affected by the Variation is rezoned to Natural Open Space Zone.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S6.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Oppose	PC 49 includes provision of road/transport corridor which will severely damage the special character of the spur and area surrounding it.	Reject	This submission point only requests the Silverstream Spur be rezoned to Natural Open Space Zone.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S6.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S6.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S6.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	I want the spur to be made a formal reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S6.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S6.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S6.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Do support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S6.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Do support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S6.1 above.	n/a
S6.2 Stephen Butler	Support	To disallow any special zoning or provisions for any road or infrastructure/transport corridor, or similar proposal on the Spur.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and infrastructure are recommended to be deleted on the basis they are technically unworkable with respect to existing provisions of the District Plan, and those proposed by PC49 for the Natural Open Space Zone. Existing operative District Plan provisions will continue to apply, and these provide a rule framework for roading and other infrastructure on the site.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S6.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	PC49 includes provision of road/transport corridor which will severely damage the special character of the spur and area surrounding it.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S6.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S6.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S6.2 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S6.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	I don't support a road to GTC land over the Spur.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S6.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S6.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S6.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	No road or infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur ever. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S6.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	No road or infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur ever. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation on S6.2 above.	n/a
S7.1 Helen Chapman	Support	That the Silverstream Spur is rezoned to Natural Open Space.	Accept	No changes to the notified Natural Open Space zoning are recommended.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S4.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Rezone to Natural Open Space is 1st step to further protection as a Reserve and public assessable natural landscape. Protect all of SNA/ NOS of Silverstream Spur. Important that area be used for benefit of current and future generations as a public reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S4.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S4.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S4.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S4.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS16 Forest & Bird	Support	The submission provides valid arguments for giving effect to PC1 of the Wellington RPS and the Emissions Reduction Plan.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S4.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	I want the spur to be made a formal reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S4.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S4.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S4.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S4.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation on S4.1 above.	n/a
S7.2 Helen Chapman	Seek amendment	That the Silverstream Spur remains exclusively Natural Open Space, with no transport corridor.	Accept in part	The transport corridor-specific provisions are recommended to be deleted, but for technical reasons. The Panel notes there are other provisions in the Operative District Plan that manage roads and infrastructure.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part S7.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Transport/Road corridor will damage Natural Open Space character and split the Open Space nature of the area. Agree that traffic congestion of Kiln Street and Silverstream area is too greater cost to nature of area.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part S7.2 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		Agree that parking requirements for area are too greater cost for nature of area. Disruption to native wildlife in area of Spur is too greater cost. Agree - SGA is not within a 15 min walking distance of public transport. Transport/Road corridor will take a large area on spur to meet gradient requirements plus the added area for all infrastructure will do extensive damage to SNA and other areas of bush on spur. Agree. Who pays for upkeep of road to private development?			
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission that the Silverstream Spur remains exclusively Natural Open Space, with no transport corridor.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part S7.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission that the Silverstream Spur remains exclusively Natural Open Space, with no transport corridor.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part S7.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part S7.2 above.	n/a
FS16 Forest & Bird	Support	The submission provides valid arguments for giving effect to PC1 of the Wellington RPS and the Emissions Reduction Plan.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part S7.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	I don't support a road to GTC land over the Spur.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part S7.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part S7.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part S7.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part S7.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part S7.2 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
S8.1 Craig Thorn	Support with amendment	To require the developers to seek to use Reynolds Bach Drive as access to their proposed subdivision leaving the Spur intact. Access through Silverstream and the Spur should be a proposition of last resort.	Reject	The submission does not request specific changes to Variation 1 provisions, and requests decisions that fall beyond the plan-making process – i.e. requiring developers to seek to use Reynolds Bach Drive as access to their proposed subdivision leaving the Spur intact.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject S8.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	The transport/road corridor is not required over spur.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject S8.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support in part	Agree with submission that access to the SGA through the Spur from Kiln Street should be discouraged from this Plan Change but disagree with the submission's suggestion of any alternative routes to the SGA because the SGA is a private development proposed by Guildford Timber Company (GTC) and as such the onus should be on GTC to propose access routes for its development through a Private Plan Change of its own, not through this publicly-financed Plan Change by Council.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject S8.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support in part	Agree with submission that access to the SGA through the Spur from Kiln Street should be discouraged from this Plan Change but disagree with the submission's suggestion of any alternative routes to the SGA because the SGA is a private development proposed by Guildford Timber Company (GTC) and as such the onus should be on GTC to propose access routes for its development through a Private Plan Change of its own, not through this publicly-financed Plan Change by Council.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject S8.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject S8.1 above.	n/a
FS16 Forest & Bird	Oppose in part	Forest & Bird considers an options analysis is required to consider all options for a transport corridor to access the Southern Growth Area while considering matters of national importance, specifically s6(c) of the RMA and duty to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject S8.1 above.	n/a



Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	There should not be any consideration for a road to be built on the Spur as it is inconsistent with the Spur being a reserve.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject S8.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Oppose	Enabling any form of road/infrastructure corridor on any part of the Silverstream spur is inconsistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and rezoning as Natural Open Space. Utilising Reynolds Bach Drive will still require the Spur to be used to gain access to the SGA and will cause the destruction of native habitat, storm water issues and many of the other issues raised by submissions. Reynolds Bach Drive is more remote from public transport meaning the SGA will be locked in as a car dependant suburb for ever. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they already own several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject S8.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support in part	Support access to Guildford Timber Company from Reynolds Bach Drive provided any road does not cross the Silverstream Spur at any point. Do not support "Access through Silverstream and the spur should be a proposition of last resort." - It should not be considered at all.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject S8.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support in part	Support access to Guildford Timber Company from Reynolds Bach Drive provided any road does not cross the Silverstream Spur at any point.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject S8.1 above.	n/a
S8.2 Craig Thorn	Neutral	There has been insufficient disclosure on how the public transport and rail will be affected by another 2-3000 homes and commuters asking where the new parking will be to accommodate the increased demand and who will build it and pay for it. There is already a lack of parking in Silverstream for train commuters with parking past Field Street, Dowling Grove and as far as Terminus and Gloucester Streets.	Reject	The submission does not request specific changes to Variation 1 provisions.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject S8.2 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Agree that there has been a lack of publicly available information at this stage for a lot of people to comment on provisions. Transport parking is already a problem at Silverstream, so further pressure will increase the problem	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject S8.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject S8.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	The building of houses on GTC land doesn't meet the requirements of being close to transport hubs.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject S8.2 above.	n/a
S9.1 Duncan Stuart	Support	That the Silverstream Spur is rezoned to Natural Open Space and remains exclusively Natural Open Space, and designate the Spur as a Reserve under the Reserves Act (1977).	Accept in part	It is recommended to rezone the site to Natural Open Space Zone. Any decision by Council to designate the Spur as a Reserve under the Reserves Act falls beyond the formal Schedule 1 RMA plan-making process. A decision on whether to create reserve under the Reserves Act requires a separate statutory processes and decisions by Council.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S9.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Silverstream Spur as area with public walkway, cycle tracks would be a treasure to area. Only used for recreation, conservation - No transport/road provision.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S9.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S9.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S9.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S9.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S9.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S9.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Scott				part submission S9.1 above.	
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S9.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S9.1 above.	n/a
S9.2 Duncan Stuart	Oppose	That the Silverstream Spur is rezoned to Natural Open Space and remains exclusively Natural Open Space, with no transport corridor, now or in the future, and designate the Spur as a Reserve under the Reserves Act (1977).	Accept in part	It is recommended to rezone the site to Natural Open Space Zone. Any decision by Council to designate the Spur as a Reserve under the Reserves Act falls beyond the formal Schedule 1 RMA plan-making process. A decision on whether to create reserve under the Reserves Act requires a separate statutory processes and decisions by Council.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S9.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Spur retained as a NOS. Cost of infrastructure too high and who pays costs. NOS does not include transport/road.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S9.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S9.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S9.2 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S9.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No roads on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S9.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S9.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S9.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S9.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S9.2 above.	n/a
S10.1 Logan McLean	Seek amendment	To see the Silverstream Spur in full protected as a Natural Open Space Zone - without the addition of a road corridor. To see UHCC finally work with the community to allow restoration of this reserve through community-led native planting projects and development of walking trails. This will enhance the existing community trapping efforts in this area with a view to enhancing and restoring the biodiversity of the area.	Accept in part	The Silverstream Spur is recommended to be rezoned to Natural Open Space Zone. Site-specific provisions for a road corridor are recommended to be deleted for technical reasons. Restoration activities fall beyond the scope of the variation.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S10.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Silverstream Spur needs to be fully protected as a reserve and restored to a SNA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S10.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S10.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Pattinson				part submission S10.1 above.	
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S10.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No roads on a reserve. No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S10.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S10.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S10.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support in part	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S10.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S10.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
S11.1 Carl Leenders	Oppose	To remove the ability for an access corridor to be included in the plan for the area.	Accept in part	Site-specific provisions for a road corridor are recommended to be deleted for technical reasons. However, the construction of roading and other infrastructure may be possible on the site via other operative existing District Plan provisions that fall beyond the scope of the variation.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S11.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	The transport/road corridor is not required over spur.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S11.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S11.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S11.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S11.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No roads on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S11.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S11.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S11.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support in part	Support: "Majority of changes proposed." Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation,	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S11.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		conservation, and customary purposes. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.			
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support in part	Support: "Majority of changes proposed." Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S11.1 above.	n/a
S12.1 Jonathan Board	Oppose	To remove the provision for a transport corridor crossing the Spur.	Accept	The transport corridor-specific provisions are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons. The proposed provisions would prove ineffective due to the existence of operative rules that either duplicate or override the proposed provisions. These operative provisions are not within the scope of the variation and will continue to provide a rule framework for infrastructure on the site. The recommended deletion of the policy direction proposing to enable a transport corridor and infrastructure conflicts with 'avoidance' policy direction within the proposed Natural Open Space zone provisions under PC49.	Yes
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S12.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	The transport/road corridor is not required over spur. Habitat for native and endangered species is important and needs to be protected. Flood risk is a consideration for the Silver Stream Rail and current residents beside Hull's Creek and the area below spur.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S12.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S12.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S12.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S12.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No roads on a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S12.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S12.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S12.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S12.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S12.1 above.	n/a
S13.1 Adam Ricketts	Support	To rezone Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the notified extent of the Natural Open Space zone on the site.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S13.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Allowed but add opposition to allowing for Transport/Road corridor.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S13.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S13.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S13.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S13.1 above.	n/a



Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S13.1 above.	n/a
FS1 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S13.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S13.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support in part	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S13.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support in part	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S13.1 above.	n/a
S14.1 Howie Rait	Seek amendment	To provide detailed planning, dimensions and maps showing the access to the Silverstream Spur and the transport corridor including who would be able to use this transport corridor and for what purposes would it be used otherwise remove all wording regarding a transport corridor and potential future access to the Southern Growth Area from the variation.	Reject	The requests fall beyond the scope of the Variation. The requested detailed planning could be carried out in the future by the developer(s) or the Council in future if desired, however such decisions are not relevant to the variation process.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S14.1 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	NOS zoning is required but access for transport/road corridor rejected	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S14.1 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S14.1 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support in part	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides,	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S14.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA. I seek that the parts of the submission relating to the rezoning to Natural Open Space be allowed and any parts that refer to further information being required to allow an infrastructure/transport corridor to be decided upon be disallowed.			
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support in part	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. "remove all wording regarding a "transport corridor" and "potential future access to the Southern Growth Area" from the variation.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S14.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support in part	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S14.1 above.	n/a
S15.1 Lisa Clephane	Support	Support Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space and protect identified Significant Natural Areas and it makes sense to put a road through the Spur to give access to the Southern Growth Area	Accept in part	It is recommended to rezone the site to Natural Open Space Zone, however the site-specific provisions for a road corridor and associated infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons. The proposed transport corridor and associated infrastructure provisions would prove ineffective due to the existence of operative rules that either duplicate or override the proposed provisions. These operative provisions	No

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
				are not within the scope of the variation and will continue to provide a rule framework for infrastructure on the site. The recommended deletion of the policy direction proposing to enable a transport corridor and infrastructure conflicts with 'avoidance' policy direction within the proposed Natural Open Space zone provisions under PC49.	
FS8 Helen Chapman	Oppose	Not stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S15.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Oppose	Agree with NOS zoning but do not agree with roading provision as will damage NOS and accessibility for public.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S15.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support in part	Agree with submission and disagree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S15.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support in part	Agree with submission and disagree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S15.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Oppose	Submission may not be aware that there are other options to access the SGA (the developer owns land adjacent which could have a road built on it)	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S15.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support in part	Support – Spur to be a reserve and no road on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S15.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support in part	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Enabling any form of road/infrastructure corridor on any part of the Silverstream spur is inconsistent with rezoning as Natural Open Space. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they already own several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA. I seek that the parts of the submission relating to the rezoning to Natural Open Space be allowed and any parts that refer to the Spur being used to allow an infrastructure/transport corridor to be disallowed.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S15.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support in part	No reason stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S15.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support in part	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S15.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support in part	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S15.1 above.	n/a
S16.1 Herenga ā Nuku/ Outdoor Access Commission	Support with amendment	That the unformed legal road from Kiln Street to and alongside the property's south-eastern border be identified by signage. It may be necessary to undertake some clearing or development of the unformed legal road to make access practical. That consideration should also be given to identifying access to the western corner, where it is adjacent to Reynolds Bach Drive.	Reject	The requests falls beyond the scope of the variation. The submitter is encouraged to communicate the requests to Council via the Long Term Plan community consultation process of via direct contact with the appropriate Council department.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Oppose	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S16.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Support setting aside this land for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes and the need to exclude provision of transport/roading corridor.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S16.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S16.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Utilising the Spur for recreation, conservation and customary purposes is in line with the majority of the community.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S16.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support in part	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Suggestion to designate the Spur as a reserve in the future. Access to Guildford Timber Company from Reynolds Bach Drive provided any road does not cross the Silverstream Spur at any point. Do	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S16.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.			
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support in part	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Suggestion to designate the Spur as a reserve in the future. Access to Guildford Timber Company from Reynolds Bach Drive provided any road does not cross the Silverstream Spur at any point. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S16.1 above.	n/a
S17.1 Kelsey Fly	Support	To approve the proposal to make Silverstream Spur a designated Natural Open Space.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the notified extent of the Natural Open Space zone on the site.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S17.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Spur is crucial area within valley for linkage across valley for native species.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S17.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S17.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S17.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S17.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S17.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S17.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S17.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S17.1 above.	n/a
S17.2 Kelsey Fly	Oppose	To remove the provisions to enable infrastructure, including a transport corridor, through the Spur.	Accept	The site-specific provisions for a road corridor and associated infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons. The proposed transport corridor and associated infrastructure provisions would prove ineffective due to the existence of operative rules that either duplicate or override the proposed provisions. These operative provisions are not within the scope of the variation and will continue to provide a rule framework for infrastructure on the site. The recommended deletion of the policy direction proposing to enable a transport corridor and infrastructure conflicts with 'avoidance' policy direction within the proposed Natural Open Space zone provisions under PC49.	Yes
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S17.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Transport/road corridor will defeat purpose of NOS. Agree with disruption of wildlife on spur if road allowed.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S17.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S17.2 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S17.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S17.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S17.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S17.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S17.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support in part	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S17.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support in part	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S17.2 above.	n/a
S18.1 Silverstream Retreat – John Ross	Oppose	To either leave the zone as is or change the Hill Residential portion of it to General Residential, making the whole area a General Residential zone.	n/a	SUBMISSION WITHDRAWN 6.11.2023	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Oppose	Zone changed to NOS is required to protect special nature/character of spur.	n/a	SUBMISSION S18 WITHDRAWN 6.11.2023	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Strongly oppose	Strongly disagree with submission - The Silverstream Spur has never been legitimately zoned for Residential use. A previous Council acknowledged that the "Residential Conservation" zoning on the Spur was a mapping error and committed to correct it to "Scenic Reserve" but failed to follow through on that commitment - see SOH's full submission.	n/a	SUBMISSION S18 WITHDRAWN 6.11.2023	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Strongly oppose	Strongly disagree with submission - The Silverstream Spur has never been legitimately zoned for Residential use. A previous Council acknowledged that the "Residential Conservation" zoning on the Spur was a mapping error and committed to correct it to "Scenic Reserve" but failed to follow through on that commitment - see SOH's full submission.	n/a	SUBMISSION S18 WITHDRAWN 6.11.2023	n/a
FS12 The Guildford Timber Company	Support in part	GTC supports that part of the submission that seeks to retain the operative zoning for the Silverstream Spur (a combination of General Residential and Rural Hill Blue Mountains zoning). The relief that GTC has sought in its primary submission (i.e., the withdrawal and comprehensive redrafting of the variation) would have an effect similar to that sought by the submission in this case. i.e., the retention of the operative zoning. To the extent that such an outcome is consistent with its own submission, GTC supports submission point S18.1 in part.	n/a	SUBMISSION S18 WITHDRAWN 6.11.2023	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Oppose	Direction and policy from central and regional govern favours building up, not out. Therefore, we should be developing the valley floor and rezoning the full Spur.	n/a	SUBMISSION S18 WITHDRAWN 6.11.2023	n/a
FS16 Forest & Bird	Oppose	This submission fails to give effect to s6(c) of the RMA and the Wellington RPS.	n/a	SUBMISSION S18 WITHDRAWN 6.11.2023	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Oppose	The submission owns land neighbouring the Silverstream Spur that is zoned in the Hutt City Council District Plan as Passive Recreation. Zoning the Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space would match the zoning on the submissions land and contribute to the green backdrop promoted on the Silverstream Retreat website. The banner picture on the current website prominently shows the Spur with the caption "Surrounded by native bush with beautiful views of the Hutt Valley." Utilising the Spur in its entirety for housing would not be consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money. Nor would it be consistent with the promotional material on the Silverstream Retreat website. It is hoped that the submissions neighbouring land could be enhanced in future with the	n/a	SUBMISSION S18 WITHDRAWN 6.11.2023	n/a



Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		removal of the pine trees and through the planting of further native vegetation to strengthen the ecological values of the existing native cover, the whole area including the spur will be a great backdrop for the entrance to Upper Hutt and the submissions back yard.			
FS20 Caleb Scott	Oppose	No reason stated.	n/a	SUBMISSION S18 WITHDRAWN 6.11.2023	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Oppose	70% of submissions support zoning change to Natural Open Space without road. This is the 'compelling' reason to re-zone the Spur as Natural Open Space to give it the maximum protection possible. With increased housing intensification as per the NPS UD and UHCC IPI it will be essential to maintain dedicated Natural Open Space in close proximity to these developments for the well-being of the community and environment. The community has asked that the Silverstream Spur be included in PC49 as Natural Open Space. The community has not asked for housing to be included in this plan change. The Spur is an area that forms a natural gateway into Upper Hutt, a flora and fauna corridor and was originally designated reserve land. The Spur has the potential to be restored to native forest and increase local biodiversity as per the UHCC Sustainability Strategy Goal 2 - "We will prioritise protecting and enhancing our natural environment."	n/a	SUBMISSION S18 WITHDRAWN 6.11.2023	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Oppose	70% of submissions support zoning change to Natural Open Space without road. This is the 'compelling' reason to re-zone the Spur as Natural Open Space to give it the maximum protection possible. With increased housing intensification as per the NPS UD and UHCC IPI it will be essential to maintain dedicated Natural Open Space in close proximity to these developments for the well-being of the community and environment. The community has asked that the Silverstream Spur be included in PC49 as Natural Open Space. The community has not asked for housing to be included in this plan change. The Spur is an area that forms a natural gateway into Upper Hutt, a flora and fauna corridor and was originally designated reserve land. The Spur has the	n/a	SUBMISSION S18 WITHDRAWN 6.11.2023	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		potential to be restored to native forest and increase local biodiversity as per the UHCC Sustainability Strategy Goal 2 - "We will prioritise protecting and enhancing our natural environment."			
S19.1 Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington broadly supports the Variation at this stage and seeks some amendments relating to the transport corridor and indigenous biodiversity provisions.	Accept in part	The SNA provisions are recommended to be amended to give effect to the RPS and the NPS-IB with respect to the Silverstream Spur site.	No
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Support - with reservation regarding change for transport/roading corridor. Transport/roading corridor is contrary to zoning of NOS.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S19.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support in part	Agree with submission with respect to protecting SNA and Indigenous biodiversity, but do not support the submission's acceptance of a transport and infrastructure corridor.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S19.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support in part	Agree with submission with respect to protecting SNA and Indigenous biodiversity, but do not support the submission's acceptance of a transport and infrastructure corridor.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S19.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with point.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S19.1 above.	n/a
FS16 Forest & Bird	Support	It is necessary for the District Plan to give effect to s6(c) of the RMA and give effect to RPS Policies 23-28 to identify and protect significant indigenous biodiversity values and landscapes.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S19.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Oppose	The spur to be a reserve – no roading on reserves.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S19.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity. The Spur easily meets	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S19.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		the threshold as a SAL area, this overlay should be added to the zoning change and SNA's.			
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support in part	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S19.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support in part	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Recognition that in the absence of environmental protection from the draft PC48 and the draft NPS IB the PC 49 can offer this protection. Recognition that insufficient information and detail around any infrastructure/transportation corridor makes it impossible to assess and comment on this proposed feature. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S19.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support in part	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Recognition that in the absence of environmental protection from the draft PC48 and the draft NPS IB the PC 49 can offer this protection. Recognition that insufficient information and detail around any infrastructure/transportation corridor makes it impossible to assess and comment on this proposed feature. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S19.1 above.	n/a
S19.2 Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support with amendment	To ensure the provision for future growth in the Southern Growth Area, and access to it through the Silverstream Spur, has regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 and provides for a well-functioning urban environment. This should include providing for public transport and multi-modal and low/zero-carbon transport options along the proposed transport corridor. Amendments to the provisions providing for this transport corridor may be appropriate to signal multi-modal transport connections.	Reject	The 'Southern Growth Area' is not an area identified in the Future Development Strategy as providing for residential capacity or growth in Upper Hutt over the next 30 years. The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons. The proposed transport corridor and associated infrastructure provisions would prove ineffective due to the existence of operative rules that either duplicate or override the proposed provisions. These operative provisions are not within the scope of the variation and will continue to provide a rule framework for infrastructure on the site. The recommended deletion of the policy direction proposing to enable a transport corridor and infrastructure	No

