# Appendix 12: Summary of Submissions and Recommendations – PC49 Variation (Silverstream Spur)

Recommendations made in the revised Section 42a report are in green text and recommendations in the right of reply are highlighted in yellow.

| Submission number | Submission | Support or oppose | Related submission number | Decision Sought | Recommendation | Section of report |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| S1.1 | Bob Alkema | Support | | The adoption of Variation 1 to Plan Change 49. | Accept in part | 4 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S1.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S1.1 | Need to zone Spur as Natural Open Space as part of east/west corridor | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support in part | S1.1 | Oppose the adoption of Plan Change 49 Variation 1 in its entirety. Disagree with provision of infrastructure including a transport corridor through the Spur. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support in part | S1.1 | Oppose the adoption of Plan Change 49 Variation 1 in its entirety. Disagree with provision of infrastructure including a transport corridor through the Spur. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S1.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S1.1 | 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.<br><br>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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | | Support | S1.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support in part | S1.1 | Support:<br>• 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.<br>• Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.<br><br>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 | S1.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>• Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49 | | |
| 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.<br><br>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 | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S2.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S2.1 | • Congestion of traffic in Silverstream area will have adverse effect on accessibility.<br>• Loss of indigenous vegetation<br>• Reynolds Bach Road is viable alternative access road.<br>Silverstream Spur icon properties retained. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support in part | S2.1 | 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. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support in part | S2.1 | 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. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S2.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Oppose | S2.1 | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support in part | S2.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>• Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.<br><br>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 | S2.1 | Support:<br>• 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.<br>• Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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. | Accept in part | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Oppose | S3.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Oppose | S3.1 | • No access to Southern Growth Area through Silverstream Spur is acceptable.<br>• Residential development not needed. Infrastructure too costly and provision for road/ transport corridor too damaging to indigenous vegetation and potential for native reserve.<br>• Do not need a road to achieve this. Can be achieved by car park & walkway with walking/biking trails through Spur.<br>• Who will pay cost for infrastructure? Developer?? Damage to Spur will be extensive for transport corridor and other infrastructure.<br>• Does Silverstream need residential development? People live there because of "village" atmosphere.<br>• 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.<br>Irrelevant to Spur iconic nature. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Oppose | S3.1 | Disagree with submission's reasons. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Oppose | S3.1 | Disagree with submission's reasons. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Oppose | S3.1 | • SGA could be even more directly connected to Eastern Hutt Road via Reynolds Bach Drive.<br>• These could be accessed by other means unrelated to developing the SGA.<br>• 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.<br>• Based on the current state of submissions, these development opportunities are neither wanted nor needed.<br>• 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.<br>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. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Oppose | S3.1 | Road access is not required in any other local reserves, including, but not only Wi Tako Reserve, and Keith George Memorial Park.<br><br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>The owners of the SGA have stated in UHCC documents that the SGA development can go ahead without the use of the Spur.<br><br>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 directed.<br><br>Loss of biodiversity from urban development is well documented including in other submissions to this plan change. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Oppose | S3.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Oppose | S3.1 | Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.<br>Reasons:<br>• Access to the Southern Growth Area can be achieved through multiple other areas including Reynolds Bach Drive.<br>• SGA will not provide the kind of housing sought through the NPS UD, e.g., affordable housing along existing infrastructure and transportation corridors.<br>• 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.<br>• 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.<br>• 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."<br>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. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Oppose | S3.1 | Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.<br>Reasons:<br>• Access to the Southern Growth Area can be achieved through multiple other areas including Reynolds Bach Drive.<br>• SGA will not provide the kind of housing sought through the NPS UD, e.g., affordable housing along existing infrastructure and transportation corridors.<br>• 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.<br>• 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.<br>• 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."<br>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. | | |
| S4.1 | Caroline Woollams | Support with amendment | | 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. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S4.1 | Agree with all points in submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S4.1 | Access to SGA does not need to be through Spur. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support in part | S4.1 | 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. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support in part | S4.1 | 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. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S4.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Oppose | S4.1 | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support in part | S4.1 | Support access to GTC from Reynolds Bach Drive provided any road does not cross the Silverstream Spur at any point. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support in part | S4.1 | Support access to GTC from Reynolds Bach Drive provided any road does not cross the Silverstream Spur at any point. | | |
| S5.1 Lynda Joines | Support | | To include the entire 35.5 ha of the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space. | Accept | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S5.1 | Agree with all points in submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S5.1 | Spur zoned as Natural Open Space. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S5.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S5.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S5.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS17 Lynda Joines | Support | S5.1 | 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. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S5.1 | I want the spur to be made a formal reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S5.1 | 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. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S5.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S5.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| 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. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S5.2 | Agree with all points in submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S5.2 | Disallow special zoning provisions for roading/transport corridor. Will damage special indigenous plant area. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S5.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S5.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S5.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS17 Lynda Joines | Support | S5.2 | I do not want roading on the Spur. It is harmful to the environment, including wildlife and residents living in Pinehaven. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S5.2 | I don't support a road to GTC land over the Spur. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S5.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S5.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S5.2 | No road or infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur ever. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S5.2 | No road or infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur ever. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S6.1 Stephen Butler | Support | | To proceed with including all Silverstream Spur in Plan Change 49. | Accept | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S6.1 | Agree with all points in submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Oppose | S6.1 | PC 49 includes provision of road/transport corridor which will severely damage the special character of the spur and area surrounding it. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S6.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S6.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S6.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S6.1 | I want the spur to be made a formal reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S6.1 | 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.. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S6.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S6.1 | Do support:<br>Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S6.1 | Do support:<br>Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S6.2 | Agree with all points in submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S6.2 | PC49 includes provision of road/transport corridor which will severely damage the special character of the spur and area surrounding it. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S6.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S6.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S6.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S6.2 | I don't support a road to GTC land over the Spur. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S6.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S6.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S6.2 | No road or infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur ever. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S6.2 | No road or infrastructure/transport corridor on the Spur ever. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S7.1 | Helen Chapman | Support | | That the Silverstream Spur is rezoned to Natural Open Space. | Accept | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S7.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S7.1 | 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. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S7.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S7.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S7.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS16 Forest & Bird | | Support | S7.1 | The submission provides valid arguments for giving effect to PC1 of the Wellington RPS and the Emissions Reduction Plan. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S7.1 | I want the spur to be made a formal reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S7.1 | 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. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S7.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S7.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>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 | S7.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. | | |
| S7.2 Helen Chapman | Seek amendment | | That the Silverstream Spur remains exclusively Natural Open Space, with no transport corridor. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S7.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S7.2 | • Transport/Road corridor will damage Natural Open Space character and split the Open Space nature of the area.<br>• Agree that traffic congestion of Kiln Street and Silverstream area is too greater cost to nature of area.<br>• Agree that parking requirements for area are too greater cost for nature of area.<br>• Disruption to native wildlife in area of Spur is too greater cost.<br>• Agree - SGA is not within a 15 min walking distance of public transport.<br>• 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.<br>Agree. Who pays for upkeep of road to private development? | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S7.2 | Agree with submission that the Silverstream Spur remains exclusively Natural Open Space, with no transport corridor. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S7.2 | Agree with submission that the Silverstream Spur remains exclusively Natural Open Space, with no transport corridor. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S7.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS16 Forest & Bird | Support | S7.2 | The submission provides valid arguments for giving effect to PC1 of the Wellington RPS and the Emissions Reduction Plan. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S7.2 | I don't support a road to GTC land over the Spur. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S7.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S7.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S7.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S7.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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 | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S8.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S8.1 | The transport/road corridor is not required over spur. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support in part | S8.1 | 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. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support in part | S8.1 | 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. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S8.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS16 Forest & Bird | Oppose in part | S8.1 | 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. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S8.1 | 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. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Oppose | S8.1 | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support in part | S8.1 | Support access to Guildford Timber Company from Reynolds Bach Drive provided any road does not cross the Silverstream Spur at any point.<br><br>Do not support "Access through Silverstream and the spur should be a proposition of last resort." - It should not be considered at all. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support in part | S8.1 | Support access to Guildford Timber Company from Reynolds Bach Drive provided any road does not cross the Silverstream Spur at any point. | | |
| 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.<br><br>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 | 5 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | Support | S8.2 | Agree with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | Support | S8.2 | Agree that there has been a lack of publically available information at this stage for a lot of people to comment on provisions.<br><br>Transport parking is already a problem at Silverstream, so further pressure will increase the problem | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S8.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S8.2 | The building of houses on GTC land doesn't meet the requirements of being close to transport hubs. | | |
| 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 | 5 and 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S9.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S9.1 | Silverstream Spur as area with public walkway, cycle tracks would be a treasure to area. Only used for recreation, conservation - No transport/road provision. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S9.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S9.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S9.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S9.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S9.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | | Support | S9.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S9.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>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 | S9.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. | | |
| 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 | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S9.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S9.2 | • Spur retained as a NOS. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | • Cost of infrastructure too high and who pays costs.<br>NOS does not include transport/road. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S9.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S9.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S9.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S9.2 | No roads on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S9.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S9.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S9.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S9.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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.<br><br>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 | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S10.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S10.1 | Silverstream Spur needs to be fully protected as a reserve and restored to a SNA. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S10.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S10.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S10.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S10.1 | No roads on a reserve.<br><br>No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S10.1 | 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.<br><br>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 | S10.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support in part | S10.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>• Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S10.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>• Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S11.1 Carl Leenders | Oppose | | To remove the ability for an access corridor to be included in the plan for the area. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S11.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S11.1 | The transport/road corridor is not required over spur. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S11.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S11.1 | Agree with submission. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S11.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S11.1 | No roads on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S11.1 | 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.<br><br>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 | S11.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support in part | S11.1 | Support:<br>• "Majority of changes proposed."<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>• Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.