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
				conflicts with 'avoidance' policy direction within the proposed Natural Open Space zone provisions under PC49.	
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Agree with comments.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S19.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Oppose	Disagree with submission that the proposed SGA will successfully support public transport unless it is very high density which would be totally inappropriate on Pinehaven Hills.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S19.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Oppose	Disagree with submission that the proposed SGA will successfully support public transport unless it is very high density which would be totally inappropriate on Pinehaven Hills.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S19.2 above.	n/a
FS12 The Guildford Timber Company	Support in part	GTC supports the intent of the submission, being to ensure the provision for future growth in the Southern Growth Area, and access to it through the Silverstream Spur, has regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 and provides for a well-functioning urban environment. To the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought in its own submission, GTC supports in part the relief that submission point S19.2 then seeks, being to amend the relevant provisions of the variation (e.g., NOSZ-P6 and NOSZ-S4) to provide for public transport and multi-modal and low/zero-carbon transport options along the proposed transport corridor. This corresponds with amendments to proposed rules and standards sought by GTC in its original submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S19.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Oppose	Disagree with point. Based on submissions, a road is not wanted by the community.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S19.2 above.	n/a
FS16 Forest & Bird	Oppose	Acknowledge there is not enough information in Variation 1 regarding the transport corridor. However, the relief sought by GW suggests a transport corridor would be necessary to provide for public transport and multi-modal and low/zero-carbon transport options. Provision of a transport corridor, even for public transport, would be contrary to s6(c) of the RMA and would fail to consider the national direction of the	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S19.2 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		Emissions Reduction Plan.			
FS18 Peter Ross	Oppose	The spur to be a reserve – no roading on reserves.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S19.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Oppose	GWRC offering public support for an “undefined” transport corridor is overruling the other primary environmental responsibilities that GWRC must promote sustainable development and use of resources within the region. The environmental impacts of new development on hill suburbs within the entire Hutt Valley from the past 50 plus years are equally apparent to GWRC as all other submissions and residents of these communities. These environmental impacts have been the destruction of habitats and indigenous biodiversity, increased intensity and volumes of stormwater discharges and preference for private cars over public transport or multimodal transport options or connections. The development of further areas of hilltop such as the proposed SGA would therefore seem to be directly in contradiction with the Regional Policy Statement proposed change No. 1 as “providing for a well-functioning urban environment”. The toe of Silverstream Spur is already at the outer edge of the 15 minute walkable catchment, without including a steep road of well over 1km in length substantially increasing the walking time meaning residents are more likely to use private motor vehicles to access the SGA.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S19.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support in part	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S19.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support in part	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S19.2 above.	n/a
S19.3 Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support with amendment	To amend reference to the effects management hierarchy to ensure consistency with the ‘avoid, minimise, remedy’ direction in Policy 32 of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan, and equivalent provisions in the National Policy Statement for	Accept in part	Amendments to the effects management hierarchy to give effect to the NPS-IB are recommended in response to other submissions. No amendments are recommended in response to the content of the Natural Resources Plan as	No

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		Freshwater Management 2020 and National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2022 exposure draft.		the NRP is also required to give effect to the NPS-IB with respect to the effects management hierarchy.	
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with point.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S19.3 above.	n/a
FS16 Forest & Bird	Support in part	Support the need to amend the effects management hierarchy to ensure consistency with the 'avoid, minimise, remedy' direction in Policy 32 of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan, and equivalent provisions in the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 and National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2022 exposure draft. However, suggest it needs to be stronger, as per Forest & Bird's original submission on Variation 1.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S19.3 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Severing the Silverstream Spur effectively in half with a road/infrastructure corridor to service a remote greenfield development and at the same time destroying valuable a valuable ecological corridor, then the best way for this area to be protected would be to Avoid, thus removing the specific provisions for a road/infrastructure anywhere on the Silverstream Spur. Other options are available to access the SGA, including parcels of land that the developer already owns.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S19.3 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S19.3 above.	n/a
S20.1 Colin Rickerby	Support	To rezone the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space and protect Significant Natural Areas.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the notified Natural Open Space zoning of the site. It is recommended to include provisions that identify and protect the identified SNA on the site.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S20.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Need to include exclusion of Transport/Road corridor provision.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S20.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S20.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S20.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S20.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S20.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S20.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S20.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Eventual 'Reserve' status. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access via Kiln Street to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S20.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Eventual 'Reserve' status. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access via Kiln Street to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S20.1 above.	n/a
S21.1 Michael Gray	Support	To add the provision to rezone the Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space and provision to protect identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the notified Natural Open Space zoning of the site. It is recommended to include provisions that identify and protect the identified SNA on the site.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S21.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S21.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S21.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S21.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S21.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S21.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S21.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S21.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S21.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S21.1 above.	n/a
S22.1 Jane Derbyshire	Seek amendment	Seek amendments to the provisions so the Silverstream Spur in full is protected as a Natural Open Space Zone - without the addition of a road/infrastructure corridor UHCC progress this area as intended - to reserve status. Support zoning of Significant Natural Areas within the Spur area.	Accept in part	No amendments are recommended to the notified Natural Open Space zoning of the site. It is recommended to include provisions that identify and protect the identified SNA on the site. The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons. The proposed transport corridor and associated infrastructure provisions would prove ineffective due to the existence of operative rules that either duplicate or override the proposed provisions. These operative provisions are not within the scope of	Yes



Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
				the variation and will continue to provide a rule framework for infrastructure on the site. The recommended deletion of the policy direction proposing to enable a transport corridor and infrastructure conflicts with 'avoidance' policy direction within the proposed Natural Open Space zone provisions under PC49. Any Council decision to make the site a reserve falls beyond the scope of the variation and would require a separate process under other legislation.	
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S22.1 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S22.1 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter that council fulfil its earlier obligation to make the entire spur a reserve under the Reserves act - see SOH full submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S22.1 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter that council fulfil its earlier obligation to make the entire spur a reserve under the Reserves act - see SOH full submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S22.1 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S22.1 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve. No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S22.1 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S22.1 above.	n/a
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S22.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Eventual ‘Reserve’ status. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Support: Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S22.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Eventual ‘Reserve’ status. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Do not support: Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S22.1 above.	n/a
S23.1 John D O’Malley	Support	To support the rezoning of the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the notified Natural Open Space zoning of the site.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC’s original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.1 above.	n/a

Submission number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
S23.2 John D O'Malley	Oppose	To oppose the enablement on the site for specific provisions for infrastructure including a transport corridor to access the Southern Growth Area.	Accept	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons. The proposed transport corridor and associated infrastructure provisions would prove ineffective due to the existence of operative rules that either duplicate or override the proposed provisions. These operative provisions are not within the scope of the variation and will continue to provide a rule framework for infrastructure on the site. The recommended deletion of the policy direction proposing to enable a transport corridor and infrastructure conflicts with 'avoidance' policy direction within the proposed Natural Open Space zone provisions under PC49.	Yes
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.2 above.	n/a
S23.3 John D O'Malley	Support	To support the protection of identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept	Amendments are recommended to provisions to protect the SNA from inappropriate development in response to other submissions and to give effect to the NPS-IB.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.3 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.3 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.3 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.3 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.3 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Fits with being a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.3 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.3 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S23.3 above.	n/a
S24.1 Nancy Bramley-Thompson	Support	To support the proposal to rezone Silverstream Spur from mix of Rural Hill and Residential Conservation zones to Natural Open Space and the proposal to protect identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the notified Natural Open Space zoning of the site. Amendments to provisions protecting the identified SNA are recommended to give effect to the RPS and the NPS-IB in response to other submissions.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S24.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S24.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S24.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S24.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S24.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S24.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S24.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S24.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S24.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S24.1 above.	n/a
S24.2 Nancy Bramley-Thompson	Oppose	To not support the enablement of site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor, within Silverstream Spur.	Accept	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons. The proposed transport corridor and associated infrastructure provisions would prove ineffective due to the existence of operative rules that either duplicate or override the proposed provisions. These operative provisions are not within the scope of the variation and will continue to provide a rule framework for infrastructure on the site. The recommended deletion of the policy direction proposing to enable a transport corridor and infrastructure conflicts with 'avoidance' policy direction within the proposed Natural Open Space zone provisions under PC49.	Yes
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S24.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S24.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S24.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S24.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S24.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve. No road on a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S24.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S24.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S24.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support references to the UHCC Sustainability Strategy Goal 2 in relation to PC49. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S24.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support references to the UHCC Sustainability Strategy Goal 2 in relation to PC49. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S24.2 above.	n/a
S25.1 Maurice Berrington	Seek amendment	To seek to have the Silverstream Spur as a reserve with cycle paths and walkways for the public to enjoy for future to come.	Reject	A Council decision on whether to give the site reserve status falls beyond the scope of the variation.	No



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S25.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S25.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S25.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S25.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S25.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve. No road on a reserve.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S25.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S25.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S25.1 above.	n/a
S26.1 Ian Price	Support	To rezone the Silverstream Spur completely as a Significant Natural Area and permanently protect all Significant Natural Areas.	Accept in part	All areas identified as meeting the criteria to be deemed a SNA are recommended for inclusion in the variation. Not all parts of the site are considered to be meet the criterial necessary to include them as SNA.	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S26.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S26.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S26.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S26.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S26.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S26.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S26.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S26.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Approximately 20% of the Spur is currently designated as a draft SNA. At this point in time the total area of the Spur would not qualify as SNA however with protection and restoration it would certainly qualify in the future. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. References to the UHCC Sustainability Strategy Goal 2 in relation	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S26.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		to PC49.			
S26.2 Ian Price	Oppose	To disallow any provision for any road or infrastructure corridor on any part of Silverstream Spur permanently.	Reject	Although it is recommended to delete the proposed site-specific provisions for a road corridor and associated network utility infrastructure for technical reasons, the operative District Plan includes provisions that may provide a consent path for a road corridor and associated network utility infrastructure on the site. It is not considered appropriate to introduce any provisions that would disallow the case-by-case consideration of infrastructure on the site.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S26.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S26.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S26.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S26.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S26.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S26.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Inc	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S26.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S26.2 above.	n/a
S27.1 Doug Johnston	Oppose	To abandon any plans to Plan Change 49 immediately for the greater good of both the Silver Stream Railway and the natural vegetation covering the Spur. I do not believe this one off transaction for housing development acts in the best interest of the local community.	Reject	The submission does not request any amendments to Variation 1. It is not recommended to abandon the variation entirely.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S27.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Does need to allow for rezoning spur as NOS.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S27.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S27.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Consistent with opposition to any road over spur to GTC land.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S27.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S27.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S27.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support in part	Support: The need to protect the future of the Silverstream Railway. The idea that protecting the Spur for the community is more important than allowing housing development on the Spur.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S27.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support in part	Support: The need to protect the future of the Silverstream Railway. The idea that protecting the Spur for the community is more important than allowing housing	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S27.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		development on the Spur.			
S28.1 Lance Hurlly	Support	To rezone the Spur to Natural Open Space	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the notified proposed zoning of the site as Natural Open Space.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S28.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S28.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S28.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S28.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S28.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S28.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S28.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S28.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S28.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S28.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
S28.2 Lance Hurly	Oppose	Withdraw any intention to establish a transport corridor.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons. The proposed transport corridor and associated infrastructure provisions would prove ineffective due to the existence of operative rules that either duplicate or override the proposed provisions. These operative provisions are not within the scope of the variation and will continue to provide a rule framework for infrastructure on the site. The recommended deletion of the policy direction proposing to enable a transport corridor and infrastructure conflicts with 'avoidance' policy direction within the proposed Natural Open Space zone provisions under PC49.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S28.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S28.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S28.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S28.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S28.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S28.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Inc	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S28.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.			
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S28.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S28.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S28.2 above.	n/a
S28.3 Lance Hurlly	Support	Protect the Significant Natural Areas on the Spur from development.	Accept	Amendments are recommended in response to other submissions to protect the proposed SNA from inappropriate development and adverse effects in accordance with the RPS and the NPS-IB.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S28.3 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S28.3 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S28.3 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S28.3 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S28.3 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S28.3 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S28.3 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity.			
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S28.3 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation and customary purposes.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S28.3 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation and customary purposes.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S28.3 above.	n/a
S29.1 Peter Zajac	Oppose	To remove the provisions for a road and transport corridor over the entire Silverstream Spur.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons. The proposed transport corridor and associated infrastructure provisions would prove ineffective due to the existence of operative rules that either duplicate or override the proposed provisions. These operative provisions are not within the scope of the variation and will continue to provide a rule framework for infrastructure on the site. The recommended deletion of the policy direction proposing to enable a transport corridor and infrastructure conflicts with 'avoidance' policy direction within the proposed Natural Open Space zone provisions under PC49.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S29.1 above.	n/a



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S29.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S29.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S29.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S29.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No roads on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S29.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S29.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S29.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Submission's list of warnings regarding future housing development on the GTC Silverstream Forest. Submission's statements around the importance of the Silverstream Spur for the environment and community. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S29.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Submission's list of warnings regarding future housing development on the GTC Silverstream Forest. Submission's statements around the importance of the Silverstream Spur for the environment and community. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S29.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.			
S30.1 Laura Johnston	Oppose	To remove the provisions for a road and transport corridor over the entire Silverstream Spur.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons. The proposed transport corridor and associated infrastructure provisions would prove ineffective due to the existence of operative rules that either duplicate or override the proposed provisions. These operative provisions are not within the scope of the variation and will continue to provide a rule framework for infrastructure on the site. The recommended deletion of the policy direction proposing to enable a transport corridor and infrastructure conflicts with 'avoidance' policy direction within the proposed Natural Open Space zone provisions under PC49.	No
FS1 Peter Zajac	Support	The Spur should be fully protected and not bisected by a road (of unknown size) to provide housing in a potentially dangerous location. Submission 30 aligns with my submission statements (see submission point 29.1).	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S30.1 above.	n/a
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S30.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Need for NOS provision to be allowed.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S30.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S30.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S30.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S30.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter	Support	No roads on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Ross				part submission S30.1 above.	
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S30.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S30.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support removal of site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.\	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S30.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support removal of site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S30.1 above.	n/a
S31.1 W Gibson	Seek amendment	For the Silverstream Spur to be Natural Open Space and to protect the native flora and fauna for future generations.	Accept	The identified SNA on the site is recommended to be included and protected via provisions.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S31.1 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S31.1 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S31.1 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S31.1 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S31.1 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No roads on a reserve	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S31.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S31.1 above.	n/a
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S31.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. The Spur was purchased in 1990 to be a reserve. Submitter’s statements around the importance of the Silverstream Spur for the future protection of the environment. Do not support: Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S31.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Submitter’s acknowledgement that the Spur was purchased in 1990 to be a reserve. Submitter’s statements around the importance of the Silverstream Spur for the future protection of the environment. Do not support: Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S31.1 above.	n/a
S32.1 Tom Halliburton	Seek amendment	To rezone the Silverstream Spur as proposed, but do not provide provision for access to the privately owned Southern Growth Area and to immediately begin a process for Silverstream Spur to be classified as reserve.	Accept in part	It is recommended to rezone the Silverstream Spur site to Natural Open Space as notified. The proposed provisions intended to enable an infrastructure corridor through the site to the Southern Growth Area are recommended to be	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
				deleted for technical reasons in response to other submissions. Classifying the site as a reserve is not a matter that falls under the RMA or the variation process.	
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S32.1 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S32.1 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S32.1 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S32.1 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S32.1 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No reason given	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S32.1 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S32.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		and providing infrastructure to the SGA.			
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S32.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Submitter’s list of warnings regarding future housing development on the GTC Silverstream Forest. Submitter’s statements around the importance of the Silverstream Spur for the environment and community. Future designation of the Spur as a reserve. Do not support: Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S32.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Submitter’s list of warnings regarding future housing development on the GTC Silverstream Forest. Submitter’s statements around the importance of the Silverstream Spur for the environment and community. Future designation of the Spur as a reserve. Do not support: Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S32.1 above.	n/a
S33.1 Calvin Berg	Support	The Council take action to have the Spur zoned as a Natural Open Space. The Council to stop supporting private interests trying to develop the Spur as appears to be the case at present.	Accept in part	No amendments are recommended to the notified proposed Natural Open Space zoning for the site.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S33.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Need to include opposition to Transport/roading corridor.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S33.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission, because the full submission clarifies that the comments about private interests trying to develop the Spur for their own benefit are made with reference to "The development of a corridor for infrastructure or any other development	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S33.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		of the Spur", indicating that the Submission is opposing a transport and infrastructure corridor through the Silverstream Spur.			
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with Submission, because the full submission clarifies that the comments about private interests trying to develop the Spur for their own benefit are made with reference to "The development of a corridor for infrastructure or any other development of the Spur", indicating that the submission is opposing a transport and infrastructure corridor through the Silverstream Spur.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S33.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S33.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S33.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S33.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S33.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Submission's statements around the importance of the Silverstream Spur as part of the local ecosystem. Submission's call for UHCC to distance itself from private commercial developers' interests.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S33.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Submission's statements around the importance of the Silverstream Spur as part of the local ecosystem. Submission's call for	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S33.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		UHCC to distance itself from private commercial developers' interests.			
S34.1 John Durry	Oppose	To seek the decision to remain as originally intended as a reserve and remove any provisions in the Plan Change allowing the building of a road or any other infrastructure on the whole of the Spur and rezone as Natural Open Space.	Accept in part	It is recommended to rezone the Silverstream Spur site to Natural Open Space as notified. The proposed provisions intended to enable an infrastructure corridor through the site to the Southern Growth Area are recommended to be deleted for technical reasons in response to other submissions. Classifying the site as a reserve is not a matter that falls under the RMA or the variation process.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S34.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S34.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S34.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S34.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S34.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S34.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S34.1 above.	n/a



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.			
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S34.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Submission's statements around the importance of the Silverstream Spur for the environment and community. Submission's statements around the original intentions for the Spur as a reserve. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S34.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Submission's statements around the importance of the Silverstream Spur for the environment and community. Submission's statements around the original intentions for the Spur as a reserve. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S34.1 above.	n/a
S35.1 Graham Bellamy	Support	That the Council rezones the Spur to Natural Open Space and then pursues the whole Silverstream Spur and neighbouring identified Significant Natural Areas being designated as a public reserve under the Reserves Act 1977, to provide protection against future rezoning of the area.	Accept in part	No amendments are recommended to the notified proposed Natural Open Space zoning of the site. It is recommended to retain amended SNA provisions that are specific to the site. Decisions by Council on whether to create a reserve under the Reserves Act fall beyond the variation and RMA processes.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.1 above.	n/a
S35.2 Graham Bellamy	Oppose	That the site-specific provisions to enable infrastructure including a transport corridor to make the Silverstream Spur accessible for these activities as well as opening access to potential development of the Southern Growth Area (SGA) be excluded.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons in response to other submissions. Existing operative provisions in other chapters of the District Plan provide a potential consenting path for infrastructure including a road on the site.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Ross				part submission S35.2 above.	
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support the pages of signatories to the petition to have the Silverstream Spur protected through PC 49 without any road or infrastructure corridor through the middle of it. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support the pages of signatories to the petition to have the Silverstream Spur protected through PC 49 without any road or infrastructure corridor through the middle of it. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.2 above.	n/a
S35.3 Graham Bellamy	Support with Amendment	That the identified Significant Natural Area on the Spur be retained, and no development be allowed in this area, except for the purpose of creation of a native bush Natural Open Space.	Accept in part	The proposed SNA is recommended to be retained. Provisions provide a method to determine whether development within the SNA are appropriate on a case-by-case basis.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.3 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.3 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.3 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.3 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.3 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.3 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.3 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. The Spur is an area that forms a natural gateway into Upper Hutt, a flora and fauna corridor and was originally designated reserve land. The Spur has the potential to be restored to native forest and increase local biodiversity as per the UHCC Sustainability Strategy Goal 2 - "We will prioritise protecting and enhancing our natural environment."	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.3 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. The Spur is an area that forms a natural gateway into Upper Hutt, a flora and fauna corridor and was originally designated reserve land. The Spur has the potential to be restored to native forest and increase local biodiversity as per the UHCC Sustainability Strategy Goal 2 - "We will prioritise protecting and enhancing our natural environment."	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S35.3 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
S36.1 Chris and Julie Manu	Oppose	To deny the enablement of site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor.	Accept	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons in response to other submissions. Existing operative provisions in other chapters of the District Plan provide a potential consenting path for infrastructure including a road on the site.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S35.3 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S35.3 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S35.3 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S35.3 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S35.3 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S35.3 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S35.3 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S35.3 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Submissions list of liabilities associated with a road through the Spur. Removal of site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S35.3 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		PC49.			
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Submissions list of liabilities associated with a road through the Spur. Removal of site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S35.3 above.	n/a
S37.1 Cathy Price	Support	Rezone the Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space completely, protect all SNA areas on the Silverstream Spur.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the proposed Natural Open zoning of the site. Amendments are recommended in response to other submissions to the proposed SNA provisions to protect the identified SNA as required by the RPS and the NPS-IB.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S37.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S37.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S37.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S37.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S37.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S37.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S37.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S37.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Do support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S37.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S37.1 above.	n/a
S37.2 Cathy Price	Oppose	Disallow any provision for a road, infrastructure corridor on any part of the Silverstream Spur.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion in response to other submissions due to technical reasons. The proposed transport corridor and associated infrastructure provisions would prove ineffective due to the existence of operative rules that either duplicate or override the proposed provisions. These operative provisions are not within the scope of the variation and will continue to provide a rule framework for infrastructure on the site. The recommended deletion of the policy direction proposing to enable a transport corridor and infrastructure conflicts with 'avoidance' policy direction within the proposed Natural Open Space zone provisions under PC49.	No
FS8 Helen	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Chapman				part submission S37.2 above.	
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S37.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S37.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S37.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S37.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S37.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S37.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S37.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S37.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S37.2 above.	n/a
S38.1 Gerald and Carleen Bealing	Support	To seek Council's approval of the variation subject to removal of provision of a transport corridor.	Accept	The proposed rezoning of the site to Natural Open Space Zone is recommended for retention. The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion in response to other submissions due to technical	No