<br><br>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 | S11.1 | Support:<br>• "Majority of changes proposed."<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>• Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S12.1 Jonathan Board | Oppose | | To remove the provision for a transport corridor crossing the Spur. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S12.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S12.1 | • The transport/road corridor is not required over spur. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | • Habitat for native and endangered species is important and needs to be protected.<br>Flood risk is a consideration for the Silver Stream Rail and current residents beside Hull's Creek and the area below spur. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S12.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S12.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S12.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S12.1 | No roads on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S12.1 | 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.<br><br>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 | S12.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S12.1 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S12.1 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S13.1 Adam Ricketts | Support | | To rezone Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space. | Accept | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S13.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S13.1 | Allowed but add opposition to allowing for Transport/Road corridor. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S13.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S13.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S13.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S13.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S13.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S13.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support in part | S13.1 | 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. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support in part | S13.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| 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 | 8 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Support | S14.1 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | | Support | S14.1 | NOS zoning is required but access for transport/road corridor rejected | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | | Support | S14.1 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support in part | S14.1 | 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.<br>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<br>options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA.<br>I seek that the parts of the submission relating to the rezoing 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<br>upon be disallowed. | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support in part | S14.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br><br>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 | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | Support in part | S14.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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 | 4 and 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Oppose | S15.1 | Not stated | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Oppose | S15.1 | Agree with NOS zoning but do not agree with roading provision as will damage NOS and accessibility for public. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support in part | S15.1 | Agree with submission and disagree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support in part | S15.1 | Agree with submission and disagree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Oppose | S15.1 | 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) | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support in part | S15.1 | Support – Spur to be a reserve and no road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support in part | S15.1 | 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.<br><br>Enabling any form of road/infrastructure corridor on any part of the Silverstream spur is inconsistent with rezoning as Natural Open Space<br>. 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.<br><br>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. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support in part | S15.1 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support in part | S15.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br><br>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 | S15.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S16.1 Herenga ā Nuku/Outdoor Access Commission – David Barnes | 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.<br><br>That consideration should also be given to identifying access to the western corner, where it is adjacent to Reynolds Bach Drive. | Reject | 5 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Oppose | S16.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S16.1 | Support setting aside this land for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes and the need to exclude provision of transport/roading corridor. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S16.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S16.1 | Utilising the Spur for recreation, conservation and customary purposes is in line with the majority of the community. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support in part | S16.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Suggestion to designate the Spur as a reserve in the future.<br>• Access to Guildford Timber Company from Reynolds Bach Drive provided any road does not cross the Silverstream Spur at any point.<br><br>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 | S16.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Suggestion to designate the Spur as a reserve in the future.<br>• Access to Guildford Timber Company from Reynolds Bach Drive provided any road does not cross the Silverstream Spur at any point.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S17.1 Kelsey Fly | Support | | To approve the proposal to make Silverstream Spur a designated Natural Open Space. | Accept | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S17.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S17.1 | Spur is crucial area within valley for linkage across valley for native species. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S17.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S17.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S17.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S17.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S17.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S17.1 | Support:<br>• 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.<br>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 | S17.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. | | |
| S17.2 Kelsey Fly | Oppose | | To remove the provisions to enable infrastructure, including a transport corridor, through the Spur. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S17.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S17.2 | Transport/road corridor will defeat purpose of NOS. Agree with disruption of wildlife on spur if road allowed. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S17.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S17.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S17.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S17.2 | No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S17.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S17.2 | No reason stated. | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support in part | S17.2 | 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 | S17.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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. | Reject | 6 |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Oppose | S18.1 | Zone changed to NOS is required to protect special nature/character of spur. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Strongly oppose | S18.1 | 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. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Strongly oppose | S18.1 | 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. | | |
| FS12 The Guildford Timber Company | | Support in part | S18.1 | 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).<br><br>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.<br><br>To the extent that such an outcome is consistent with its own submission, GTC supports submission point S18.1 in part. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Oppose | S18.1 | 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. | | |
| FS16 Forest & Bird | | Oppose | S18.1 | This submission fails to give effect to s6(c) of the RMA and the Wellington RPS. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Oppose | S18.1 | 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."<br><br>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 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 | S18.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Oppose | S18.1 | 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.<br><br>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.<br>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.<br><br>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." | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Oppose | S18.1 | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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." | | |
| 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 | 7 |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S19.1 | • Support - with reservation regarding change for transport/roading corridor.<br>Transport/roading corridor is contrary to zoning of NOS. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support in part | S19.1 | 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. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support in part | S19.1 | 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. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S19.1 | Agree with point. | | |