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
				reasons.	
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S38.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S38.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S38.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S38.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S38.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve. No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S38.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S38.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S38.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S38.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of passive recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.			
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of passive recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S38.1 above.	n/a
S38.2 Gerald and Carleen Bealing	Oppose	Removal of provision of a transport corridor.	Accept	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion in response to other submissions due to technical reasons.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S38.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S38.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S38.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S38.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S38.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S38.2 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S38.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.			
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S38.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S38.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S38.2 above.	n/a
S39.1 Jennifer Durry	Support	To remain as originally intended as a reserve and rezone as Natural Open Space.	Accept in part	It is recommended to retain the proposed Natural Open Space zoning as notified. A decision whether to make the site a reserve falls beyond the RMA and the scope of the variation.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S39.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S39.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S39.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S39.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S39.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S39.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S39.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		and 2001.			
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S39.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S39.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S39.1 above.	n/a
S39.2 Jennifer Durry	Oppose	To remove any provision in the Plan Change allowing the building of any type of road or any infrastructure on the whole of the Spur.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion in response to other submissions due to technical reasons. However, existing operative provisions of the District Plan still provide a consent path for a road and infrastructure on the site.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S39.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S39.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S39.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S39.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S39.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S39.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S39.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.			
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S39.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S39.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S39.2 above.	n/a
S40.1 Stephen Bell	Support	To rezone the Spur as a Natural Open Space.	Accept	It is recommended to retain the proposed Natural Open Space zoning of the site as notified.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 40.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 40.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 40.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 40.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 40.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 40.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 40.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Scott				submission 40.1 above.	
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space Submission's concerns around the environmental damage that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 40.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space Submission's concerns around the environmental damage that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 40.1 above.	n/a
S40.2 Stephen Bell	Oppose	To remove the provision providing for an infrastructure and transportation corridor from the proposal.	Accept	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion in response to other submissions due to technical reasons.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 40.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 40.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 40.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 40.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 40.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 40.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 40.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Incorporated		Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.			
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 40.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 40.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 40.2 above.	n/a
S41.1 Bob McLellan	Support	To approve the provision to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept	It is recommended to retain the proposed Natural Open Space zoning of the site as notified.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 41.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 41.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 41.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 41.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 41.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 41.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 41.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		and 2001.			
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Do support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 41.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Do support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 41.1 above.	n/a
S41.2 Bob McLellan	Support	To approve the provision to protect identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	Provisions to protect the SNA are recommended to be retained but amended in response to other submissions and to give effect to the NPS-IB.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 41.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 41.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 41.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 41.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 41.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 41.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 41.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony	Support	Support to protect identified significant natural areas	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in	n/a



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Chad		on the Silverstream Spur from development.		part submission 41.2 above.	
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 41.2 above.	n/a
S41.3 Bob McLellan	Oppose	To decline (not approve) the provision to enable site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor.	Accept	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion in response to other submissions due to technical reasons.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 41.3 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 41.3 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 41.3 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 41.3 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 41.3 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 41.3 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 41.3 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 41.3 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Beth Taylor		the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49		submission 41.3 above.	
S42.1 Pat van Berkel	Support with amendment	Zone the entire Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space and extend the area of the Spur to include Sylvan Heights reserve (Parcel 3824934. Lot 46 DP 90006). Additionally, zone the extended Silverstream Spur described above Natural Open Space.	Accept in part	It is recommended to rezone the notified proposed portion of the Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space Zone. The Panel does not recommend rezoning the extended area of the Silverstream Spur as sought by the submission as there is no evidence before the Panel that demonstrates this would be the most appropriate method to achieve the purpose of the RMA. In addition, it is recommended that consultation with all directly affected property owners should be carried out prior to rezoning land.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Including the land adjacent to the Spur above Sylvan Way as Natural Open Space was part of the original PC49 consultation so it should be included.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur. View to the Spur being designated a reserve under the Reserve Act.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur. View to the Spur being designated a reserve under the Reserve Act.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.1 above.	n/a
S42.2 Pat van Berkel	Support with amendment	To protect the Significant Natural Area delineated on the Map in the Variation from development. Extend the Significant Natural Area (delineated on the Map in the Variation) to include the 6 recovering areas of native bush. Additionally, protect the extended Significant Natural Area from development. Recognise the whole Silverstream Spur as a Special Amenity Landscape. Acknowledge the strategic importance of the Silverstream Spur as part of the bird/wildlife corridor from the Wainuiomata Mainland Island to Keith George Memorial Park (which links to Zealandia and Akatarawa).	Accept in part	It is recommended to retain the notified extent of the identified SNA within the variation. The recommended provisions will protect the SNA from inappropriate development and adverse effects in accordance with the NPS-IB and the RPS. It is not recommended to extend the SNA to include other in the absence of ecological evidence supporting their inclusion. Special Amenity Landscapes fall beyond the scope of the variation, and Council has already made a decision not to include them in the District Plan.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support to protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.2 above.	n/a
S42.3 Pat van Berkel	Oppose	Remove provision for infrastructure and/or transport corridor on any part of the Silverstream Spur. Stop (in the legal sense) the unformed road Kiln St (from Sylvan Way to the westernmost extent of Kiln St). Extend the area of Silverstream Spur to include the stopped road	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion in response to other submissions due to technical reasons. Road stopping falls beyond the RMA and variation processes. The District Plan does not apply a zoning to roads.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.3 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.3 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.3 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Pattinson				part submission 42.3 above.	
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.3 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.3 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA. Stopping of the Kiln Street paper road should also be included in this plan change.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.3 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.3 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support submission's concerns around the environmental damage that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.3 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support submission's concerns around the environmental damage that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.3 above.	n/a
S42.4 Pat van Berkel	Seek amendment	Acknowledge that the Section 32 report on the Variation is incomplete because: a. It does not include analysis on road corridor	Accept in part	Road corridor options in terms of location fall beyond the level of detail appropriate for a plan change or variation. The Panel has ensured it has	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		<p>options (despite the stated “critical” importance of a road corridor).</p> <p>b. It does not include analysis on the changed emphasis in the updated NPS-UD that means Upper Hutt can meet urban growth in the foreseeable future through intensification rather than greenfield development (and hence no road corridor is needed) such as the SGA.</p> <p>c. It does not identify the strategic importance of the Spur as part of a significant wildlife/bird corridor.</p> <p>d. The Ecological Values Assessment is a point-in-time assessment that is inappropriate for the discussion about the Spur’s future. The assessment should cover its potential for the next 50 years.</p> <p>e. The Ecological Values Assessment needs to be updated, as nature has expanded the areas of significant native bush (as previously stated). Complete the Section 32 report in the 5 incomplete areas (described above).</p>		<p>up to date information as required by the NPS-UD including the latest post-IPI HBA specifying housing land supply/demand for the next 30 years, and the content of the approved Future Development Strategy with respect to the location of planned future urban areas to meet the anticipated demand for housing in Upper Hutt for the next 30 years. The Panel acknowledges these sources of information have changed and evolved since the variation was notified. The Panel directed Council to prepare an updated ecology assessment as part of the hearing process to inform the Panel’s recommendations on the most appropriate extent of the SNA on the site.</p>	
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.4 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.4 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission. Rata (and Rewarewa) also helps to stabilise the steep slopes with their extensive rooting systems, and therefore should be included in regeneration of natives on the Spur - see also submission by John Campbell (submission No. 80).	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.4 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission. Rata (and Rewarewa) also helps to stabilise the steep slopes with their extensive rooting systems, and therefore should be included in regeneration of natives on the Spur - see also submission by John Campbell (submission No. 80).	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.4 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Stuart				part submission 42.4 above.	
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Not including the transport/infrastructure corridor on the Spur will cause no impact to the SGA as the developers currently have several other options for accessing their land and have stated that without the Spur the development is still able to go ahead.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.4 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 42.4 above.	n/a
S43.1 Heather Frances Beckman	Support	To approve the rezoning of the entire Spur as Natural Open Space and the protection of Significant Natural Areas.	Accept in part	It is recommended to retain the notified proposed rezoning of the site to Natural Open Space zone. Amendments are recommended to the proposed SNA provisions in response to other submissions and the requirement to give effect to the NPS-IB.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 43.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 43.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 43.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 43.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 43.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 43.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 43.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity.			
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 43.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 43.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 43.1 above.	n/a
S43.2 Heather Frances Beckman	Oppose	To not approve the provision for a road/infrastructure corridor to the neighbouring privately owned land.	Accept	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion in response to other submissions due to technical reasons.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 43.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 43.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 43.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept	n/a



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Pattinson				submission 43.2 above.	
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 43.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 43.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 43.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 43.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support submission's concerns around the environmental damage that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 43.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support submission's concerns around the environmental damage that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 43.2 above.	n/a
S44.1 Lynne McLellan	Support	To approve the provision to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and General Residential Zone to Natural Open Space. To approve the provision to protect identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	It is recommended to retain the notified proposed rezoning of the site to Natural Open Space zone. Amendments are recommended to the proposed SNA provisions in response to other submissions and the requirement to give effect to	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
				the NPS-IB.	
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 44.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 44.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 44.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 44.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 44.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 44.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 44.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 44.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 44.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.			
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 44.1 above.	n/a
S44.2 Lynne McLellan	Oppose	To decline (not approve) the provision to enable site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor.	Accept	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion in response to other submissions due to technical reasons.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 44.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 44.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 44.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 44.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 44.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 44.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 44.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Scott				submission 44.2 above.	
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support submission's concerns around the environmental damage that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 44.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support submission's concerns around the environmental damage that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 44.2 above.	n/a
S45.1 John Pepper	Support	That Council proceed with rezoning as a Natural Open Space, designating the area as a Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. That Council give full protection to identified areas of Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur.	Accept in part	It is recommended to retain the notified proposed rezoning of the site to Natural Open Space zone. Amendments are recommended to the proposed SNA provisions in response to other submissions and the requirement to give effect to the NPS-IB. A Council decision on whether to make the site a reserve under the Reserves Act falls beyond the scope the RMA and the variation process.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 45.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 45.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 45.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 45.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 45.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 45.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 45.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 45.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Silverstream Spur as recreation/conservation zone forever.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 45.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Silverstream Spur as recreation/conservation zone forever.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 45.1 above.	n/a
S45.2 John Pepper	Oppose	That Council decline any proposal to construct a road/infrastructure corridor within the boundaries of the Silverstream Spur.	Reject	A proposal for the construction of a road/infrastructure corridor on the site would require a resource consent application that would be considered on its merits on a case-by-	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
				case basis under all relevant provisions of the District Plan. It would be inappropriate for the variation process to predetermine the outcome of any particular resource consent application.	
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 45.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 45.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 45.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 45.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 45.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 45.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 45.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 45.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support submission's concerns around the environmental damage that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support site - specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 45.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support submission's concerns around the environmental damage that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 45.2 above.	n/a
S46.1 Chris Cosslett	Support	To adopt the Natural Open Space Zoning for Silverstream Spur.	Accept	It is recommended to retain the proposed Natural Open Space zoning of the site as notified.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 46.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 46.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 46.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 46.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 46.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 46.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 46.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 46.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 46.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		Spur.			
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance to the Spur.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 46.1 above.	n/a
S46.2 Chris Cosslett	Oppose	To delete provision for a road corridor through Silverstream Spur.	Accept	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion in response to other submissions due to technical reasons.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 46.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 46.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 46.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 46.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 46.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 46.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 46.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 46.2 above.	n/a



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. View to the Spur being designated a Scenic Reserve under the Reserve Act. Submission's concerns around the negative ecological impact that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 46.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. View to the Spur being designated a Scenic Reserve under the Reserve Act. Submission's concerns around the negative ecological impact that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 46.2 above.	n/a
S47.1 Allan Sheppard	Support	That the Silverstream Spur be rezoned to Natural Open Space.	Accept	It is recommended to retain the proposed Natural Open Space zoning of the site as notified.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 47.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	I assume opposes transport/roading corridor.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 47.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 47.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 47.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 47.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 47.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 47.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 47.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 47.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 47.1 above.	n/a
S48.1 Donald Keith Skerman	Support	Proceed with rezoning of the Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space	Accept	It is recommended to retain the proposed Natural Open Space zoning of the site as notified.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 48.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 48.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 48.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 48.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 48.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 48.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 48.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Incorporated		and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.			
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 48.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. View to the Spur being designated a Reserve under the Reserve Act. Submission's acknowledgement that significant planting and restoration work has already been completed in the area by environmental groups.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 48.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. View to the Spur being designated a Reserve under the Reserve Act. Submission's acknowledgement that significant planting and restoration work has already been completed in the area by environmental groups.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 48.1 above.	n/a
S48.2 Donald Keith Skerman	Oppose	Ensure that the land is protected from the construction of any infrastructure on this land apart from walking and cycling tracks. Ensure that any walking or cycling tracks are built in a way that ensures that they will function in a sustainable manner and not increase erosion or other environmental degradation.	Reject	The recommended provisions remove the proposed site-specific infrastructure provisions in response to other submissions for technical reasons. Resource consent for infrastructure on the site may still be sought via other existing provisions within the Operative District Plan. All resource consent applications will need to be assessed with respect to environmental effects, and for consistency against the proposed Natural Open Space Zone policies under PC49, in addition to the relevant policies from all other District Plan chapters. The Panel does not recommend amendments to the Variation provisions to specify the methodology for walking and cycling tracks. The Panel notes and considers that that operative District Plan earthworks provisions combined with the recommended SNA provisions may address	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
				some of the concerns raised in the submission.	
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 48.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 48.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 48.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 48.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 48.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 48.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 48.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 48.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of passive recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. Submission's concerns around the visual and environmental damage that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 48.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of passive recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. Submission's concerns around the visual and environmental damage that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 48.2 above.	n/a
S48.3 Donald Keith Skerman	Support in part	That only walking and cycle paths should be permitted on any part of the land, not just areas that are judged to already be Significant Natural Areas. Support the removal of indigenous vegetation being disallowed on the land.	Accept in part	The Panel does not recommend amendments to the Variation provisions to specify the methodology for walking and cycling tracks on the site. Support for proposed SNA provisions is noted, although amendments are recommended to these provisions in response to other submissions and to give effect to the NPS-IB.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 48.3 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 48.3 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 48.3 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 48.3 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 48.3 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 48.3 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity.			
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 48.3 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support to protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 48.3 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 48.3 above.	n/a
S49.1 Rick Wheeler	Oppose	To stop all planning changes that may be proposed now, and in the future, to initially implement the construction of an access road onto the Spur.	Reject	The requested changes fall beyond the scope of what can be achieved via the variation. Resource consent for infrastructure on the site may still be sought via other existing provisions within the Operative District Plan. All resource consent applications will need to be assessed with respect to environmental effects, and for consistency against the proposed Natural Open Space Zone policies under PC49, in addition to the relevant policies from all other District Plan chapters	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 49.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 49.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 49.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 49.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 49.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 49.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 49.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Railway Incorporated		Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.			
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Submissions list of liabilities associated with a road through the Spur. Removal of site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 49.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Submissions list of liabilities associated with a road through the Spur. Removal of site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 49.1 above.	n/a
S50.1 Abbie Spiers	Support	To support the UHCC proposal to rezone the Spur from its existing designation to Natural Open Space. That UHCC rezone the Spur to Natural Open Space and protect the Spur and its SNAs in their entirety as Natural Open Space with no caveats.	Accept in part	It is recommended to retain the proposed Natural Open Space zoning of the site as notified. The SNA provisions are recommended to be amended in response to other submissions and to give effect to the NPS-IB. The Panel notes this will not protect the entirety of the Spur as requested by the submission.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. It was bought and paid for as a reserve	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. It was bought and paid for as a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.1 above.	n/a
S50.2 Abbie Spiers	Support with amendment	For UHCC to amend provisions to protect the Spur SNAs from all forms of development, infrastructure or roading, and not just from the vaguely worded 'development'.	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended to the proposed SNA provisions in response to matters raised by other submissions and to give effect to the NPS-IB. The Panel notes the term 'development' is a term used in the RMA that is distinct from 'subdivision' and 'use'. It is not considered appropriate to amend the provisions to prevent all forms of development from within the SNA as it is the role of the resource consent process to determine the level of effects on the environment on a case-by-case basis.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in	n/a



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Hills				part submission 50.2 above.	
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Submission's acknowledgement that significant planting and restoration work has already been completed in the area by environmental groups.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Submission's acknowledgement that significant planting and restoration work has already been completed in the area by environmental groups.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.2 above.	n/a
S50.3 Abbie Spiers	Oppose	Urge UHCC to reject any such site-specific provisions.	Accept in part	The site-specific infrastructure provisions are recommended for deletion in response to other submissions for technical reasons. Existing operative infrastructure provisions that apply to	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
				the site will continue to apply regardless of the Variation provisions. Please see the Panel recommendation report for details.	
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.3 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.3 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.3 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.3 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.3 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.3 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.3 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.3 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of passive recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. View to the Spur being designated a Reserve under the Reserve Act. Submission's concerns around the negative ecological impact that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support site -	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.3 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.			
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of passive recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. View to the Spur being designated a Reserve under the Reserve Act. Submission's concerns around the negative ecological impact that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 50.3 above.	n/a
S51.1 Derek Reeves	Support	To rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space and to protect identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	It is recommended to retain the proposed rezoning of the site to Natural Open Space as notified. Amendments are recommended to the proposed SNA provisions in response to matters raised by other submissions and to give effect to the NPS-IB.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 51.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 51.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 51.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 51.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 51.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 51.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 51.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 51.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. It was bought and paid for as a reserve. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 51.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. It was bought and paid for as a reserve. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 51.1 above.	n/a
S51.2 Derek Reeves	Oppose	To prohibit site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for infrastructure are recommended to be deleted in response to matters raised in other submissions and to address technical issues. It is not recommended to introduce any form of prohibition on infrastructure as existing District Plan provisions for infrastructure will provide a consent path for infrastructure on the site.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 51.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 51.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 51.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 51.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 51.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 51.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 51.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 51.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of passive recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. Submission's concerns around the negative ecological impact that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 51.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of passive recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. Submission's concerns around the negative ecological impact that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 51.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
S52.1 Phil Hancock	Support	To rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space and protect identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	It is recommended to retain the proposed rezoning of the site to Natural Open Space as notified. Amendments are recommended to the proposed SNA provisions in response to matters raised by other submissions and to give effect to the NPS-IB.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 52.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 52.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 52.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 52.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 52.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 52.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 52.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 52.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 52.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 52.1 above.	n/a
S52.2 Phil Hancock	Oppose	To provide public access for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.	Accept in part	The panel notes these activities are provided for via proposed PC49 provisions for the Natural Open Space Zone.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 52.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 52.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 52.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 52.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 52.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 52.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes)	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 52.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.			
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 52.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of passive recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. View to the Spur being designated a reserve under the Reserve Act. Submission's concerns around the negative environmental impact that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space A road through the Spur is incompatible with Natural Open Space. Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 52.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of passive recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. View to the Spur being designated a reserve under the Reserve Act. Submission's concerns around the negative environmental impact that would result from the inclusion of a road/ infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space A road through the Spur is incompatible with Natural Open Space. Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 52.2 above.	n/a
S53.1 Steven	Support	To rezone the Spur to Open Space. Then as soon as the Spur is rezoned to Open Space an application	Accept in part	It is recommended to retain the proposed rezoning of the site to Natural Open Space as	No



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Robertson		should be made (and followed through on this time) to make it a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. To approve the SNA designation.		notified. Amendments are recommended to the proposed SNA provisions in response to matters raised by other submissions and to give effect to the NPS-IB. Any decision by Council on whether to have the site classified as a reserve sits beyond the RMA and variation process.	
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 53.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 53.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 53.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 53.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 53.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 53.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 53.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Scott				part submission 53.1 above.	
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of passive recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. View to the Spur being designated a reserve under the Reserve Act.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 53.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of passive recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. View to the Spur being designated a reserve under the Reserve Act.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 53.1 above.	n/a
S53.2 Steven Robertson	Oppose	To remove the provision to allow a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur.	Accept	These provisions are recommended for removal in response to other submissions.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 53.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 53.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 53.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 53.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 53.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 53.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 53.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 53.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support submission's concerns around the slope risk and negative ecological impact that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 53.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support submission's concerns around the slope risk and negative ecological impact that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 53.2 above.	n/a
S54.1 Suilva Fay McIntyre	Support	To retain the Natural Open Space in perpetuity.	Accept in part	It is recommended to rezone the site Natural Open Space as notified.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 54.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	With provision of opposed to Transport/roading corridor.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 54.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 54.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 54.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 54.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 54.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 54.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 54.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 54.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 54.1 above.	n/a
S55.1 Jason Durry	Support	To rezone all of the Spur to Natural Open Space.	Accept in part	It is recommended to rezone the part of the Silverstream Spur affected by Variation 1 to Natural Open Space Zone as notified. No amendments are recommended to the zoning of the balance of the Silverstream Spur.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.1 above.	n/a
S55.2 Jason Durry	Oppose	To remove/disallow any provisions for the constructions or to enable construction of a road/infrastructure on any part of the Spur.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons in response to other submissions. Existing operative provisions in other chapters of the District Plan will continue to provide a potential consenting path for infrastructure including a road on the site.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Bellamy				part submission 55.2 above.	
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.2 above.	n/a
S55.3 Jason Durry	Seek amendment	To correct the erroneous SNA maps and include all areas with native vegetation based on detailed site analysis.	Accept in part	The Panel has ensured that sufficient ecology evidence is available to accurately recommend the extent of the SNA on the site. The Panel is satisfied that the level of ecological analysis on the site is sufficient to identify and protect the SNA as required by the RPS and the NPS-IB.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.3 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.3 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.3 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.3 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.3 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.3 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.3 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.3 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support the correction of SNA mapping on the Silverstream Spur.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.3 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support the correction of SNA mapping on the Silverstream Spur.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 55.3 above.	n/a
S56.1 Quintin Towler	Support	To zone the entire Spur as Natural Open Space and ensure protection of all SNAs.	Accept in part	It is recommended to rezone the site Natural Open Space Zone as notified. The SNA identified on the site is recommended to be included to protect significant indigenous vegetation and habitats as required by the RPS and the NPS-IB. Only the part of the Spur affected by the Variation is recommended to be rezoned.	No
FS8 Helen	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Chapman				part submission 56.1 above.	
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 56.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 56.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 56.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 56.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 56.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 56.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 56.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 56.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 56.1 above.	n/a



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		Natural Open Space.			
S56.2 Quintin Towler	Oppose	To remove all provisions allowing a road/corridor anywhere on the Spur.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons in response to other submissions. However, the existing operative provisions in other chapters of the District Plan will continue to provide a potential consenting path for infrastructure including a road on the site.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 56.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 56.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 56.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 56.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 56.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 56.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 56.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 56.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony	Support	Do not support site -specific provisions for	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Chad		infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.		part submission 56.2 above.	
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 56.2 above.	n/a
S57.1 Christian Woods	Support	To rezone the entire Spur as Natural Space.	Accept in part	The part of the Spur affected by the Variation is recommended to be rezoned Natural Open Space as notified. The balance of the Silverstream Spur site will retain its existing zoning.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 57.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 57.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 57.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 57.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 57.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 57.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 57.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 57.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Acknowledgement that the Silverstream Spur was purchased with UHCC Reserve funds and should only be used as Natural Open Space.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 57.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Acknowledgement that the Silverstream Spur was purchased with UHCC Reserve funds and should only be used as Natural Open Space.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 57.1 above.	n/a
S57.2 Christian Woods	Oppose	To remove provisions for a road or/and infrastructure corridor anywhere on the Silverstream Spur.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons in response to other submissions. However, the existing operative provisions in other chapters of the District Plan will continue to provide a potential consenting path for infrastructure including a road on the site.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 57.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 57.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 57.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 57.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 57.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 57.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 57.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 57.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 57.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 57.2 above.	n/a
S58.1 Marie Harris	Support	To zone the entire Spur as Natural Open Space.	Accept in part	The part of the Spur affected by the Variation is recommended to be rezoned Natural Open Space as notified. The balance of the Silverstream Spur site will retain its existing zoning.	n/a
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.1 above.	n/a
S58.2 Marie Harris	Support with amendment	To correct inadequate SNA areas.	Accept in part	The Panel has ensured that sufficient ecology evidence is available to accurately recommend the extent of the SNA on the site. The Panel is satisfied that the level of ecological analysis on the site is sufficient to identify and protect the SNA as required by the RPS and the NPS-IB.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve. No road on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support correction of SNA mapping on the Silverstream Spur.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support correction of SNA mapping on the Silverstream Spur.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.2 above.	n/a
S58.3 Marie Harris	Oppose	To remove provisions for building a road and utilities.	Accept	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons in response to other submissions.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.3 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.3 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.3 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.3 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.3 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.3 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.3 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.3 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support submission’s concerns around the slope risk and negative ecological impact that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.3 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support submission’s concerns around the slope risk and negative ecological impact that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 58.3 above.	n/a
S59.1 Nadine Ebbett	Oppose	To remove any provisions for the building of a road or infrastructure anywhere on the Spur and to rezone the Spur as a reserve.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons in response to other submissions. Existing operative provisions in other chapters of the District Plan provide a potential consenting path for infrastructure including a road on the site. It is recommended to rezone the site to Natural Open Space Zone as	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
				notified.	
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 59.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 59.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 59.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 59.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 59.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve so no roads allowed.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 59.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 59.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 59.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. It was bought and paid for as a reserve. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Road/infrastructure corridor is not needed for recreational access to the Spur. Do not support site - specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 59.1 above.	n/a



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. It was bought and paid for as a reserve. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Road/infrastructure corridor is not needed for recreational access to the Spur. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 59.1 above.	n/a
S60.1 Ben Jones	Oppose	To disallow and provision for a road/infrastructure corridor on any part of the Silverstream Spur.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons in response to other submissions. However, existing operative provisions in other chapters of the District Plan will continue to provide a potential consenting path for infrastructure including a road on the site.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 60.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 60.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 60.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 60.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 60.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve so no roads allowed.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 60.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 60.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Incorporated		Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.			
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 60.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. It was intended to be a reserve when purchased and disallow road/infrastructure corridor as it is not compatible with Natural Open Space. Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 60.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. It was intended to be a reserve when purchased and disallow road/infrastructure corridor as it is not compatible with Natural Open Space. Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 60.1 above.	n/a
S61.1 Scott Fitzgerald	Oppose	To remove any provisions for any road or infrastructure corridor on any part of the Silverstream Spur.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons in response to other submissions. However, existing operative provisions in other chapters of the District Plan will continue to provide a potential consenting path for infrastructure including a road on the site.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 61.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Bellamy				part submission 61.1 above.	
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 61.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 61.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 61.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve so no roads allowed.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 61.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 61.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 61.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support to disallow road/infrastructure corridor as it is not compatible with Natural Open Space and submission's concerns around the slope risk and negative ecological impact that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support site - specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 61.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to disallow road/infrastructure corridor as it is not compatible with Natural Open Space and submission's concerns around the slope risk and negative ecological impact that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support site -	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 61.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.			
S62.1 Martin McGlue	Support	To rezone the Spur as a Natural Open Space zone in full and protect all SNA areas on the Spur.	Accept	It is recommended to rezone the site Natural Open Space Zone as notified. The Panel is satisfied that sufficient ecology evidence exists to identify and protect all areas deemed significant under the RPS and NPS-IB criteria for SNAs. Provisions are recommended to protect the SNA. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more detail.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 62.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 62.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 62.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 62.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 62.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 62.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 62.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 62.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		Natural Open Space. It was bought and paid for as a reserve. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.			
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. It was bought and paid for as a reserve. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 62.1 above.	n/a
S62.2 Martin McGlue	Oppose	To disallow any provisions for road/infrastructure corridor on any part of the Spur land.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons in response to other submissions. However, existing operative provisions in other chapters of the District Plan will continue to provide a potential consenting path for infrastructure including a road on the site.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 62.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 62.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 62.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 62.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 62.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 62.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 62.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.			
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 62.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 62.2 above.	n/a
S63.1 Trevor Richardson	Oppose	That the Silverstream Spur remains as is and not become a housing area with a road and associated utilities with housing and roading.	Reject	Future decisions regarding potential development of the Spur are not within the scope of the variation.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 63.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 63.2 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 63.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 63.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 63.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 63.2 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 63.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 63.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support submission's concerns: around the negative environmental impact that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. s around the negative impact on Silverstream Railway that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space and submission's stated intent "That the Silverstream Spur remains as a Natural Open Space as a Reserve. To be enjoyed by all. Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 63.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support submission's concerns around the negative environmental impact that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space and around the negative impact on Silverstream Railway that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission 63.2 above.	n/a
S64.1 Elizabeth Maria Christensen	Support	To rezone the Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space.	Accept	It is recommended to rezone the site Natural Open Space Zone as notified.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 64.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 64.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 64.1 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 64.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 64.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 64.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 64.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 64.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 64.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 64.1 above.	n/a
S64.2 Elizabeth Maria Christensen	Support	To protect identified natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development, but only development as native planting.	Accept in part	It is recommended to identify and protect all areas on the site that qualify as a SNA under the RPS and the NPS-IB. It is not appropriate to limit all development within the SNA to native planting. The recommended provisions provide protection of the SNA from specific adverse effects that must be avoided in accordance with the NPS-IB.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 64.2 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 64.2 above.	n/a



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 64.2 above.	n/a
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 64.2 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 64.2 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Go the natives.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 64.2 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 64.2 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 64.2 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support to protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 64.2 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 64.2 above.	n/a
S64.3 Elizabeth Maria Christensen	Oppose	To remove the site specific provisions for infrastructure including a transport corridor from the proposed variation.	Accept	The provisions are recommended for deletion in response to other submissions due to technical issues. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more detail.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 64.3 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 64.3 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 64.3 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 64.3 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 64.3 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 64.3 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SG	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 64.3 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 64.3 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 64.3 above.	n/a
FS624 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission 64.3 above.	n/a
S65.1 Janice Nancy Carey	Support	To make the Silverstream Spur a Natural Open Space for always, for us all.	Accept in part	It is recommended to rezone the site Natural Open Space Zone as notified. Future decisions on the use and development of the site are not within the scope of the variation.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 65.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 65.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 65.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 65.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 65.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 65.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and is in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 65.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 65.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space forever.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 65.1 above.	n/a
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space forever.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission 65.1 above.	n/a
S66.1 Anthony Carey	Support	Seek to rezone the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space for the entire Upper Hutt community.	Accept	It is recommended to rezone the site Natural Open Space Zone as notified.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S66.1 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S66.1 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S66.1 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S66.1 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan	Support	Agree with all points in the submission	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Stuart				submission S66.1 above.	
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S66.1 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S66.1 above.	n/a
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S66.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space forever	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S66.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space forever	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S66.1 above.	n/a
S67.1 Lynette Elizabeth Smith	Oppose	To delete Variation 1, including a transport corridor, from PC49. To establish the Silverstream Spur as a reforestation project and across valley ecological link for our birdlife. To confirm the public ownership of the Silverstream Spur and class it as an ecological corridor.	Accept in part	Parts of the variation that relate to the enablement of a transport corridor are recommended for deletion in response to other submissions. The other components of this submission point raise matters that fall beyond the variation process.	No
FS8 Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S67.1 above.	n/a
FS9 Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S67.1 above.	n/a
FS10 Save our	Support in	Agree with submission in opposing the construction	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Hills	part	of a road through the [35] hectares of the Silverstream Spur, and that the wilding pines that the Council planted need removal and replanted with natives, but do not agree with deleting the entire Variation 1 because we want the entire Spur re-zoned as Natural Open Space and the SNA's along with all the rest of the Silverstream Spur protected from urban development.		part submission S67.1 above.	
FS11 Susan Pattinson	Support in part	Agree with submission in opposing the construction of a road through the [35] hectares of the Silverstream Spur, and that the wilding pines that the Council planted need removal and replanted with natives, but do not agree with deleting the entire Variation 1 because we want the entire Spur re-zoned as Natural Open Space and the SNA's along with all the rest of the Silverstream Spur protected from urban development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S67.1 above.	n/a
FS13 Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S67.1 above.	n/a
FS18 Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve. No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S67.1 above.	n/a
FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S67.1 above.	n/a
FS20 Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S67.1 above.	n/a
FS23 Tony Chad	Support	Support: Removal of wilding pines on the Silverstream Spur, carried out in a planned manner in the best interests of the regenerating indigenous biodiversity. Reforestation of Silverstream Spur. Maintaining the	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S67.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		Spur in public ownership. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.			
FS24 Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Removal of wilding pines on the Silverstream Spur, carried out in a planned manner in the best interests of the regenerating indigenous biodiversity. Reforestation of Silverstream Spur. Maintaining the Spur in public ownership. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S67.1 above.	n/a
S68.1 Leo Parnell Smith	Oppose	To delete Variation 1, including a transport corridor, from PC49. To become actively involved in establishing the Silverstream Spur as a reforestation project and across valley ecological link for birdlife etc. To confirm the public ownership of the Silverstream Spur and establish it as an ecological corridor.	Accept in part	Parts of the variation that relate to the enablement of a transport corridor are recommended for deletion in response to other submissions. The other components of this submission point raise matters that fall beyond the variation process.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S68.1 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S68.1 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support in part	Agree with submitter in opposing the construction of a road through the Silverstream Spur, and that the wilding pines that the Council planted need removal and replanted with natives, but do not agree with deleting the entire Variation 1 because we want the entire Spur re-zoned as Natural Open Space and the SNA's along with all the rest of the Silverstream Spur protected from urban development	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S68.1 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter in opposing the construction of a road through the Silverstream Spur, and that the wilding pines that the Council planted need removal and replanted with natives, but do not agree with	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S68.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		deleting the entire Variation 1 because we want the entire Spur re-zoned as Natural Open Space and the SNA's along with all the rest of the Silverstream Spur protected from urban development			
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S68.1 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S68.1 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S68.1 above.	n/a
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S68.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Removal of wilding pines on the Silverstream Spur, carried out in a planned manner in the best interests of the regenerating indigenous biodiversity. Reforestation of Silverstream Spur with appropriate native plantings. Maintaining the Spur in public ownership. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S68.1 above.	n/a
S69.1 Heather Blissett	Support	The protection of the Spur in favour of her ecological and recreational and healing value.	Accept in part	The site is recommended to be rezoned to Natural Open Space as notified. PC49 provisions provide the recreational activities and use. SNAs on the site are recommended to be identified and protected in accordance with the RPS and the NPS-IB.	No
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S69.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S69.1 above.	n/a
FS24- Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S69.1 above.	n/a
S69.2 Heather Blissett	Oppose	Do not allow a transport corridor or any major human disturbance on the Spur except to remove exotic trees in favour of indigenous trees.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons in response to other submissions. However, existing operative provisions in other chapters of the District Plan will continue to provide a potential consenting path for infrastructure including a road on the site. SNAs on the site are recommended to be identified and protected in accordance with the RPS and the NPS-IB.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S69.2 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S69.2 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S69.2 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S69.2 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S69.2 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S69.2 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city,	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S69.2 above.	n/a



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.			
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S69.2 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support minimal human disturbance except for removal of exotic flora, carried out in a planned manner in the best interests of the regenerating indigenous biodiversity. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S69.2 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support minimal human disturbance except for removal of exotic flora, carried out in a planned manner in the best interests of the regenerating indigenous biodiversity. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S69.2 above.	n/a
S70.1 Katelin Hardgrave	Support	The decision for the Silverstream Spur to remain as its original intention as a reserve without any roads or infrastructure.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons in response to other submissions. However, the existing operative provisions in other chapters of the District Plan will continue to provide a potential consenting path for infrastructure including a road on the site. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S70.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Chad		Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space and NOT Open Space. "The Silverstream Spur to remain as its original intention without any roads or infrastructure."		part submission S70.1 above.	
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space and NOT Open Space	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S70.1 above.	n/a
S70.2 Katelin Hardgrave	Oppose	No road or infrastructure corridor through the Spur.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons in response to other submissions. However, the existing operative provisions in other chapters of the District Plan will continue to provide a potential consenting path for infrastructure including a road on the site. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S70.2 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S70.2 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S70.2 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S70.2 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S70.2 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S70.2 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city,	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S70.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed.			
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S70.2 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S70.2 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S70.2 above.	n/a
S71.1 Mary Beth Taylor	Support with amendment	That the Silverstream Spur be zoned Natural Open Space only in its entirety free of any roads, infrastructure corridors and free of any housing Seek following for the Silverstream Spur: Protect and enhance the draft SNA areas. Protect and enhance the draft SAL areas (the entire Spur). Add the Sylvan Way public reserve land to the Silverstream Spur. Stop the Kiln Street paper road and add this land to the Silverstream Spur.	Accept in part	It is recommended to retain the proposed Natural Open Space zoning for the site as notified. Council has already made a decision not to include special amenity landscapes in the District Plan. The Panel does not recommend changes to decisions the Council has already made. The Panel also notes it has no evidence available to it upon which it could consider special amenity landscapes. The other matters requested fall outside of the RMA and variation processes.	No
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S71.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Inclusion of Sylvan Heights	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S71.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur. Stop Kiln Street paper road and add this land to the Spur. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development			
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur. Stop Kiln Street paper road and add this land to the Spur. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S71.1 above.	n/a
S71.2 Mary Beth Taylor	Oppose	That the Silverstream Spur to be free of any roads, infrastructure corridors. Seek the following actions for the Silverstream Spur: Create public access via Sylvan Way similar to Ecclesfield Reserve in Pinehaven. Create tracks designed for good accessibility for a range of ages and abilities. Create basic amenities (toilets, water, benches). Once Natural Open Space zone status is secured, to begin the process of designating the Silverstream Spur a Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. This process was begun in 1992 and 2001 but not yet followed through.	Reject	The submission requests amendments that are either beyond the scope of the variation process, or require decisions from Council under other legislation. Recommended amendments to remove transport corridor and infrastructure-specific provisions in response to other submissions may address some of the matters raised in the submission.	No
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S71.2 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation and customary purposes. Submitter’s concerns around the environmental damage that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support: Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S71.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		Remove from PC49.			
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation and customary purposes. Submitter’s concerns around the environmental damage that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support: Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S71.2 above.	n/a
S71.3 Mary Beth Taylor	Neutral	Seek the following actions for the Silverstream Spur: To remain in community ownership. Protect and enhance the draft SAL areas (the entire Spur). Once Natural Open Space zone status is secured, to begin the process of designating the Silverstream Spur a Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. This process was begun in 1992 and 2001 but not yet followed through.	Reject	Future ownership of the site is a matter that falls beyond the RMA and Variation process. The Panel does not recommend the inclusion of any SALs on the basis that the Panel has insufficient evidence to support this. A Council decision on whether to make the site a reserve under the Reserves Act is a separate Council decision and process that falls beyond the RMA and variation process.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S71.3 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S71.3 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S71.3 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S71.3 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S71.3 above.	n/a
FS16 – Forest and Bird	Support	Including Silverstream Spur as a Special Amenity Landscape would be consistent with UHCC’s obligations under s7(c) of the RMA. Furthermore, protecting the Spur as a reserve under the Reserves	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S71.3 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		Act would be appropriate in light of the original intention of the purchase of the land.			
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S71.3 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity. Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/ transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S71.3 above.	n/a
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S71.3 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support the view to the Spur being designated a reserve under the Reserve Act.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S71.3 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support the view to the Spur being designated a reserve under the Reserve Act.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S71.3 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
S72.1 Peter Ross	Seek amendments	To declare the Silverstream Spur, in its entirety, as a public open space. To amend proposed PC49 variation to remove all reference to having site-specific provisions for infrastructure including a transport corridor on or over or through the Silverstream Spur. To declare the Silverstream Spur land in its entirety to be a reserve within the meaning of the Reserves Act 1977 section 14 - where a 'Local authority may declare land vested in it to be a reserve'.	Accept in part	It is recommended to rezone the site to Natural Open Space as notified. The transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure provisions are recommended to be deleted in response to other submissions. A Council decision on whether to make the site a reserve under the Reserves Act is a separate Council decision and process that falls beyond the RMA and variation process.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S72.1 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S72.1 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S72.1 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S72.1 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S72.1 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	My submission	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S72.1 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. On at least 2 previous occasions steps were taken to designate the	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S72.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		Spur as a reserve but they were not followed through with. It needs to happen this time around.			
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S72.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space/reserve as it was originally intended. Submitter’s concerns around the public possibly ending up funding a plan change and infrastructure for a private developer. Submitter’s concerns around the GTC submission request to build a road through the Spur. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S72.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space/reserve as it was originally intended. Submitter’s concerns around the public possibly ending up funding a plan change and infrastructure for a private developer. Submitter’s concerns around the GTC submission request to build a road through the Spur. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S72.1 above.	n/a
S73.1 Shayne Fairbrother	Support	For the Silverstream Spur to be rezoned as a Natural Open Space and protected against developmental incursion that negatively impacts on the natural environment	Accept in part	It is recommended that the site be rezoned to Natural Open Space as notified. Provisions are recommended to protect the SNA to give effect to the RPS and the NPS-IB, however development on the site cannot be prevented via the variation process.	No
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S73.1 above.	n/a