| FS16 Forest & Bird | | Support | S19.1 | 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. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Oppose | S19.1 | The spur to be a reserve – no roading on reserves. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S19.1 | 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.<br><br>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 the threshold as a SAL area, this overlay should be added to the zoning change and SNA's. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S19.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support in part | S19.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Recognition that in the absence of environmental protection from the draft PC48 and the draft NPS IB the PC 49 can offer this protection.<br>• Recognition that insufficient information and detail around any infrastructure/transportation corridor makes it impossible to assess and comment on this proposed feature.<br>Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support in part | S19.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Recognition that in the absence of environmental protection from the draft PC48 and the draft NPS IB the PC 49 can offer this protection.<br>• Recognition that insufficient information and detail around any infrastructure/transportation corridor makes it impossible to assess and comment on this proposed feature.<br>Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |
| 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.<br><br>This should include providing for public transport and multi-modal and low/zero-carbon transport options along the proposed transport corridor.<br><br>Amendments to the provisions providing for this transport corridor may be appropriate to signal multi-modal transport connections. | Accept in part | 8 |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S19.2 | Agree with comments. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Oppose | S19.2 | 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. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Oppose | S19.2 | 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. | | |
| FS12 The Guildford Timber Company | Support in part | S19.2 | 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.<br><br>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. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Oppose | S19.2 | Disagree with point. Based on submissions, a road is not wanted by the community. | | |
| FS16 Forest & Bird | Oppose | S19.2 | 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.<br><br>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 Emissions Reduction Plan. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Oppose | S19.2 | The spur to be a reserve – no roading on reserves. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Oppose | S19.2 | 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.<br><br>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. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support in part | S19.2 | 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 | S19.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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 Freshwater Management 2020 and National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2022 exposure draft. | Reject | 13 |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S19.3 | Agree with point. | | |
| FS16 Forest & Bird | Support in part | S19.3 | 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.<br><br>However, suggest it needs to be stronger, as per Forest & Bird's original submission on Variation 1. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S19.3 | 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.<br><br>Other options are available to access the SGA, including parcels of land that the developer already owns. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S19.3 | No reason stated. | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| S20.1 | Colin Rickerby | Support | | To rezone the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space and protect Significant Natural Areas. | Accept | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S20.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S20.1 | Need to include exclusion of Transport/Road corridor provision. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S20.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S20.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S20.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S20.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S20.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | | Support | S20.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S20.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Eventual 'Reserve' status.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>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. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S20.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Eventual 'Reserve' status.<br>• 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. | | |
| 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 | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S21.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S21.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S21.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S21.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S21.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S21.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S21.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | | Support | S21.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S21.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S21.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |
| S22.1 | Jane Derbyshire | Seek amendments | | 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 | Accept in part | 5, 6 and 8 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | UHCC progress this area as intended - to reserve status.<br><br>Support zoning of Significant Natural Areas within the Spur area. | | |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | Support | S22.1 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | Support | S22.1 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | Support | S22.1 | Agree with submitter that council fulfil it's earlier obligation to make the entire spur a reserve under the Reserves act - see SOH full submission | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | Support | S22.1 | Agree with submitter that council fulfil it's earlier obligation to make the entire spur a reserve under the Reserves act - see SOH full submission | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | Support | S22.1 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Support | S22.1 | Spur to be a reserve. No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S22.1 | 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<br>options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA. | | |
| FS20 – Caleb Scott | Support | S22.1 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | Support | S22.1 | Support:<br>- Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Eventual 'Reserve' status.<br>- Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>Dupport:<br>Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S22.1 | Support: | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | - Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. Eventual 'Reserve' status.<br>- Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>Do not support:<br>Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S23.1 | John D O'Malley | Support | | To support the rezoning of the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space. | Accept | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S23.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S23.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S23.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S23.1 | Agree with submission | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S23.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S23.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S23.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | | Support | S23.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S23.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>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 | S23.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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. | Reject | 5 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S23.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S23.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S23.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S23.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S23.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S23.2 | No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S23.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S23.2 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S23.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S23.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S23.3 | John D O'Malley | Support | | To support the protection of identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | Accept | **7** |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S23.3 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S23.3 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S23.3 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S23.3 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S23.3 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S23.3 | Fits with being a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S23.3 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S23.3 | No reason stated. | | |
| 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 | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S24.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S24.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | support | S24.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S24.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S24.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S24.1 | Spur to be a reserve | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S24.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S24.1 | No reason stated. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S24.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>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 | S24.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. | | |