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Give the Spur Reserve status and protect forever. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S73.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Give the Spur Reserve status and protect forever. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S73.1 above.	n/a
S73.2 Shayne Fairbrother	Oppose	Silverstream Spur to be rezoned as a Natural Open Space and protected against developmental incursion that negatively impacts on the natural environment.	Accept in part	It is recommended that the site be rezoned to Natural Open Space as notified. Provisions are recommended to protect the SNA to give effect to the RPS and the NPS-IB, however development on the site cannot be prevented via the variation process.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S73.2 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S73.2 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S73.2 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S73.2 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S73.2 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S73.2 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC’s original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S73.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Incorporated		amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs is to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity. Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed.			
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S73.2 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support Submitter's concerns around the traffic issues and negative ecological impact that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S73.2 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support Submitter's concerns around the traffic issues and negative ecological impact that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S73.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
S74.1 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Amelia Geary	Support	To retain the NOSZ zoning proposed by Variation 1 for Silverstream Spur.	Accept	The Panel recommends rezoning the site to Natural Open Space Zone as notified.	No
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S74.1 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S74.1 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S74.1 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S74.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Ultimately give the Spur Reserve status and protection.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S74.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Ultimately give the Spur Reserve status and protection.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S74.1 above.	n/a
S74.2	Seek	Seek that either policy NOSZ-P6 is deleted, or,	Accept in part	The Panel recommends NOSZ-P6 be deleted as it	Yes

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Amelia Geary	amendment	provided that the effects management hierarchy in policy 7 is amended in line with our submission, retain policy 6, with the below amendments: NOSZ-P6 Silverstream Spur Infrastructure <u>Only consider enabling</u> <del>Enable</del> infrastructure including a transport corridor within the Silverstream Spur (Pt Sec 1 SO 34755, Parcel ID: 3875189) at an appropriate scale, design, and location to 1. Provide for a range of passive recreation opportunities; and 2. <del>Support for the development of the Southern Growth Area;</del> <u>where the effects of such development are managed in accordance with NOSZ-P7</u>		is considered to conflict with policies in the proposed NOSZ chapter under PC49. The Panel notes that infrastructure, including roads, are already supported by policies in the relevant operative District Plan chapters TP and NU. In addition, the Panel considers that 'enable' is not consistent with the activity status of operative District Plan rules in the TP and INF chapters for roads and infrastructure. Please see the Panel report for further details.  The Panel recommends amendments to NOSZ-P7 in response to submissions S74.3 and S79.3, albeit in an amended form to ensure the policy gives effect to Clause 3.10 of the NPS-IB.	
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support in part	Agree with submitter except do not agree with "enabling infrastructure including a transport corridor within the Silverstream Spur" at all because of the uncertainty of what the terms "infrastructure" and "transport corridor" imply,	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S74.2 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support in part	Agree with submitter except do not agree with "enabling infrastructure including a transport corridor within the Silverstream Spur" at all because of the uncertainty of what the terms "infrastructure" and "transport corridor" imply,	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S74.2 above.	n/a
FS12 – The Guildford Timber Company	Support in part	GTC supports in part that part of the rationale for the submission which is based on a critique of the variation, such that the provision for a proposed transport corridor in NOSZ-P6 does not align with the general purpose of the proposed Natural Open Space zoning. However, in GTC's submission, this is not because the provision for a transport corridor serving the Southern Growth Area on the Silverstream Spur is inappropriate; rather, it is a reflection that the operative zoning is more appropriate and fit-for-purpose. GTC notes also that the Spur, being public-	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S74.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		owned, need not be zoned open space in order to advance native regeneration programmes. To the extent that the rationale espoused in submission point S74.2 aligns with GTC's primary submission in this regard, it is supported in part.			
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S74.2 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Submitter's concerns around the negative impact on local biodiversity and loss of habitat that would result from the inclusion of a road/ infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Submitter's concerns that road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur is not compatible with the designation as Natural Open Space and recreational use by the public. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S74.2 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Submitter's concerns around the negative impact on local biodiversity and loss of habitat that would result from the inclusion of a road/ infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Submitter's concerns that road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur is not compatible with the designation as Natural Open Space and recreational use by the public. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S74.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
S74.3 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Amelia Geary	Seek amendment	<p>Amend policy NOSZ-P7 to clarify that this is an additional consideration not an alternative to other NOSZ policy.</p> <p>NOSZ-P7 Silverstream Spur Natural Area <u>Protect the biodiversity values of Silverstream Spur Significant Natural Areas identified on Map XX by requiring</u> <del>Adverse effects from development to:</del> <u>on the identified Silverstream Spur Significant Natural Areas shall be:</u></p> <p>(a) <del>avoided where practicable; and</del> <u>Avoid the following adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity:</u></p> <p><u>(i) Loss of ecosystem representation and extent; (ii) Disruption to sequences, mosaics or ecosystem function;</u></p> <p><u>(iii) Fragmentation or loss of buffering or connectivity within the SNAs and between other indigenous habitats and ecosystems; and</u></p> <p><u>(iv) A reduction in population size or occupancy of threatened species using the SNAs for any part of their life cycle.</u></p> <p>(b) <del>where adverse effects cannot be demonstrably avoided, they are mitigated where practicable; and</del> <u>Avoid other adverse effects as far as possible; and</u> <del>where adverse effects cannot be demonstrably mitigated, they are remedied where practicable; and</del></p> <p>(c) Minimise adverse effects on the identified biodiversity values where avoidance under (b) is not possible;</p> <p>(d) <del>where more than minor residual adverse effects cannot be demonstrably avoided, minimised, or remedied, biodiversity offsetting is provided where possible; and</del> <u>Remedy adverse effects where they cannot be avoided or minimised under (b) and (c); and</u> if biodiversity offsetting is not appropriate, the development itself is avoided.</p>	Accept in part	The Panel agrees it is appropriate and necessary to amend NOSZ-P7 to give effect to the primary ‘avoid’ direction of the NPS-IB before applying the effects management hierarchy to other effects. Amendments are recommended that are similar to those requested by the submission, but the amendments ensure that they give effect to NPS-IB Clause 3.10. Please see the Panel’s recommendation report for more details.	Yes

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Respect for the submitter's expertise in this area	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S74.3 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Respect for the submitter's expertise in this area	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S74.3 above.	n/a
FS12 – The Guildford Timber Company	Oppose	GTC is opposed to that part of the submission that seeks to resolve the inherent tensions in the variation provisions, and specifically in NOSZ-P6 and NOSZ-P7, by requesting their amendment to make provision for infrastructure including a transport corridor subject to an effects management hierarchy that favours the protection of biodiversity values in the first instance. GTC is not opposed to protection of biodiversity values in Silverstream – to the contrary, GTC has undertaken its own native revegetation programme within its landholdings in the area to enhance natural values. In GTC's view, the ecological values of the Spur have not been accurately or objectively identified to date, and the submission would artificially and disproportionately inflate the importance of those values. To the extent that the relief sought in submission points S74.2 and S74.3 would conflict with GTC's own position that a reasonable and navigable consenting pathway needs to be assured for a proposed transport corridor on the Spur, GTC is accordingly opposed to that relief.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S74.3 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S74.3 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony	Support	Support to protect identified significant natural areas	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Chad		on the Silverstream Spur from development.		part submission S74.3 above.	
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S74.3 above.	n/a
S74.4 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Amelia Geary	Seek amendment	The Variation needs to include a definition of biodiversity offsetting, which includes a requirement that an offset proposed meets the principles of offsetting. These should be included in an appendix to the Plan and should be mandatory (rather than guidance).	Accept in part	The Panel agrees it would be beneficial to include a definition for biodiversity offsetting. A definition is recommended to be added to the Interpretation section of the District Plan. As biodiversity offsetting is referred to in recommended policy NOSZ-P7 the Panel considers that the implementation of NOSZ-P7 will be aided by the new definition.	Yes
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Respect for the submitter's expertise in this area.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S74.4 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Respect for the submitter's expertise in this area.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S74.4 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support inclusion of a definition of 'biodiversity offsetting'.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S74.4 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support inclusion of a definition of 'biodiversity offsetting'.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S74.4 above.	n/a
S74.5 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Amelia Geary	Oppose	Seek deletion of Controlled Activity Rule R15.	Accept	Proposed rule NOSZ-R15 is recommended for deletion as the Panel considers it would prove ineffective due to the existence of operative rules that either duplicate or override the proposed rule. These operative provisions are not within the scope of the variation and will continue to provide a rule framework for infrastructure on the site. The Panel considers there is insufficiently clear scope available within submissions to recommend amendments to the operative higher-level rules located in the TP and NU chapters of the District Plan.  The Panel considers it would be poor resource management practice to recommend the	Yes



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
				inclusion of a site-specific rule that could not be implemented in practice.  The Panel also agrees that controlled activity status is inappropriate for a rule that could conceivably result in significant adverse effects on the environment.	
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Respect for the submitter's expertise in this area.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S74.5 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Respect for the submitter's expertise in this area.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S74.5 above.	n/a
S74.6 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Amelia Geary	Support	Retain NOSZ-R22.	Accept	Rule NOSZ-R22 is recommended to be retained as notified.	No
S74.7 Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Amelia Geary	Seek amendment	As a consequence of deleting NOSZ-R15, delete NOSZ- S4.	Accept	NOSZ-R15 is recommended for deletion as a consequence of the Panel's recommendation to delete NOSZ-R15. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	Yes
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Respect for the submitter's expertise in this area.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S74.7 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Respect for the submitter's expertise in this area.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S74.7 above.	n/a
S74.8 Royal Forest and Bird	Seek amendment	Identify on the map the Significant Natural Area within the Natural Open Space Zone for Silverstream Spur. Include labelling or a key to the map.	Accept	It is recommended to clearly identify the SNA on the site with the notified extent, with an amendment to the name, and reference to the	Yes

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Amelia Geary				District Plan maps within relevant provisions so the name and location of the SNA is clear to plan users.	
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S74.8 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S74.8 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S74.8 above.	n/a
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S74.8 above.	n/a
S75.1 Polly Forrest	Support	To declare the Silverstream Spur a Natural Open Space and become a protected reserve.	Reject	A decision by Council on whether to make the Silverstream Spur site a reserve is a separate decision and process that sits outside of the RMA and Variation 1 processes.	No
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S75.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S75.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S75.1 above.	n/a
S75.2 Polly Forrest	Oppose	No road or residential development. The road must not happen.	Reject	The submission does not appear to request any specific amendments to the Variation 1 provisions. The Panel notes that recommendations are made to remove road-specific provisions from the Variation in response to other submissions for technical reasons – noting that other operative District Plan provisions for new roads will continue to apply to the site. These recommended amendments may	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
				address some of the concerns raised in the submission.	
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S75.2 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S75.2 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S75.2 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S75.2 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S75.2 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S75.2 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC’s original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S75.2 above.	n/a
FS20 – Caleb	Support	No reason stated	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Scott				submission S75.2 above.	
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S75.2 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S75.2 above.	n/a
S76.1 Kate Hunter	Oppose	That Silverstream Spur is rezoned as Natural Open Space. That the ecological values of the Spur are investigated as part of the larger conservation mosaic of the lower North Island and is given sufficient protection.	Accept in part	It is recommended to rezone the site to Natural Open Space Zone as notified. The Panel has ensured that sufficient ecological evidence exists demonstrating that the site contains a SNA. Provisions are recommended to protect the SNA on the site as required by the RPS and the NPS-IB. Any additional investigation into the ecological values on the site as part of the larger conservation mosaic of the lower North Island would require a separate decision from Council.	No
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S76.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Submitter's view that the Silverstream Spur forms part of a larger national conservation movement including public education and awareness of ecological values. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S76.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Submitter's view that the Silverstream Spur forms part of a larger national conservation movement including public education and awareness of ecological values. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S76.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		Spur from development.			
S76.2 Kate Hunter	Oppose	That a transport corridor is not approved, rather a decision is made to explore alternative access mechanisms.	Accept in part	The transport corridor-specific provisions are recommended for deletion in response to other submissions for technical reasons. Any exploration of alternative access mechanisms is not a matter that falls under the variation process. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S76.2 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S76.2 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S76.2 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S76.2 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S76.2 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S76.2 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S76.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity. Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed.			
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S76.2 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S76.2 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S76.2 above.	n/a
S77.1 Tony Chad	Support	That the Silverstream Spur be zoned Natural Open Space only in its entirety, free of any roads, infrastructure corridors, free of any housing and remain in community ownership. Seek the following actions for the Silverstream Spur:  Protect and enhance the draft SNA areas. Protect and enhance the draft SAL areas on the entire Spur. Add the Sylvan Way public reserve land to the Silverstream Spur. Stop the Kiln Street paper road. Add this land to the Silverstream Spur. Create public access via Sylvan Way similar to Ecclesfield Reserve in Pinehaven, Wi Tako Ngatata Scenic Reserve, Keith George Memorial Park. Create tracks designed for good accessibility for a range of ages and abilities. Create basic amenities (toilets, water, benches). Once Natural Open Space zone status is secured, to begin the process of designating the Silverstream Spur a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. This	Accept in part	The Panel recommends the zoning of the site is amended to Natural Open Space zone as notified. The proposed transport corridor and associated infrastructure-specific provisions are recommended for deletion in response to other submissions for technical reasons. The SNA on the site is recommended to be identified and protected as required by the RPS and the NPS-IB. The Panel does not recommend the inclusion of any SAL's on the site due to a lack of corroborating evidence and the fact that the Council has already decided not to include SALs in the District Plan.  All other requests within this submission point fall outside of the RMA and Variation 1 process. These requests would require specific decisions by Council outside of the RMA schedule 1	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		process was begun in 1992 and 2001 but not yet followed through.		process.	
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S77.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur. Stop Kiln Street paper road and add this land to the Spur Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation and customary purposes. View to the Spur being designated a reserve under the Reserve Act.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S77.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur. Stop Kiln Street paper road and add this land to the Spur Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation and customary purposes. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. View to the Spur being designated a reserve under the Reserve Act.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S77.1 above.	n/a
S77.2 Tony Chad	Oppose	That the Silverstream Spur be zoned Natural Open Space only in its entirety, free of any roads, infrastructure corridors, free of any housing and remain in community ownership.	Accept in part	The zoning of the site is recommended to be Natural Open Space as notified. The road and infrastructure-specific provisions are recommended for deletion in response to other submissions for technical reasons. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
				information. Ownership and potential future uses and development on the site are decisions for Council that fall beyond the scope of the Variation process.	
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S77.2 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S77.2 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S77.2 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S77.2 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S77.2 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S77.2 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S77.2 above.	n/a



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity. Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed.			
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S77.2 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad		Support: Submitter’s concerns around the environmental damage that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Submitter’s concerns around the lack of pre-planning by GTC, communication and lack of disclosure around their development plans. Submitter’s view that the inclusion of a road/ infrastructure corridor through the Spur is not compatible with Natural Open Space. Submitter’s view that the inclusion of a road/ infrastructure corridor through the Spur is not essential to access to the GTC land as other entrances already exist. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S77.2 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Submitter’s concerns around the environmental damage that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Submitter’s concerns around the lack of pre-planning by GTC, communication and lack of disclosure around their development plans. Submitter’s view that the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur is not compatible with Natural Open Space Submitter’s view that the inclusion of a road /infrastructure corridor through the Spur is not	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S77.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		essential to access to the GTC land as other entrances already exist. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.			
S78.1 Caleb Scott	Support	That the Silverstream Spur be rezoned as Natural Open Space for future reserve status and have no development, and be protected from future development, of any sort including roads and any kind of utilities infrastructure.	Accept in part	The zoning of the site is recommended to be Natural Open Space as notified. The road and infrastructure-specific provisions are recommended for deletion in response to other submissions for technical reasons. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more information.  Potential future uses and development on the site are decisions for Council that fall beyond the scope of the Variation process.	No
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S78.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S78.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S78.1 above.	n/a
S78.2 Caleb Scott	Oppose	To disallow any provisions allowing construction of a road/infrastructure corridor.	Accept in part	The road and infrastructure-specific provisions are recommended for deletion in response to other submissions for technical reasons. Existing plan provisions in other chapters of the Operative District Plan still provide a potential consent path for roading and other infrastructure on the site. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more information.	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S78.2 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S78.2 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S78.2 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S78.2 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S78.2 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC’s original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S78.2 above.	n/a
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S78.2 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S78.2 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S78.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
S79.1 Upper Hutt Branch of Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Barry Wards	Support	To rezone the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space as proposed in Variation 1.	Accept	It is recommended to rezone the site Natural Open Space as notified.	No
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S79.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Submitter’s view that the need for Natural Open Space in the future will increase. Submitter’s acknowledgement that significant restoration work has already been done by Forest and Bird Upper Hutt.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S79.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Submitter’s view that the need for Natural Open Space in the future will increase. Submitter’s acknowledgement that significant restoration work has already been done by Forest and Bird Upper Hutt.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S79.1 above.	n/a
S79.2 Upper Hutt Branch of Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Barry	Seek amendment	Amend policy NOSZ-P6 to remove the focus on infrastructure, remove enabling of infrastructure including a transport corridor, and to solely provide for passive activities, as suggested below: NOSZ-P6 – Silverstream Spur Natural Open Space <u>Protect and enhance the biodiversity values and passive recreation, customary and conservation opportunities within the Silverstream Spur Natural Open Space (Pt Sec 1 SO 34755, Parcel ID: 3875189).</u>	Reject	The Panel recommends that NOSZ-P6 be deleted in response to other submissions. Please see the Panel’s recommendation report for further details.	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Wards		to: Allow optimum ecological functioning; Enable appropriate activities to support achieving those values and opportunities			
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S79.2 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Protect and enhance identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Submitter’s concerns around the negative impact on local biodiversity and loss of habitat that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S79.2 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Protect and enhance identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Submitter’s concerns around the negative impact on local biodiversity and loss of habitat that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S79.2 above.	n/a
S79.3 Upper Hutt Branch of Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Barry	Seek amendment	Amend policy NOSZ-P7 to address the management of effects that may result from the provisions of the amended NOSZ-P6 above, as suggested below: NOSZ-P7 – Silverstream Spur Natural Open Space – Management of Effects Adverse effects from activities within the Silverstream Spur Natural Open Space shall: Be avoided where practicable. 2. Avoid the following adverse effects on indigenous	Accept in part	The Panel agrees that amendments are necessary to NOSZ-P7 to ensure the policy gives effect to the ‘avoid’ direction and effects management hierarchy specified by clause 3.10 of the NPS-IB. The Panel recommends amendments to achieve this, noting that different wording is recommended to that specifically requested by the submission. Please see the Panel’s recommendation report	Yes