| S24.2 Nancy Bramley-Thompson | Oppose | | To not support the enablement of site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor, within Silverstream Spur. | Reject | **8** |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S24.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S24.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | support | S24.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S24.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S24.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S24.2 | Spur to be a reserve. No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S24.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S24.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S24.2 | Support references to the UHCC Sustainability Strategy Goal 2 in relation to PC49.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S24.2 | Support references to the UHCC Sustainability Strategy Goal 2 in relation to PC49.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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. | Accept in part | 5 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S25.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S25.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S25.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S25.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S25.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S25.1 | Spur to be a reserve. No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S25.1 | 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. | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S25.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49 | | |
| 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 | 7 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S26.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S26.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S26.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S26.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S26.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S26.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S26.1 | 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.. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | | Support | S26.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S26.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• 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.<br>• Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.<br>References to the UHCC Sustainability Strategy Goal 2 in relation 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 | 8 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S26.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S26.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S26.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S26.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S26.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S26.2 | No road on a reserve | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S26.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S26.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| 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 | 4 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S27.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S27.1 | Does need to allow for rezoning spur as NOS. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S27.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S27.1 | Consistent with opposition to any road over spur to GTC land. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S27.1 | 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.. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S27.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support in part | S27.1 | Support:<br>• The need to protect the future of the Silverstream Railway.<br>The idea that protecting the Spur for the community is more important than allowing housing development on the Spur. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support in part | S27.1 | Support:<br>• The need to protect the future of the Silverstream Railway.<br>The idea that protecting the Spur for the community is more important than allowing housing development on the Spur. | | |
| S28.1 Lance Hurly | Support | | To rezone the Spur to Natural Open Space | Accept | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S28.1 | Agree with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S28.1 | Not stated. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S28.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S28.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S28.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S28.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S28.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S28.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S28.1 | Support:<br>Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S28.1 | Support:<br>Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| S28.2 Lance Hurly | Oppose | | Withdraw any intention to establish a transport corridor. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S28.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S28.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S28.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S28.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S28.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S28.2 | No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S28.2 | 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.<br>• 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 | S28.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S28.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49 | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S28.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S28.3 Lance Hurly | Support | | Protect the Significant Natural Areas on the Spur from development. | Accept | 7 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | Support | S28.3 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | Support | S28.3 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | Support | S28.3 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | Support | S28.3 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | Support | S28.3 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Support | S28.3 | Spur to be a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S28.3 | 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<br>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<br>enhance these areas in perpetuity. | | |
| FS20 – Caleb Scott | Support | S28.3 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | Support | S28.3 | Support:<br>- Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>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 | S28.3 | Support:<br>- Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>- Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation and customary purposes. | | |
| S29.1 Peter Zajac | Oppose | | To remove the provisions for a road and transport corridor over the entire Silverstream Spur. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S29.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S29.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S29.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S29.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S29.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S29.1 | No roads on a reserve. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S29.1 | 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.<br><br>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 | S29.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S29.1 | Support:<br>• Submission's list of warnings regarding future housing development on the GTC Silverstream Forest.<br>• Submission's statements around the importance of the Silverstream Spur for the environment and community.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S29.1 | Support:<br>• Submission's list of warnings regarding future housing development on the GTC Silverstream Forest.<br>• Submission's statements around the importance of the Silverstream Spur for the environment and community.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a 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. | Reject | 8 |
| FS1 Peter Zajac | Support | S30.1 | 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). | | |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S30.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S30.1 | Need for NOS provision to be allowed. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S30.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S30.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S30.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S30.1 | No roads on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S30.1 | 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.<br><br>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 | S30.1 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S30.1 | Support removal of site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49.\ | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S30.1 | Support removal of site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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 | 6 and 7 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | Support | S31.1 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | Support | S31.1 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | Support | S31.1 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | Support | S31.1 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | Support | S31.1 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Support | S31.1 | No roads on a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S31.1 | 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 | S31.1 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | Support | S31.1 | Support:<br>- Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>- 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.<br>Do not support:<br>Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S31.1 | Support:<br>- Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>- Submitter's acknowledgement that the Spur was purchased in 1990 to be a reserve.<br>- Submitter's statements around the importance of the Silverstream Spur for the future protection of the environment.<br>Do not support:<br>Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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. | Reject | 5, 6 and 8 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | Support | S32.1 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | Support | S32.1 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | Support | S32.1 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | Support | S32.1 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | Support | S32.1 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Support | S32.1 | No reason given | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S32.1 | 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.<br>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 | S32.1 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | Support | S32.1 | Support:<br>- Submitter's list of warnings regarding future housing development on the GTC Silverstream Forest.<br>- Submitter's statements around the importance of the Silverstream Spur for the environment and community.<br>- Future designation of the Spur as a reserve.<br>Do not support:<br>Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S32.1 | Support:<br>- Submitter's list of warnings regarding future housing development on the GTC Silverstream Forest.<br>- Submitter's statements around the importance of the Silverstream Spur for the environment and community.<br>- Future designation of the Spur as a reserve.<br>Do not support:<br>Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S33.1 Calvin Berg | Support | | The Council take action to have the Spur zoned as a Natural Open Space.<br><br>The Council to stop supporting private interests trying to develop the Spur as appears to be the case at present. | Accept in part | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S33.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S33.1 | Need to include opposition to Transport/roading corridor. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S33.1 | 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. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S33.1 | 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. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S33.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S33.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S33.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S33.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S33.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Submission's statements around the importance of the Silverstream Spur as part of the local ecosystem.<br>Submission's call for UHCC to distance itself from private commercial developers' interests. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S33.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Submission's statements around the importance of the Silverstream Spur as part of the local ecosystem.<br>Submission's call for 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. | Reject | 5 and 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S34.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S34.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S34.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S34.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S34.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S34.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S34.1 | 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.<br><br>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 | S34.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S34.1 | Support:<br>• Submission's statements around the importance of the Silverstream Spur for the environment and community.<br>• Submission's statements around the original intentions for the Spur as a reserve.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S34.1 | Support:<br>• Submission's statements around the importance of the Silverstream Spur for the environment and community.<br>• Submission's statements around the original intentions for the Spur as a reserve.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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 | 5 and 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S35.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S35.1 | Agree with submission. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S35.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S35.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S35.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S35.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S35.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S35.1 | Support:<br>Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S35.1 | Support:<br>Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| 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. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S35.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S35.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S35.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S35.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S35.2 | No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S35.2 | 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 | S35.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S35.2 | 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.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S35.2 | 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.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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 | 7 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S35.3 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S35.3 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S35.3 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S35.3 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S35.3 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S35.3 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S35.3 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S35.3 | Support:<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>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." | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S35.3 | Support:<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>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." | | |
| S36.1 Chris and Julie Manu | Oppose | | To deny the enablement of site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S36.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S36.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S36.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S36.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S36.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S36.1 | No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S36.1 | 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.<br><br>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 | S36.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S36.1 | Support:<br>• Submissions list of liabilities associated with a road through the Spur.<br>Removal of site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S36.1 | Support:<br>• Submissions list of liabilities associated with a road through the Spur.<br>Removal of site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S37.1 Cathy Price | Support | | Rezone the Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space completely, protect all SNA areas on the Silverstream Spur. | Accept | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S37.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S37.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S37.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S37.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S37.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S37.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S37.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S37.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S37.1 | Do support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>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 | S37.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. | | |
| S37.2 Cathy Price | Oppose | | Disallow any provision for a road, infrastructure corridor on any part of the Silverstream Spur. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S37.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S37.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S37.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S37.2 | Agree with submission. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S37.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S37.2 | No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S37.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S37.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S37.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S37.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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 in part | 6 and 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S38.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S38.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S38.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S38.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S38.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S38.1 | Spur to be a reserve. No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S38.1 | 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.<br><br>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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S38.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S38.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>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 | S38.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of passive recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. | | |