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Wards		<p>biodiversity values:            Loss of ecosystem representation and extent;            Loss or disturbance to ecosystem functioning;            Habitat fragmentation or loss of connectivity within the open space and between other indigenous habitats and ecosystems;            The potential for indigenous species recovery or establishment, especially through the functioning of ecological corridors; and            Reduction in population size of indigenous flora and fauna.</p> <p>3. Avoid other adverse effects as far as possible, including those that may compromise all values that characterise the open space through the zoning designation.</p> <p>4. If unable to be avoided, minimise adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity values and values identified in 3 above.</p> <p>If biodiversity offsetting is not appropriate, the activities shall be avoided.</p>		for more details.	
S79.4 Upper Hutt Branch of Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Barry Wards	Seek amendment	Include a definition for 'biodiversity offsetting' in the operative Upper Hutt District Plan.	Accept in part	The Panel agrees it would be helpful to include a definition for biodiversity offsetting. A definition is recommended to be added to the Interpretation section of the District Plan that is consistent with the defined term in the NPS-IB.	Yes
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support inclusion of a definition of 'biodiversity offsetting'	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S79.2 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support inclusion of a definition of 'biodiversity offsetting'	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S79.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
S79.5 Upper Hutt Branch of Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Barry Wards	Oppose	Delete NOSZ-R15.	Accept	<p>The Panel agrees it is appropriate to delete proposed rule NOSZ-R15. The Panel notes the rule could not be implemented as intended due to the existence of higher-level operative rules in the TP and NU chapters that have not been included in the Variation and have not been identified within any submission, submitter evidence, or legal submissions. Please see the Panel report for the Panel's analysis and reasoning for reaching this position.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, the Panel considers that Controlled Activity status for a road and associated network utility infrastructure to be inappropriate and out-of-step with all other zones. If the Panel was satisfied that sufficiently clear scope existed within submissions to amend the relevant provisions in the TP chapter, the Panel would recommend amendments to rules TP-R5 (Discretionary), and TP-R5 (Non-Complying) as recommended by Ms Rushmere in her right of reply, albeit with minor amendments to reflect the structure of the operative District Plan rule table. This would make a road a Discretionary Activity on the site, and other forms of network utility infrastructure either a Discretionary or Restricted Discretionary Activity under the relevant operative rules. The Panel would then recommend the consequential deletion of NOSZ-R15, as it would needlessly duplicate provisions in the TP and NU chapters.</p>	Yes
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Road and associated network utility infrastructure, including storage tanks or reservoirs, are inappropriate activities on the Silverstream Spur	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S79.5 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Road and associated network utility infrastructure, including storage tanks or reservoirs, are	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S79.5 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		inappropriate activities on the Silverstream Spur			
S79.6 Upper Hutt Branch of Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Barry Wards	Seek amendment	Retain NOSZ-R22 but amend 'Silverstream Spur Natural Area' to 'Silverstream Spur Natural Open Space'.	Accept in part	Proposed NOSZ-R22 is recommended to be retained as a discretionary activity. The Panel recommends the SNA be renamed the 'Silverstream Spur Significant Natural Area'. The Panel also recommends that reference to 'as shown on the District Plan maps' is included to provide greater clarify for plan users.	No
S79.7 Upper Hutt Branch of Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Barry Wards	Oppose	Delete NOSZ-S4.	Accept	The Panel recommends deleting NOSZ-S4 as a consequential amendment to the recommended deletion of NOSZ-R15 and NOSZ-P6. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for further details.	Yes
S79.8 Upper Hutt Branch of Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Barry Wards	Seek amendment	Clearly identify the Significant Natural Area(s) within the Silverstream Spur Natural Open Space and adjacent to that Open Space on the map.	Accept in part	The Panel has ensured that sufficient ecology evidence is available to accurately recommend the extent of the SNA on the site. The Panel is satisfied that the level of ecological analysis on the site is sufficient to identify and protect the SNA as required by the RPS and the NPS-IB. This does not extend to areas adjacent to the site.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S79.8 above.	n/a



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S79.8 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S79.8 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S79.8 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S79.8 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity. Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S79.8 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.			
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated			
S80.1 John Campbell	Oppose	That Variation 1 be rejected, and that no road be allowed to cut through the Silverstream Reserve.	Reject	The Panel recommends that Variation 1 proceed, albeit in an amended form in response to other submissions.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S80.1 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S80.1 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S80.1 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S80.1 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S80.1 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S80.1 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support in part	Enabling any form of road/infrastructure corridor on any part of the Silverstream spur is inconsistent with UHCC’s original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and rezoning as Natural Open Space. Utilising Reynolds Bach Drive will still require the Spur to be used to gain access to the SGA and will cause the destruction of native habitat, storm water issues and many of the other issues raised by submitters. Reynolds Bach Drive is more remote from public transport meaning the SGA will be locked in as a car dependant suburb for ever. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they already own several other options for accessing and	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S80.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		providing infrastructure to the SGA. I seek the part of the submission requesting removal of any road/infrastructure provisions on the Spur be allowed. I seek the part of the submission to utilise Reynolds Bach Drive for access to the SGA be disallowed.			
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S80.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support access to GTC from Reynolds Bach Drive provided any road does not cross the Silverstream Spur at any point. Removal of provision for road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S80.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support access to GTC from Reynolds Bach Drive provided any road does not cross the Silverstream Spur at any point. Removal of provision for road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S80.1 above.	n/a
S81.1 Ros Connelly	Oppose	To remove the provision of the transport corridor.	Accept	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons in response to other submissions. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for more details.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S81.1 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S81.1 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S81.1 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S81.1 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S81.1 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter	Support	No road on a reserve	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Ross				submission S81.1 above.	
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S81.1 above.	n/a
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S81.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Submitter’s concerns around the SGA and the non-alignment with the NPS UD and UHCC IPI. Submitter’s concerns around the need to plan housing developments to mitigate the effects of accelerated climate change impacts. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S81.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Submitter’s concerns around the SGA and the non-alignment with the NPS UD and UHCC IPI. Submitter’s concerns around the need to plan housing developments to mitigate the effects of accelerated climate change impacts. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S81.1 above.	n/a
S82.1 The Guildford Timber	Seek amendment	In summary, GTC seeks that either: 1. The variation be withdrawn/rejected and PC49 continues through the schedule 1 RMA process	Accept in part	The Panel does not recommend the withdrawal of the Variation, but notes the Council may consider this in full or in part under Clause 8D of Schedule	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Company Limited		<p>without affecting the Silverstream Spur; or</p> <p>2. The variation is subject to a comprehensive redrafting to address the matters outlined in the 'overall position' section of this submission and</p> <p>3. Any alternative or consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in this submission be adopted.</p>		<p>1 of the RMA.</p> <p>The Panel has reviewed the Variation and recommends many amendments in response to other submissions, some of which may address in part the concerns raised in Submission S82.</p> <p>Potential consequential amendments that may give effect to the relief sought in the submission were canvassed in detail by the submitter's expert evidence and legal submissions presented as part of the hearing process.</p> <p>Please see the Panel's report for further details on the Panel's recommendations on the specific changes requested by submission S82.</p>	
FS4 – Pat van Berkel	Oppose	<p>The stated overall position of GTC does not recognise: the significant amenity value of the Silverstream Spur as framing the entrance/exit of Upper Hutt the Spur becoming a natural bush reserve in Silverstream that will serve the huge residential developments in St Pats (and presumably the SGA). The Spur will be a crucial link in the wildlife corridor between the Wainuiomata Mainland Island and Zealandia as the indigenous bush is restored. Therefore I oppose GTC's narrow view of the Silverstream Spur which is about efficiency and effectiveness, and ignores other important values. GTC submission lists a number of confusions over the terminology and description of significant natural areas, etc. I also found these confusing and my submission (#42) clarifies that. A key point is that the determination of SNAs is done at a point-in-time that ignores the fact that the Spur will naturally transform into a thriving, mature forest over decades.</p>	Accept in part	<p>See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.1 above.</p>	n/a
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Oppose	Not stated	Accept in part	<p>See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.1 above.</p>	n/a
FS9 – Graham	Oppose	This party has a financial interest in this plan change.	Accept in part	<p>See reasons for recommendation to accept in</p>	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Bellamy				part submission S82.1 above.	
FS10 – Save our Hills	Oppose	Strongly disagree with the submitter on all points because the Silverstream Spur is public property, whereas the proposed Southern Growth Area (i.e. the Guildford Timber Company's proposed development on the Silverstream and Pinehaven hills according to Council's Land Use Strategy 2016) is a private development. We strongly oppose this Council plan change (PC49) being used to enable a transport corridor and infrastructure through the Spur for the benefit of a private developer (GTC) against the expressed views of a large majority of the submitters on this Plan Change.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.1 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Oppose	Strongly disagree with the submitter on all points because the Silverstream Spur is public property, whereas the proposed Southern Growth Area (i.e. the Guildford Timber Company's proposed development on the Silverstream and Pinehaven hills according to Council's Land Use Strategy 2016) is a private development. We strongly oppose this Council plan change (PC49) being used to enable a transport corridor and infrastructure through the Spur for the benefit of a private developer (GTC) against the expressed views of a large majority of the submitters on this Plan Change.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.1 above.	n/a
FS14 – Duigald Myers	Oppose	I oppose the submission in its entirety. The submission appears totally biased towards access for the Southern Growth area and its ensuing development – a proposal I vehemently oppose	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.1 above.	n/a
FS16 – Forest and Bird	Oppose	We agree that Variation 1 was poorly drafted and uncertain as per Forest & Bird's original submission to Variation 1. However, we do not support the relief sought because it will not give effect to s6(c) of the RMA or policies 24 and 47 of the Regional Policy Statement for Wellington.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS18 – Peter Ross	Oppose	Against public spending to support a private company via a public change request	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.1 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Oppose	UHCC as an organization has the right to “change its mind” in regard to previous decisions or statements made. This is one of the fundamental principles of a democratically elected local government. Therefore we do not support the assertion in the submission from GTC that should be able to rely on decisions or statements made by UHCC previously on “future development of the Southern Growth Area” and/or “development of a road/infrastructure corridor across the Silverstream Spur as part of Council’s responsibility to plan for growth”. A key attribute of the negotiations between UHCC and GTC on issues relating to the Spur including the recent unsuccessful application to the Infrastructure Acceleration Fund by UHCC for a “Silverstream Infrastructure Corridor” has been the “closed doors” policy of not making any of the UHCC decisions or documents relating to these issues public. We do not support the GTC revisions proposed to the planning maps to retain the General residential zone instead of re- zoning to Natural Open Space. The intent of the plan change is to recognize the Spur as Natural Open Space available for present and future generations to enjoy and benefit from.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Oppose	Do not support: Submitter’s call to abandon PC49. It is the public will that PC49 be adopted with the inclusion of Silverstream Spur (public land) as a reserve and exclusion of any road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur. Submitter’s reference to the UHCC operative (old) DP chapter on Biodiversity when this chapter is in the middle of a major re- write to strengthen protection and restoration of local indigenous ecosystems. Submitter’s inclusion of an overwhelming and often irrelevant amount of material	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		<p>in their submission. This submitter expresses frustration at competing goals of :</p> <p>1) establishing a transport corridor and</p> <p>2) protecting SNAs and indigenous biodiversity. The simple solution is to remove all reference to a transport corridor from PC49 Variation 1.</p> <p>A transport corridor as envisaged by this submitter would destroy a valuable ecological area, even without their additional call that “provision should be made for housing development alongside a proposed road to enhance the investment in new servicing and the efficient integration of infrastructure and development.” These goals of GTC do not sit well with the Government’s vision “ To protect and, where necessary, restore the environment and its capacity to provide for the wellbeing of present and future generations.” Guildfords need to take responsibility for building houses if that’s what they want to do. Find their own access way to their own development that doesn’t involve public land / Spur / SNAs</p>			
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Oppose	<p>Do not support:</p> <p>Submitter’s call to abandon PC49. It is the public will that PC49 be adopted with the inclusion of Silverstream Spur (public land) as a reserve and exclusion of any road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur. Submitter’s reference to the UHCC operative (old) DP chapter on Biodiversity when this chapter is in the middle of a major re- write to strengthen protection and restoration of local indigenous ecosystem. Submitter’s inclusion of an overwhelming and often irrelevant amount of material in their submission</p>	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.1 above.	n/a
S82.2 The Guildford Timber Company	Seek amendment	<p>Amend the proposed zoning of the Silverstream Spur as follows:</p> <p>1. Retain the General Residential Zone over that portion of the land subject to that zoning in the</p>	Accept in part	The Panel considers that the most appropriate zoning for the site is Natural Open Space Zone as notified. The Council does not propose the use of the site for residential development, and does	Yes



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Limited		<p>Operative Plan.</p> <p>2. Accept the proposed rezoning of that portion of the land zoned Rural Hills in the operative Plan to Natural Open Space zone, provided that appropriate policies and rules are included in the variation to efficiently and effectively enable construction and operation of a new collector road and associated services between Kiln Street and the Southern Growth Area, including associated earthworks and vegetation clearance.</p> <p>NB - Alternative zoning options may also be appropriate.</p> <p>3. Consequentially delete the spatial notation labelled UH070 as shown on the proposed rezoning map.</p>		<p>not require the site for housing capacity post-IPI. Natural Open Space zoning is the best fit under the National Planning Standards Zone Framework Standard.</p> <p>The spatial extent of UH070 that is shown on adjacent land on the notified proposed zoning map is recommended to be deleted. However, the SNA on the Silverstream Spur site that is subject to the variation is recommended for retention.</p>	
FS4 – Pat van Berkel	Oppose	<p>UHCC has already declared that there will be no housing on the Silverstream Spur. Furthermore this Variation 1 proposes to rezone the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space. It is incongruous to continue to push for housing on the Spur when it is dead in the water. I do not support housing on the Spur.</p> <p>I oppose GTC's wish to retain the General Residential Zone. I oppose GTC's wish to delete UH070 off the rezoning map.</p>	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.2 above.	n/a
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Oppose	Not stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.2 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Oppose	Strongly disagree with submitter - The Silverstream Spur has never been legitimately zoned for Residential use. A previous Council acknowledged that the "Residential Conservation" zoning on the Spur was a mapping error and committed to correct it to "Scenic Reserve" but failed to follow through on that commitment - see SOH's full submission	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.2 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Oppose	Strongly disagree with submitter - The Silverstream Spur has never been legitimately zoned for	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		Residential use. A previous Council acknowledged that the "Residential Conservation" zoning on the Spur was a mapping error and committed to correct it to "Scenic Reserve" but failed to follow through on that commitment - see SOH's full submission			
FS16 – Forest and Bird	Oppose	Retention of General Residential zoning is not appropriate. NOS zoning aligns with protection and maintenance of indigenous biodiversity which have been clearly identified on Silverstream Spur. Furthermore, it is inappropriate to apply a zone for activities that are clearly contrary to protecting s6 matters over an SNA. A roading corridor is not in keeping with the intent of the NOS zone and the NPS-UD does not override s6 matters of national importance outlined in the RMA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.2 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Oppose	Spur to be marked as a reserve	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.2 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Oppose	We do not support the GTC revisions proposed to the planning maps to retain the General residential zone instead of re-zoning to Natural Open Space. The intent of the plan change is to recognize the Spur as Natural Open Space available for present and future generations to enjoy and benefit from.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.2 above.	n/a
FS22 – Martin McGlue	Oppose	I oppose this amendment in full. The entire Spur must be rezoned as natural open space. As was the intention of the council previously	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.2 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Oppose	Do not support: Submitter's desire to retain any residential zoning on the Spur and assertion that PC49.V1 reduces the effectiveness of the UHCC District plan-There is no statutory obligation to allow a road to be built in the wrong place, eg through a Natural Open Space	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.2 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Oppose	Do not support: Submitter's desire to retain any residential zoning on the Spur. Submitter's assertion that PC49.V1 reduces the effectiveness of the UHCC	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		District plan-There is no statutory obligation to allow a road to be built in the wrong place, eg through a Natural Open Space			
S82.3 The Guildford Timber Company Limited	Support in part	Amend proposed Policy NOSZ-P6 as follows (or similar): Enable infrastructure including a transport corridor within the Silverstream Spur (Pt Sec 1 SO 34755, Parcel ID: 3875189) <del>at an appropriate scale, design, and location to:</del>  provide for a range of passive recreation opportunities; <del>and</del> support for the development of the Southern Growth Area, including the construction and operation of new community water infrastructure; <del>service residential development within the Spur;</del> <del>facilitate the revegetation of retired plantation forestry with appropriate native species.</del>	Reject	NOSZ-P6 is recommended for deletion in response to other submissions as it conflicts with policies in the proposed NOSZ chapter under PC49. The Panel notes that infrastructure, including roads, are supported by policies in the relevant operative District Plan chapters TP and NU.  In addition, the Panel considers that 'enable' is not consistent with the activity status of operative District Plan rules in the TP and INF chapters for roads and infrastructure. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for further details.	No
FS4 – Pat van Berkel	Oppose	I oppose GTC's wish to include a "transport corridor within the Silverstream Spur". I oppose GTC's wish to include "service residential development within the Spur".	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.3 above.	n/a
FS5 – Heather Blissett	Oppose	With your proposal of 1600 hundred homes. The road you mention would have to be a major arterial road. PC49 has stated that each lane will not exceed 3.5 metres. However, the road design will be a two lane road which equals 7m width. Add a parking lane and an active transport lane, guttering, services such as water and power. Additionally any vegetation will have to have a clearance area. So essentially a 4 lane road with services and infrastructure and vegetation clearance. My maths would suggest that we are now talking in excess of 18 metres wide. The gradient is also to be no greater than 1:8 so a long, very wide and winding arterial road is needed. Given the	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.3 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		<p>transparency to date. My concern would be that once a road was in then the temptation to add a few more houses along the way. Even more concerning is the need to scar the land unnecessarily. The spur is a high risk slope in accordance with PC 47. Hopefully, Cyclone Gabrielle has provided some powerful learning that will save Upper Hutt City Council money by not repeating the mistakes of our neighbouring Councils. Many have suggested the Reynolds Bach entrance. This also seems very logical and efficient solution as it bypasses traffic to a quieter road and is only minutes from the main State Highway and both Silverstream and Stokes Valley shopping centres. The spur is a taonga and our previous Council had the wisdom to see her as such. You have a vision and appear to be very connected to the whenua. I have looked at the Silverstream Forest website you mention and heard you talk. I struggle to understand how pushing for a very long and very wide winding road up a high slope spur that was given reserve status in previous documents aligns with your vision. I oppose your intention to scar the spur with a road and thereby further kill the kaitiaki of the forest such as the manu māori (native birds) mokomoko (lizards) and aitanga pepeke (insect world). Confirmation that what I suspected was right in that it is further hoped that housing will be constructed along the new road. I oppose the road for this reason also because without a road there will be no possibility that houses will be constructed on the spur. If Council were to put more of their energy into allowing for off-grid tiny home communities then their obligation under the National Policy could quite easily be met by utilizing less land especially steep slopes and reducing the need to build more infrastructure of this scale which would better support climate change resilience and our sustainability strategy. The problem I believe is</p>			

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		that there are only land rates revenue from off grid tiny homes by comparison to a 200m2 home. Therefore, what drives this vision is primarily money to a few pockets. Will there be social housing provided in the Southern Growth Area and self-sustainable tiny homes. In summary. I am not opposing your vision for the Southern Growth Area but I am opposing your request to have a very long and very wide winding road up the spur with a future vision of more houses along the road. I hope that Cyclone Gabrielle has done the convincing for me in a way that maybe my words cannot.			
FS6 – Christian Woods	Oppose	I oppose the entire submission. Particularly in relation to construction of a road / infrastructure corridor on the spur. GTC do not need the spur to access their land and already own several parcels of land that would give them all the access they need for their development.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.3 above.	n/a
FS7 – Carl Leenders	Oppose	They are seeking to remove restrictions to allow development and roading that is much less fettered by the very things that most other submitters have opposed. Already the proposed road request is an "open ticket" with very vague information given! Roading through the spur is very clearly opposed by those who submitted on the topic. Why then would UHCC consider this an appropriate course of action to proceed with, much less remove restrictions to allow far less constrained development? There is clearly a vested interest by this party in submitting in support of the roading corridor.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.3 above.	n/a
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Oppose	Not stated	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.3 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Oppose	Strongly disagree with submitter's view that water infrastructure (including reservoirs?) Should be located on the publicly-owned spur to service private development on the gtc land. We also strongly	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.3 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		disagree with the submitter's Request for residential development on the spur.			
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Oppose	Strongly disagree with submitter's view that water infrastructure (including reservoirs?) Should be located on the publicly-owned spur to service private development on the gtc land. We also strongly disagree with the submitter's request for residential development on the spur.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.3 above.	n/a
FS16 – Forest and Bird	Oppose	Forest & Bird opposes the amendment sought to NOSZ-P6. We question the need to remove the pines on the Spur as they provide habitat in their own right, sheltering the natives coming up underneath and providing roosting and nesting opportunities for native birds like falcon. It is not clear what kind of scale the submitter is talking about as clear felling would have very negative environmental outcomes.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.3 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Oppose	No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.3 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Oppose	Use of Guildford Land for future reservoirs. The submitters have no objections to GTC completing commercial negotiations with Wellington Water (or other potential future water services entity) for the sale of private land for public infrastructure such as drinking water storage reservoirs. From our professional experience in this infrastructure space (Wellington Water Consultant Panel) we would confirm that no substantive “infrastructure corridor” is required for connecting pipework to and from a service reservoir. Construction and maintenance access can be via fairly rudimentary access roads not dissimilar to forestry roads given the very intermittent requirement for access to service reservoirs. Pipework can be accommodated within negotiated easements across GTC owned land. We do not support the GTC submission that an infrastructure corridor “would facilitate the removal of pines from	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.3 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		the Spur”. Recent pine removal on Spur land by UHCC and on land adjacent to the Spur (UHCC, Silverstream Retreat and Silver Stream Railway) have all be successfully completed with limited clearance for log trimming and load out. In our opinion the removal of the pines from the Spur needs to be carried out with a minimum of forestry roading to protect the recovering and established areas of significant biodiversity from damage that roads create. Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/ transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. GTC have stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.			
FS22 – Martin McGlue	Oppose	I oppose any amendments that see to able any infrastructure or any other form of development on the Spur. There is no need for the Spur to be used for private development. GTC can use their own land for this purpose	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.3 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Oppose	Do not support: Submitter’s suggestion that the SGA cannot be developed without a road/infrastructure corridor through the middle of the Spur-There are multiple alternate ways for GTC to get to their own land. Submitter’s assertion that a GTC ‘history of a long period of engagement with UHCC in relation to the SGA and the importance of the Spur’ somehow allows them to expect that they will be able to gain consent to build a road/infrastructure corridor through the middle of a regenerating SNA on the Silverstream Spur which is publicly owned land and draft Natural Open Space	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.3 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Oppose	Do not support: Submitter’s suggestion that the SGA cannot be developed without a road/infrastructure	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.3 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		corridor through the middle of the Spur-There are multiple alternate ways for GTC to get to their own land. Submitter's assertion that a GTC 'history of a long period of engagement with UHCC in relation to the SGA and the importance of the Spur' somehow allows them to expect that they will be able to gain consent to build a road/ infrastructure corridor through the middle of a regenerating SNA on the Silverstream Spur which is publicly owned land and draft Natural Open Space			
S82.4 The Guildford Timber Company Limited	Oppose	To delete proposed Policy NOSZ-P7. This policy is more appropriate to be introduced by way of comprehensive plan change relating to significant natural areas across the city. Council's evidence base does not support the Spur (or part of the Spur) being identified as a significant natural area, nor has such an area been accurately identified in the variation document. The policy does not clarify how it is intended to be applied in conjunction with the policy direction in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter in the operative District Plan, or indeed justify its necessity given that existing direction in the Plan.	Reject	NOSZ-P7 is recommended for retention and amendment in response to other submissions and to give effect to the NPS-IB. Please see Panel report for further detail.  The Panel is satisfied that sufficient ecology evidence has now been provided to demonstrate that the site contains an SNA that meets the criteria of RPS Policy 23 and Appendix 1 of the NPS-IB.  The Panel is satisfied NOSZ-P7 is justified and necessary as the existing direction in the Plan does not include an SNA on the site or provide the same level of protection than that proposed by the Variation.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Oppose	Not stated	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.4 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Oppose	Disagree with submitter	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.4 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Oppose	Disagree with submitter	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.4 above.	n/a
FS16 – Forest and Bird	Oppose	Deletion of NOSZ-P7 is unsupportable. The justification given by the submitter fails to consider UHCC's obligations under s6(c) and its requirements to give effect to the NPS-IB. UHCC has conducted an ecological survey identifying SNAs in the District. Just	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.4 above.	n/a



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		because SNAs are still draft in policy, doesn't mean they don't exist in reality and that s6 matters don't apply.			
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Oppose	Proposed Policy NOSZ-P7 should be removed from this plan change. Plans are continuously in a cycle of review and updating citywide and therefore individual plans and proposed plan changes may not concurrently be in complete agreement.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.4 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Oppose	Do not support the submitter's vexatious and petty assertions regarding the existing draft SNA on the Spur	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.4 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Oppose	Do not support the submitter's vexatious and petty assertions regarding the existing draft SNA on the Spur	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.4 above.	n/a
S82.5 The Guildford Timber Company Limited	Seek amendment	<p>Amend proposed Rule NOSZ-R15, and make consequential amendments to the Network Utility, Earthworks, Transport &amp; Parking, Ecosystems &amp; Indigenous Biodiversity, and General Residential Chapters to address the matters summarised in the reasons for the submission immediately to the left, including:</p> <p>Amend the wording of the rule description as follows (or similar):  Road and associated network utility infrastructure, including <u>any associated earthworks and vegetation clearance storage tanks or reservoirs</u> on the Silverstream Spur Natural Area (PT Sect 1 SO 34755, Parcel ID: 3875189)</p> <p>Delete clause a) requiring compliance with proposed standard NOSZ-S4.</p> <p>Amend clauses b), c) and e) to establish a more objective basis for assessment at consent stage in relation to landscaping, road alignment location &amp; design, earthworks and associated vegetation clearance.</p>	Accept in part	<p>NOSZ-R15 is recommended for deletion in response to other submissions. The Panel notes the rule could not be implemented as intended due to the existence of higher-level operative rules in the TP and NU chapters that have not been included in the Variation and have not been identified within any submission, submitter evidence, or legal submissions. Please see the Panel report for the Panel's analysis and reasoning for reaching this position.</p> <p>The Panel considers it appropriate that earthworks and vegetation clearance – other than that located within the proposed SNA on the site, be managed via the existing operative earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance provisions in the Districtwide section of the District plan.</p> <p>The Panel's 'accept in part' recommendation is a reflection that the Panel recommends the deletion of NOSZ-S4 in response to other</p>	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		<p>Delete clauses f), g) and h).</p> <p>Consequentially amend the Network Utility, Earthworks, Transport &amp; Parking, Ecosystems &amp; Indigenous Biodiversity Chapters to exclude activities subject to proposed Rule NOSZ-R15 from corresponding provisions in those chapters.</p> <p>Make any further consequential amendments to the General Residential Zone necessary to cross refer to, or duplicate proposed Rule NOSZ-R15 as relates to the portion of the Spur sought to be retained in General Residential Zone by this submission.</p> <p><i>NB – alternative drafting solutions may be appropriate for the purposes of affecting this relief.</i></p>		<p>submissions, and as a consequential deletion to the Panel’s recommendation to delete NOSZ-R15.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, the Panel considers that Controlled Activity status for a road and associated network utility infrastructure to be inappropriate and out-of-step with all other zones. If the Panel was satisfied that sufficiently clear scope existed within submissions to amend the relevant provisions in the TP chapter, the Panel would recommend amendments to rules TP-R5 (Discretionary), and TP-R5 (Non-Complying) as recommended by Ms Rushmere in her right of reply, albeit with minor amendments to reflect the structure of the operative District Plan rule table. This would make a road a Discretionary Activity on the site, and other forms of network utility infrastructure either a Discretionary or Restricted Discretionary Activity under the relevant operative rules. The Panel would then recommend the consequential deletion of NOSZ-R15, as it would needlessly duplicate provisions in the TP and NU chapters.</p>	
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Oppose	Not stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.5 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Oppose	We want the provision of "Road and associated network utility infrastructure, including storage tanks or reservoirs on the Silverstream Spur" removed from this Plan Change.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.5 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Oppose	We want the provision of "Road and associated network utility infrastructure, including storage tanks or reservoirs on the Silverstream Spur" removed from this Plan Change.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.5 above.	n/a
FS16 – Forest	Oppose	The SNA on Silverstream Spur does span the width of	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
and Bird		the land. Compliance with the controlled activity standards under proposed NOSZ-S4 is not possible and the enabling direction of NOSZ-P6 will not be implemented. Given UHCC's s6 obligations, we refer to Forest & Bird's original submission as to why the enabling direction is not appropriate and why providing for a roading corridor does not meet council's obligations under the RM.		part submission S82.5 above.	
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Oppose	Plans are continuously in a cycle of review and updating citywide and therefore individual plans and proposed plan changes may not concurrently be in complete agreement.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.5 above.	n/a
S82.6 The Guildford Timber Company Limited	Oppose	Delete proposed Rule NOSZ-R22. Council's evidence base does not support the Spur (or part of the Spur) being identified as a significant natural area, nor has such an area been accurately identified in the variation document. The rule does not clarify how it is intended to be applied in conjunction with the rules in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter in the operative District Plan, or indeed justify its necessity given that existing regulatory approach in the Plan.	Reject	NOSZ-R22 is recommended for retention with amendments in response to other submissions and to give effect to the NPS-IB. Please see the Panel's report for further details. The Panel is satisfied that sufficient ecology evidence has now been provided to demonstrate that the site contains an SNA that meets the criteria of RPS Policy 23 and Appendix 1 of the NPS-IB. The Panel is satisfied NOSZ-R22 is justified and necessary as the existing rules in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter in the operative District Plan does not include an SNA on the site or provide the same level of protection as that proposed by the NOSZ-R22. The Panel considers that NOSZ-R22 is required to give effect to RPS Policy 24 and the NPS-IB.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Oppose	Not stated	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.6 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Oppose	Disagree with submitter	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.6 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Oppose	Disagree with submitter	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.6 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS16 – Forest and Bird	Oppose	Deletion of NOSZ-R22 is not supported. The justification given by the submitter fails to consider UHCC’s obligations under s6(c) and its requirements to give effect to the NPS-IB. UHCC has conducted an ecological survey identifying SNAs in the District. Just because SNAs are still draft in policy, doesn’t mean they don’t exist in reality and that s6 matters don’t apply.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.6 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Oppose	No reason stated	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S82.6 above.	n/a
S82.7 The Guildford Timber Company Limited	Oppose	Delete proposed standard NOSZ-S4. The proposed road design clauses (1-4) are unnecessary, and unjustified in the Council’s Section 32 Report – such matters can be addressed through matters of control on the new road. Council’s evidence base does not support the Spur (or part of the Spur) being identified as a natural area, nor has such an area been accurately identified in the variation document. Clause 5 under the standard is untenable – that roading and earthworks are subject to this control and no other network utility infrastructure enabled under proposed Rule R15 is (sic)	Accept in part	The Panel recommends deleting NOSZ-S4 in response to other submissions, and as a consequential deletion to the Panel’s recommendation to delete NOSZ-R15. Please see the Panel’s report for further details. The Panel is satisfied that sufficient ecology evidence has now been provided to demonstrate that the site contains an SNA that meets the criteria of RPS Policy 23 and Appendix 1 of the NPS-IB.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Oppose	Not stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.7 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support in part	Generally agree with submitter on this point but disagree with any proposal to put a transport corridor and urban Infrastructure on or through the spur, so any proposed Standards for such should be irrelevant to this plan change. However, standards for public pedestrian and cycle access to The spur for recreational use should be included in this plan Change	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.7 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support in part	Generally agree with submitter on this point but disagree with any proposal to put a transport corridor and urban Infrastructure on or through the spur, so any proposed Standards for such should be irrelevant to this plan change. However, standards for public pedestrian and cycle access to The spur for recreational use should be included in this plan Change	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.7 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Oppose	The developer seems to believe it is a planning department at a local authority and is battering UHCC with RMA legalese in order to further its own financial interests. The developer does not need the Spur to access the SGA. The developer could simply build a road up to the SGA on land which it already owns, which has direct access to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.7 above.	n/a
FS16 – Forest and Bird	Support in part/ oppose in part	As per Forest & Bird’s submission on Variation 1, we support deletion of NOSZ-S4 as a consequence of deleting NOSZ-R15. We would not support deletion of one without the other, however. See our original submission for justification. Seek submission point be allowed subject to Forest & Bird’s original submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.7 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Oppose	The submitter that asserts that the Spur (or parts of the Spur) does not meet thresholds to be considered as a Significant Natural Area. There is an abundance of comment by submitters with technical ecology backgrounds that describe the vegetation on the Spur “developing into a native vegetation understorey” For example Submission 80 from John Campbell. This submitter advised that the changes to the native vegetation understorey were occurring fastest in the “Shaded slopes in gully areas”. For “native” read “indigenous” vegetation. By way of example the adjacent Keith George Memorial Park is a clear example to both professionally ecology trained and non-professional ecologists of what the Spur could	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.7 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		become from its present condition. Why does the Spur have to be already at the level of indigenous vegetation as Keith George Memorial Park to be considered a Significant Natural Area?			
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Oppose	No reason stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S82.7 above.	n/a
S83.1 Pam Hurly	Support	To rezone the Spur to Natural Open Space and protecting the Significant Natural Areas on the Spur from development.	Accept in part	The site is recommended to be rezoned to Natural Open Space as notified. Provisions are recommended to identify and protect the SNA identified on the site as required by the RPS and the NPS-IB. Development may still be possible within the SNA, but the recommended policy direction specifies the adverse effects that must be avoided.	No
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S83.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	DO support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S83.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	DO support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S83.1 above.	n/a
S83.2 Pam Hurly	Oppose	To withdraw any intention to establish a transport corridor.	Accept in part	The site-specific transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons in response to other submissions. However, existing operative provisions in other chapters of the District Plan will continue to provide a potential consenting path for infrastructure including a road on the site.	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S83.2 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S83.2 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S83.2 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S83.2 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S83.2 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S83.2 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity. Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S83.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.			
S84.1 Wayne Dolden	Oppose	To remove the provision of a road on any part of the Silverstream Spur.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons in response to other submissions. Existing operative provisions in other chapters of the District Plan will continue to provide a potential consenting path for infrastructure including a road on the site.	No
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S84.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	DO NOT Support: Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S84.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	DO NOT Support: Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S84.1 above.	n/a
S84.2 Wayne Dolden	Support	For the Silverstream Spur to remain as previously intended as a reserve and zoned as Natural Open Space.	Accept in part	It is recommended to rezone the Silverstream Spur site to Natural Open Space as notified. The reserve status of the site would require a non-RMA decision and process by the Council.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S84.2 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S84.2 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S84.2 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S84.2 above.	n/a



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S84.2 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S84.2 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC’s original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S84.2 above.	n/a
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S84.2 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	DO support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space, retain as a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S84.2 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	DO support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space, retain as a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S84.2 above.	n/a
S85.1 D Garland5	Oppose	To remove the provision to enable site specific provisions for infrastructure including a transport corridor wholly, and to preclude any possible transport corridors from being built on the	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons in response to other	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		Silverstream Spur.		submissions. However, the existing operative provisions in other chapters of the District Plan will continue to provide a potential consenting path for infrastructure including a road on the site.	
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S85.1 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S85.1 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S85.1 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S85.1 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S85.1 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve. No road on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S85.1 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S85.1 above.	n/a
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S85.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space/reserve as it was originally intended. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Submitter’s gratitude that UHCC is finally working toward realising the Spur as Natural Open Space as	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S85.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		per original designation. Submitter's assertion that there is no need for a road through the Spur as there are multiple alternative access points to the GTC land. Submitter's concern over the negative ecological impacts that a road/infrastructure corridor will have on the Spur. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.			
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space/reserve as it was originally intended. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. Submitter's gratitude that UHCC is finally working toward realising the Spur as Natural Open Space as per original designation. Submitter's assertion that there is no need for a road through the Spur as there are multiple alternative access points to the GTC land. Submitter's concern over the negative ecological impacts that a road/infrastructure corridor will have on the Spur. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S85.1 above.	n/a
S86.1 Simon Edmonds	Support	To zone the entire Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space with no exceptions or exclusions to this zoning on any part of the land area. At the conclusion of the Plan Change 49 process, Upper Hutt City Council commence the process to designate the entire Silverstream Spur as a reserve in accordance with the process outlined in the Reserves Act 1977, with the result being that the entire Spur becomes a reserve in perpetuity.	Accept in part	It is recommended to rezone the Silverstream Spur site to Natural Open Space as notified. The reserve status of the site would require a non-RMA decision and process by the Council.	No
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S86.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S86.1 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S86.1 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S86.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space/reserve as it was originally intended. Submitter's desire for UHCC to begin the process to formalise the Spur as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. Submitter's indication that having the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space will provide a needed buffer for the Silverstream Railway.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S86.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space/reserve as it was originally intended. Submitter's desire for UHCC to begin the process to formalise the Spur as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. Submitter's indication that having the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space will provide a needed buffer for the Silverstream Railway.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S86.1 above.	n/a
S86.2 Simon Edmonds	Oppose	To remove all provisions for a road/transport and/or network utility infrastructure corridor on any part of the Silverstream Spur.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons. The proposed transport	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
				corridor and associated infrastructure provisions would prove ineffective due to the existence of operative rules that either duplicate or override the proposed provisions. These operative provisions are not within the scope of the variation and will continue to provide a rule framework for infrastructure on the site	
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S86.2 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S86.2 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S86.2 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S86.2 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S86.2 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Submitter’s concern over the negative ecological impacts that a road/infrastructure corridor will have on the Spur. Submitter’s assertion that a road through the middle of the Spur is not required for access to a recreational reserve. Submitter’s assertion that a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur would be destructive and not compatible with it being a Natural Open Space. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S86.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Submitter’s concern over the negative ecological impacts that a road/infrastructure corridor will have on the Spur. Submitter’s assertion that a road through the middle of the Spur is not required for access to a recreational reserve. Submitter’s assertion that a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur would be destructive and not compatible with it being a Natural Open Space. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S86.2 above.	n/a
S86.3 Simon Edmonds	Seek amendment	To review and correct errors and short comings with the Significant Natural Areas identified in Appendix 3 figure 5 of the PC49 Section 32 report and undertake to ensure all these areas are incorporated in to the Silverstream Spur Significant Natural Area overlay. The definition of the extents of current SNA areas on the Spur should not limit the areas so tightly to preclude adjacent areas that are currently transitioning to this ecological classification. It is now clear that regeneration is occurring rapidly, and the boundaries of the SNA areas are generally expanding over time from inside the gullies and over the remaining Spur topography.	Accept in part	The Panel has ensured that sufficient ecology evidence is available to accurately recommend the extent of the SNA on the site. The Panel is satisfied that the level of ecological analysis on the site is sufficient to identify and protect the SNA as required by the RPS and the NPS-IB.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S86.3 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S86.3 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S86.3 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Protection of the identified SNA’s is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S86.3 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity.			
S86.4 Simon Edmonds	Seek amendment	To formally put together a group of interested parties to oversee a future for the Spur that is sympathetic to its neighbours and allows the Spur to continue to mature into an outstanding ecological asset for Upper Hutt.	Reject	The decision requested by the submission falls outside of the RMA and variation processes.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S86.4 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S86.4 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S86.4 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	SSR are about to approach UHCC in regards to a stand of hazardous pine trees, the removal of which will allow a area of the Spur to be restored back to native vegetation with the help of community groups with no commercial interest in the land.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S86.4 above.	n/a
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S86.4 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	DO support: Submitter’s call to put together a reference group to plan for the future of the Silverstream Spur.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S86.4 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	DO support: Submitter’s call to put together a reference group to plan for the future of the Silverstream Spur.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S86.4 above.	n/a
S87.1 David Grant-Taylor	Seek amendment	To define the entire Spur as green reserve and ensure that the entire Spur is defined as a reserve, or at the very least ensure that the Significant Natural Area is both contiguous and much larger based on accurate surveys of biota.	Accept in part	The Panel has ensured that sufficient ecology evidence exists to justify the inclusion of all areas of indigenous vegetation that meet the criteria of the RPS and the NPS-IB to be a SNA. Reserve status requires a separate non-RMA process and decisions by Council.	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S87.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space/reserve as it was originally intended. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development and ensure that mapping includes the total extent.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S87.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space/reserve as it was originally intended. Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development and ensure that mapping includes the total extent.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S87.1 above.	n/a
S87.2 David Grant-Taylor	Oppose	To remove provision for roading and provision for access to the Southern Growth Area.	Accept	These provisions are recommended for deletion in response to other submissions. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for details.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S87.2 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S87.2 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S87.2 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S87.2 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S87.2 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S87.2 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S87.2 above.	n/a