| S38.2 Gerald and Carleen Bealing | Oppose | | removal of provision of a transport corrido | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S38.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S38.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S38.2 | Agree with submission. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S38.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S38.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S38.2 | No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S38.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S38.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S38.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S38.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49 | | |
| S39.1 Jennifer Durry | Support | | To remain as originally intended as a reserve and rezone as Natural Open Space. | Accept in part | 5 and 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S39.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S39.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S39.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S39.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S39.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S39.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S39.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S39.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S39.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S39.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| 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 | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S39.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S39.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S39.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S39.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S39.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S39.2 | No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S39.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S39.2 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S39.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S39.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S40.1 | Stephen Bell | Support | | To rezone the Spur as a Natural Open Space. | Accept | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S40.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S40.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S40.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S40.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S40.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S40.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S40.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S40.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S40.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br><br>Submission's concerns around the environmental damage that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S40.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>• Submission's concerns around the environmental damage that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur. | | |
| S40.2 Stephen Bell | Oppose | | To remove the provision providing for an infrastructure and transportation corridor from the proposal. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S40.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S40.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S40.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S40.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S40.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S40.2 | No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S40.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S40.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S40.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S40.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S41.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S41.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S41.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S41.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S41.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S41.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S41.1 | 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. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S41.1 | Do support:<br>Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S41.1 | Do support:<br>Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| S41.2 | Bob McLellan | Support | | To approve the provision to protect identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | Accept | 7 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S41.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S41.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S41.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S41.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S41.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S41.2 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S41.2 | 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. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S41.2 | Support to protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S41.2 | Support to protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| S41.3 | Bob McLellan | Oppose | | To decline (not approve) the provision to enable site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S41.3 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S41.3 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S41.3 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S41.3 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S41.3 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S41.3 | No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S41.3 | 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.<br><br>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 | S41.3 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49 | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S41.3 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49 | | |
| S42.1 | Pat van Berkel | Support with amendment | | Zone the entire Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space and extend the area of Silverstream Spur to include Sylvan Heights reserve (Parcel 3824934. Lot 46 DP 90006).<br>Additionally, zone the extended Silverstream Spur (described above) as Natural Open Space. | Accept in part | 5 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S42.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S42.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S42.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S42.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S42.1 | Agree with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S42.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S42.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S42.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S42.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>• Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur.<br>• View to the Spur being designated a reserve under the Reserve Act. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S42.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>• Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur.<br>• View to the Spur being designated a reserve under the Reserve Act. | | |
| S42.2 Pat van Berkel | Support with amendment | | To protect the Significant Natural Area delineated on the Map in the Variation from development.<br><br>Extend the Significant Natural Area (delineated on the Map in the Variation) to include the 6 recovering areas of native bush.<br><br>Additionally, protect the extended Significant Natural Area from development. Recognise the whole Silverstream Spur as a Special Amenity Landscape.<br><br>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 | 5, 7, 9 and 10 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S42.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S42.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S42.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S42.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S42.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S42.2 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S42.2 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S42.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S42.2 | Support to protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S42.2 | Support to protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |
| S42.3 Pat van Berkel | Oppose | | Remove provision for infrastructure and/or transport corridor on any part of the Silverstream Spur.<br><br>Stop (in the legal sense) the unformed road Kiln St (from Sylvan Way to the westernmost extent of Kiln St).<br><br>Extend the area of Silverstream Spur to include the stopped road | Reject | 5 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S42.3 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S42.3 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S42.3 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S42.3 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S42.3 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S42.3 | No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S42.3 | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>Stopping of the Kiln Street paper road should also be included in this plan change. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S42.3 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S42.3 | 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. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S42.3 | 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.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S42.4 Pat van Berkel | Seek amendments | | Acknowledge that the Section 32 report on the Variation is incomplete because:<br><br>a. It does not include analysis on road corridor options (despite the stated "critical" importance of a road corridor).<br><br>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.<br><br>c. It does not identify the strategic importance of the Spur as part of a significant wildlife/bird corridor.<br><br>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.<br><br>e. The Ecological Values Assessment needs to be updated, as nature has expanded the areas of significant native bush (as previously stated).<br><br>Complete the Section 32 report in the 5 incomplete areas (described above). | Reject | 9 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S42.4 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S42.4 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S42.4 | 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). | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S42.4 | 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). | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S42.4 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S42.4 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S42.4 | No reason stated. | | |