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity. Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.			
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S87.2 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	DO support: Submitter’s concern over funding of a potential developer’s road DO NOT Support: Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S87.2 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	DO support: Submitter’s concern over funding of a potential developer’s road. DO NOT Support: Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S87.2 above.	n/a
S88.1 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	To zone the entire Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space.	Accept	It is recommended to rezone the site to Natural Open Space Zone as notified.	No
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter and petition.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S88.1 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter and petition.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S88.1 above.	n/a
FS15 – Fraser	Support	We should be making efforts to protect Silverstream	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Robertson		spur and it's ecosystem, wildlife along with its assets such Silver Stream Railway for future generations. Considering the developer has mentioned the spur is not needed for the development (document included with original submission), there are other options that can be explored. Zoning the Spur as a reserve as originally intended for the purchase of the land (documented included with original submission). Will protect the spur for future generations and in line with the UHCC strategy goals, the original intention for the purchase of the land and the right thing to do		submission S88.1 above.	
FS16 - Forest and Bird	Support	Zoning Silverstream Spur as NOS would meet UHCC's obligations under the Emissions Reduction Plan and s7(i) of the RMA.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S88.1 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Per the petition.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S88.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space/reserve as it was originally intended.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S88.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space/reserve as it was originally intended.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S88.1 above.	n/a
S88.2 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Oppose	To remove any and all provisions for a road/transport and/or network utility infrastructure corridor on any part of the Silverstream Spur.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion due to technical reasons. The proposed transport corridor and associated infrastructure provisions would prove ineffective due to the existence of operative rules that either duplicate or override the proposed provisions. These operative provisions are not within the scope of the variation and will continue to provide a rule framework for infrastructure on the site	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS7 – Christian Woods	Support	I support the entire submission. GTC do not need the spur to access their land and already own several parcels of land that would give them all the access they need for their development.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S88.2 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S88.2 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S88.2 above.	n/a
FS16 – Forest and Bird	Support	Forest & Bird agrees that Variation 1 failed to consider alternatives to access the Southern Growth Area and by the enabling policy of the variation agrees that the likely effects of any development on the Spur will be a reduction in the absorption of rainfall within the catchments with changes to the extent of vegetation cover and the concentration of flows. The issue for the submitter is both peak flow rates and any increase in the total quantity or duration of storm water flows from catchments affecting the railway from the construction of large, paved areas such as a road and the removal of vegetation to cater for network utility infrastructure. This is out of step with national policy direction, particularly Policy 3 of the NPS-FM.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S88.2 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S88.2 above.	n/a
FS21 – June Harwood	Support	I oppose any development or transport corridor. Leave it as it is. A natural environment.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S88.2 above.	n/a
FS22 – Martin McGlue	Support	I oppose the Spur being used for anything other than natural space. I support SSR’s submission which seeks to ensure it can continue to function without threat from excess stormwater from a major road. The Spur was always intended as an open space for all as is evidenced by the large amount of supporting documents in this submission	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S88.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Submitter’s assertion that a road/ infrastructure corridor through the Spur would be destructive and not compatible with it being a Natural Open Space. Submitter’s assertion that there is no need for a road through the Spur as there are multiple alternative access points to the GTC land. Submitter’s concern that a proposed road/ infrastructure corridor through the Spur would damage Silverstream Railway’s ability to operate. Submitter’s concerns over reverse sensitivity and complaints if a road/infrastructure corridor is permitted through the Spur. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S88.2 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Submitter’s assertion that a road /infrastructure corridor through the Spur would be destructive and not compatible with it being a Natural Open Space. Submitter’s assertion that there is no need for a road through the Spur as there are multiple alternative access points to the GTC land. Submitter’s concern that a proposed road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur would damage Silverstream Railway’s ability to operate. Submitter’s concerns over reverse sensitivity and complaints if a road/ infrastructure corridor is permitted through the Spur. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S88.2 above.	n/a
S88.3 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Seek amendment	At the conclusion of the Plan Change 49 process undertake to designate the entire Silverstream Spur as a Reserve in accordance with the process outlined in the Reserves Act 1977, with the result being that the entire Spur becomes a reserve in perpetuity.	Reject	The request falls beyond the RMA and variation processes.	No
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S88.3 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S88.3 above.	n/a
FS16 – Forest and Bird	Support	Protecting the Spur as a reserve under the Reserves Act would be appropriate in light of the original intention of the purchase of the land.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S88.3 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support submitter’s desire for UHCC to begin the process to formalise the Spur as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S88.3 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support submitter’s desire for UHCC to begin the process to formalise the Spur as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S88.3 above.	n/a
S88.4 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Seek amendment	To correct errors and short comings with the Significant Natural Areas identified in Appendix 3 figure 5 of the PC49 Section 32 report and undertake to ensure all of these areas are incorporated in to the Silverstream Spur Significant Natural Area overlay.	Accept in part	The Panel has ensured that sufficient ecology evidence exists to justify the extent of the SNA identified on the site. All areas considered to meet the RPS and NPS-IB criteria for inclusion as an SNA have been included within the proposed SNA. Please see the Panel’s recommendation report for additional detail.	No
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter. SEE ALSO SOH FULL SUBMISSION – APPENDIX 2 - REVIEW OF Boffa Miskell ecological assessment by Forestry Ecologist John Campbell.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S88.4 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter. SEE ALSO SOH FULL SUBMISSION – APPENDIX 2 - REVIEW OF Boffa Miskell ecological assessment by Forestry Ecologist John Campbell.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S88.4 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support to protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development and ensure that mapping includes the total extent including the streams.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S88.4 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development and ensure that mapping includes the total extent	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S88.4 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		including the streams.			
S88.5 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Seek amendment	To introduce a Special Amenity Landscape overlay on the entire site as the Spur meets the definition by being distinctive, widely recognised and highly valued where part of the site is dominated by natural components and part is an exceptional landscape area that has been modified by human activity. The Spur also has several shared and recognised values.	Reject	Council has already made a decision not to include special amenity landscapes in the District Plan. The Panel does not recommend changes to decisions the Council has already made. The Panel also notes it has no evidence upon which the Panel could consider special amenity landscapes.	No
FS12 – The Guildford Timber Company	Oppose	GTC is opposed to the relief sought in the submission, which would involve the imposition of a Special Amenity Landscape overlay over the Silverstream Spur. GTC does not consider that there is any evidential or technical basis for the imposition of such an overlay.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S88.5 above.	n/a
FS16 – Forest and Bird	Support	Including Silverstream Spur as a Special Amenity Landscape would be consistent with UHCC's obligations under s7(c) of the RMA.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S88.5 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	DO support: Submitter's call for the Silverstream Spur to be designated a SAL (Special Amenity Landscape)	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S88.5 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	DO support: Submitter's call for the Silverstream Spur to be designated a SAL (Special Amenity Landscape)	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S88.5 above.	n/a
S88.6 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Seek amendment	To formally put together a stewardship group of interested parties to oversee a future for the Spur that is sympathetic to its neighbours and allows the Spur to continue to mature into an outstanding ecological asset for Upper Hutt. One condition of this group would be that any involvement must be on the basis of having no commercial interest in the Spur or desire for potential financial gain from the site.	Reject	The submission does not request any decision on the variation and falls beyond the RMA and variation process.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S88.6 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S88.6 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S88.6 above.	n/a
FS16 – Forest and Bird	Support	Forest & Bird would be interested in being part of a stewardship group.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S88.6 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	No reasons given. Original submission is their own.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S88.6 above.	n/a
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S88.6 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	DO support: Submitter’s call to put together a stewardship group to plan for the future and ongoing protection of the Silverstream Spur.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S88.6 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	DO support: Submitter’s call to put together a stewardship group to plan for the future and ongoing protection of the Silverstream Spur.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S88.6 above.	n/a
S89.1 Lisa Marshall	Support	To rezone the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space, leading towards the Reserves Act process.	Accept in part	It is recommended to rezone the site to Natural Open Space Zone as notified. Any decision by Council to make the site a reserve under the Reserves Act would require a separate process and decision by Council that sits outside of the RMA.	No
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S89.1 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC’s original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S89.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.			
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space with the intention of designating it reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. Protect identified significant natural areas and biodiversity on the Silverstream Spur from development and restore indigenous biodiversity.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S89.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space with the intention of designating it reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. Protect identified significant natural areas and biodiversity on the Silverstream Spur from development and restore indigenous biodiversity.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S89.1 above.	n/a
S89.2 Lisa Marshall	Oppose	To investigate alternative opportunities for transport corridor access to the Southern Growth Area.	Reject	The request falls beyond the scope of the variation.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S89.2 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S89.2 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S89.2 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S89.2 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S89.2 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S89.2 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream	Support in part	Enabling any form of road/infrastructure corridor on any part of the Silverstream spur is inconsistent with	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S89.2 above.	n/a



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Railway Incorporated		UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and rezoning as Natural Open Space. Utilising Reynolds Bach Drive will still require the Spur to be used to gain access to the SGA and will cause the destruction of native habitat, storm water issues and many of the other issues raised by submitters. Reynolds Bach Drive is more remote from public transport meaning the SGA will be locked in as a car dependant suburb for ever. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they already own several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA. I seek the part of the submission requesting removal of any road/infrastructure provisions on the Spur be allowed. I seek the part of the submission to utilise Reynolds Bach Drive for access to the SGA be disallowed.			
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support access to GTC from Reynolds Bach Drive provided any road does not cross the Silverstream Spur at any point. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S89.2 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support access to GTC from Reynolds Bach Drive provided any road does not cross the Silverstream Spur at any point. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S89.2 above.	n/a
S90.1 Rhys Lloyd	Support	To rezone the Spur as Natural Open Space.	Accept	It is recommended to rezone the site to Natural Open Space Zone as notified.	No
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S90.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S90.1 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S90.1 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC’s original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S90.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space with the intention of designating it reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S90.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space with the intention of designating it reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S90.1 above.	n/a
S90.2 Rhys Lloyd	Oppose	To remove the provisions seeking to allow a road/infrastructure corridor to be constructed on any part of the Spur.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion in response to other submissions due to technical reasons. The proposed transport corridor and associated infrastructure provisions would prove ineffective due to the existence of operative rules that either duplicate or override the proposed provisions. These operative provisions are not within the scope of the variation and will continue to provide a rule framework for infrastructure on the site. Operative rules in the District Plan will	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
				continue to provide a potential consent pathway for a road and other infrastructure on the site.	
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S90.2 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S90.2 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S90.2 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S90.2 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S90.2 above.	n/a
FS24 - Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S90.2 above.	n/a
S90.3 Rhys Lloyd	Seek amendment	To undertake a detailed assessment of native vegetation on the Spur to include all areas appropriate in the SNA.	Accept in part	The Panel has ensured that sufficient ecology evidence is available to accurately recommend the extent of the SNA on the site. The Panel is satisfied that the level of ecological analysis on the site is sufficient to identify and protect the SNA as required by the RPS and the NPS-IB.	No
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S90.3 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S90.3 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver	Support	Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Stream Railway Incorporated		ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity.		part submission S90.3 above.	
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support to identify and protect significant natural areas and biodiversity on the Silverstream Spur from development and ensure that mapping includes the total extent.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S90.3 above.	n/a
Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to identify and protect significant natural areas and biodiversity on the Silverstream Spur from development and ensure that mapping includes the total extent.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S90.3 above.	n/a
S90.4 Rhys Lloyd	Seek amendment	Introduce a Special Amenity Landscape overlay on the entire Spur.	Reject	Council has already made a decision not to include special amenity landscapes in the District Plan. The Panel does not recommend changes to decisions the Council has already made. The Panel also notes it has no evidence available to it upon which it could consider special amenity landscapes.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S90.4 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S90.4 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S90.4 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	The Spur easily meets the threshold as a SAL area, this overlay should be added to the zoning change and SNA's.	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S90.4 above.	n/a
FS20 – Caleb	Support	No reason stated	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Scott				submission S90.4 above.	
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support submitter's call for the Silverstream Spur to be designated a SAL (Special Amenity Landscape)	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S90.4 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support submitter's call for the Silverstream Spur to be designated a SAL (Special Amenity Landscape)	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S90.4 above.	n/a
S91.1 Save our Hills (Upper Hutt) Incorporated	Support with amendment	To rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space for the entire Spur. Then complete the process of officially making the entire 35ha Silverstream Spur a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.	Accept in part	It is recommended to rezone the site to Natural Opens Space as notified. Making the site a reserve under the Reserves Act would require a separate process and decision from Council that sits outside of the RMA.	No
FS2 – Beatrice McCaul	Support	I support the rezoning of the Spur as "Natural Open Space".	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.1 above.	n/a
FS3 – Shirley Anne Taylor	Support	As outlined in the Save our Hills submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.1 above.	n/a
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.1 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.1 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. SSR share SOH's concerns about the lack of documentation that supports a legitimate change of zoning to the apparent current zoning. UHCC have despite several requests have not produced any supporting evidence	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		to their claim that "the spur was rezoned in the mid 90"s" This lack of transparency likely indicates that the process was not completed correctly.			
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space with the intention of designating it reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space with the intention of designating it reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.1 above.	n/a
S91.2 Save our Hills (Upper Hutt) Incorporated	Support with amendment	To protect the identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development and protect the remainder of the entire 35ha of Silverstream Spur from development. Regenerate the entire Spur with native plants and bush.	Accept in part	It is recommended to include provisions to identify and protect the SNA on the site in accordance with the RPS and the NPS-IB. Provisions are limited to the extent of the SNA as notified. The Panel does not recommend extending the SNA to the entire site as there is no ecological evidence to support this.	No
FS3 – Shirley Anne Taylor	Support	As outlined in the Save our Hills submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.2 above.	n/a
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.2 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.2 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Protection of the identified SNA's is critical to the ecology of the Spur, but their needs to be greater clarity of these areas, especially considering the mix up in the Section 32 report, with 2 different areas identified as meeting the threshold but only one of the areas making it to the overall map. UHCC needs to continue to work with interested stake holders that do not have a commercial interest in the land to better identify and enhance these areas in perpetuity.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.2 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony	Support	Support: Identify and protect significant natural areas	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Chad		and biodiversity on the Silverstream Spur from development and ensure that mapping is accurate and includes the total extent. Submitter's call to remove the exotic vegetation and replant with indigenous vegetation to support flora and fauna corridors, carried out in a planned manner in the best interests of the regenerating indigenous biodiversity.		part submission S91.2 above.	
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Identify and protect significant natural areas and biodiversity on the Silverstream Spur from development and ensure that mapping is accurate and includes the total extent. Submitter's call to remove the exotic vegetation and replant with indigenous vegetation to support flora and fauna corridors, carried out in a planned manner in the best interests of the regenerating indigenous biodiversity.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.2 above.	n/a
S91.3 Save our Hills (Upper Hutt) Incorporated	Oppose	Do not enable site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor, through the Silverstream Spur. Do not provide potential future access to the Southern Growth Area (Guildford Timber Company private development) through the Silverstream Spur in this Public Plan Change 49 Variation 1. Any access for opening up the proposed Guildford Timber Company land for development should be via a Private Plan Change.	Accept in part	The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor and associated network utility infrastructure are recommended for deletion in response to other submissions due to technical reasons. The proposed transport corridor and associated infrastructure provisions would prove ineffective due to the existence of operative rules that either duplicate or override the proposed provisions. These operative provisions are not within the scope of the variation but will continue to provide a rule framework for infrastructure on the site. This could include a transport corridor through the site.	No
FS2 – Beatrice McCaul	Support	Environmental and safety issues. The road proposed is the first step for upcoming building residential properties along Pinehaven hills which I highly oppose.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.3 above.	n/a
FS3 – Shirley Anne Taylor	Support	As outlined in the Save our Hills submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.3 above.	n/a
FS8 – Helen	Support	Agree with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Chapman				part submission S91.3 above.	
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.3 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.3 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support Submitter’s concerns over the lack of information, detail, feasibility study around the GTC proposal for a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.3 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support Submitter’s concerns over the lack of information, detail, feasibility study around the GTC proposal for a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur. Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.3 above.	n/a
S91.4 Save our Hills (Upper Hutt) Incorporated	Seek amendment	Do provide pedestrian and cycling access to and through the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.	Accept in part	The proposed PC49 provisions provide for these activities. The PC49 provisions will apply once the site is rezoned to Natural Open Space Zone as proposed by Variation 1. No specific changes to Variation 1 provisions are requested.	No
FS3 – Shirley Anne Taylor	support	As outlined in the Save our Hills submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.4 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.4 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.4 above.	n/a



Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.4 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.4 above.	n/a
FS14 – Duigald Myers	Support	Submission supported in total. I agree in total with the reasoning.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.4 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.4 above.	n/a
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.4 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation and customary purposes	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.4 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation and customary purposes.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S91.4 above.	n/a
S92.1 Rachel Stuart	Support	That the Silverstream Spur be rezoned as Natural Open Space. To designate the Spur as a reserve (Reserves Act 1977).	Accept in part	It is recommended to rezone the site to Natural Open Space zone as notified. It would require a separate non-RMA process and decision from Council to have the site become a reserve under the Reserves Act.	No
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S92.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S92.1 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		Natural Open Space with the intention of designating it reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. Identify and protect significant natural areas and biodiversity on the Silverstream Spur from development and ensure that mapping is accurate and includes the total extent. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation and customary purposes.			
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space with the intention of designating it reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. Identify and protect significant natural areas and biodiversity on the Silverstream Spur from development and ensure that mapping is accurate and includes the total extent. Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation and customary purposes.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S92.1 above.	n/a
S92.2 Rachel Stuart	Oppose	That the Silverstream Spur remains exclusively Natural Open Space, with no transport corridor (now or in the future).	Accept in part	It is recommended to rezone the site to Natural Open Space zone as notified. The site-specific provisions for a transport corridor are recommended to be deleted in response to other submissions. Please see the Panel’s recommendation report for more detail. The Variation cannot prevent a potential future transport corridor on the site. Existing operative District Plan provisions within other chapters provide rules and standards for potential new roads and other network utility infrastructure.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S92.2 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S92.2 above.	n/a
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S92.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S92.2 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S92.2 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S92.2 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC's original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S92.2 above.	n/a
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S92.2 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur ("Now or in the future"). Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S92.2 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur ("Now or in the future"). Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S92.2 above.	n/a
S93.1 (late) Ngāti Toa	Support	We do support this area to be rezoned and considered as Natural Open Space to strengthen its importance to Tangata Whenua and iwi in the area.	Accept	It is recommended to rezone the site to Natural Open Space as notified.	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Rangitira					
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S93.1 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S93.1 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support in part	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC’s original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. I seek that this part of the submission be allowed.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S93.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Submitter’s intention to protect cultural, ecological and environmental values in the District Plan from inappropriate subdivision and development.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S93.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Submitter’s intention to protect cultural, ecological and environmental values in the District Plan from inappropriate subdivision and development.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S93.1 above.	n/a
S93.2 (Late) Ngāti Toa Rangitira	Seek amendment	The proposal for this variation includes the protection of identified Significant Natural Areas on Silverstream Spur from development. We ask that identifying sites and areas of significance to Māori is made a priority so that they are protected from development in the	Accept in part	The Panel does not recommend any changes to the variation provisions in response to this submission. However, the Panel understands that the Council and the submitter are working collaboratively towards addressing SASMs as	No

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
		Silverstream Spur.		part of the District Plan rolling review	
S93.3 (Late) Ngāti Toa Rangitira	Seek amendment	Request the addition of NOSZ-R22 which makes the removal of indigenous vegetation a discretionary activity.	Accept	Rule NOSZ-R22 is recommended to be retained as notified.	No
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support submitter’s request to add NOSZ-22 to further protect indigenous vegetation	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S93.3 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support submitter’s request to add NOSZ-22 to further protect indigenous vegetation	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S93.3 above.	n/a
S93.4 (Late) Ngāti Toa Rangitira	Seek amendment	The plan variation mentions enabling access for customary activities however, there are not any meaningful provisions for customary activities.	Accept in part	No specific amendments are requested by the submission. The Panel understands that the collaborative work between the submitter and the Council referred to in the submission is already underway as part of the District Plan rolling review process.	No
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support Submitter’s willingness and interest in working with UHCC to create provisions for including Māori customary rights and activities and their implementation on the Spur	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S93.4 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support Submitter’s willingness and interest in working with UHCC to create provisions for including Māori customary rights and activities and their implementation on the Spur	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S93.4 above.	n/a
S93.5 (Late) Ngāti Toa Rangitira	Seek amendment	The Open Space Strategy Objectives do not mention the protection of indigenous vegetation or Māori rights and cultural traditions associated with this Plan Variation.	Reject	The submission does not request anything specific with respect to Variation 1 provisions.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S93.5 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject submission S93.5 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Reject	See reasons for recommendation to reject	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Stuart				submission S93.5 above.	
S94.1 (Late) Jennifer Ann Dolton	Support	The Council to rezone and protect the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space and to protect any identified Significant Natural Areas.	Accept	The Panel recommends the part of the Silverstream Spur affected by Variation 1 is rezoned to Natural Open Space Zone as notified. The Panel recommends the identified SNA on the site be identified and protected to give effect to the RPS and the NPS-IB. Please see the Panel's recommendation report for additional detail.	No
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	Spur to be a reserve	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S94.1 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas and biodiversity on the Silverstream Spur from development and restore indigenous biodiversity.	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S94.1 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor	Support	Support: Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Protect identified significant natural areas and biodiversity on the Silverstream Spur from development and restore indigenous biodiversity	Accept	See reasons for recommendation to accept submission S94.1 above.	n/a
S94.2 (Late) Jennifer Ann Dolton	Oppose	The Council to delete all reference to roads, infrastructure, and anything else that may damage the Natural Open Space.	Accept in part	The recommended provisions remove the proposed site-specific infrastructure provisions in response to other submissions for technical reasons. Resource consent for infrastructure on the site may still be sought via other existing provisions within the Operative District Plan.	No
FS8 – Helen Chapman	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S94.2 above.	n/a
FS9 – Graham Bellamy	Support	Not stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S94.2 above.	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
FS10 – Save our Hills	Support	Agree with submitter	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S94.2 above.	n/a
FS11 – Susan Pattinson	Support	Agree with submitter	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S94.2 above.	n/a
FS13 – Duncan Stuart	Support	Agreed with all points in the submission	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S94.2 above.	n/a
FS18 – Peter Ross	Support	No road on a reserve	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S94.2 above.	n/a
FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Support	Rezoning of the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as Natural Open Space is consistent with UHCC’s original intention when purchasing the Spur using reserve fund money and will seek to; Retain the visual amenity it provides as the entrance to Upper Hutt city, protect and allow for future enhancement of the existing ecological aspects and corridor function it currently provides, assists to ensure it remains in its natural undeveloped state for the future and is in line in line with the direction and decisions made by UHCC in 1976, 1992, 1994 and 2001. Removal of the site specific provisions that would enable any infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur is in keeping with the Natural Open Space Zoning proposed. The developer has stated that the Spur is not critical or even necessary for access to the Southern Growth Area (UHCC Focus Group minutes) and that they have several other options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S94.2 above.	n/a
FS20 – Caleb Scott	Support	No reason stated	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S94.2 above.	n/a
FS23 – Tony Chad	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur or anything that could damage the Natural Open Space. Remove from PC49.	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in part submission S94.2 above.	n/a
FS24 – Mary	Support	Do not support site-specific provisions for	Accept in part	See reasons for recommendation to accept in	n/a

Sub. Number & Name	Support or oppose	Decision Sought / Reasons for Support or Opposition	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommend Amendments to Variation 1?
Beth Taylor		infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur or anything that could damage the Natural Open Space. Remove from PC49.		part submission S94.2 above.	