| 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 | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S43.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S43.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S43.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S43.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S43.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S43.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S43.1 | 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<br><br>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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S43.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S43.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>• Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur.<br>Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S43.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>• Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur.<br>Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |
| S43.2 Heather Frances Beckman | Oppose | | To not approve the provision for a road/infrastructure corridor to the neighbouring privately owned land. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S43.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S43.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S43.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S43.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S43.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S43.2 | No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S43.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S43.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S43.2 | 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.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S43.2 | 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.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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.<br><br>To approve the provision to protect identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | Accept | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S44.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S44.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S44.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S44.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S44.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S44.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S44.1 | 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.<br><br>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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | | Support | S44.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S44.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S44.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |
| S44.2 | Lynne McLellan | Oppose | | To decline (not approve) the provision to enable site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S44.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S44.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S44.2 | Agree with submission. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S44.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S44.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S44.2 | No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S44.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S44.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S44.2 | 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.<br>Do not support:<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S44.2 | 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.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S45.1 John Pepper | Support | | That Council proceed with rezoning of the land known as the Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space, designating the area as a Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.<br><br>That Council give full protection to identified areas of Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur. | Accept in part | 5, 6 and 7 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S45.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S45.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S45.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S45.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S45.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S45.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S45.1 | 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.<br><br>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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S45.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S45.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>• Silverstream Spur as recreation/conservation zone forever. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S45.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>• Silverstream Spur as recreation/conservation zone forever. | | |
| S45.2 John Pepper | Oppose | | That Council decline any proposal to construct a road/infrastructure corridor within the boundaries of the Silverstream Spur. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S45.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S45.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S45.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S45.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S45.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S45.2 | No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S45.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S45.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S45.2 | 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.<br><br>Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S45.2 | 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.<br><br>Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S46.1 Chris Cosslett | Support | | To adopt the Natural Open Space Zoning for Silverstream Spur. | Accept | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S46.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S46.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S46.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S46.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S46.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S46.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S46.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S46.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S46.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S46.1 | Support:<br>• 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. | | |
| S46.2 | Chris Cosslett | Oppose | | To delete provision for a road corridor through Silverstream Spur. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S46.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S46.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S46.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S46.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S46.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S46.2 | No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S46.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S46.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S46.2 | Support:<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>• View to the Spur being designated a Scenic Reserve under the Reserve Act.<br>• 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.<br><br>Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S46.2 | Support:<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>• View to the Spur being designated a Scenic Reserve under the Reserve Act.<br>• 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. | | |
| S47.1 | Allan Sheppard | Support | | That the Silverstream Spur be rezoned to Natural Open Space. | Accept | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S47.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S47.1 | I assume opposes transport/roading corridor. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S47.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S47.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S47.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S47.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S47.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | | Support | S47.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S47.1 | Support:<br>Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S47.1 | Support:<br>Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| S48.1 | Donald Keith Skerman | Support | | Proceed with rezoning of the Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space | Accept | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S48.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S48.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S48.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S48.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S48.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S48.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S48.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | | Support | S48.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S48.1 | Support: | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | • Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>• View to the Spur being designated a Reserve under the Reserve Act.<br>• Submission's acknowledgement that significant planting and restoration work has already been completed in the area by environmental groups. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S48.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>• View to the Spur being designated a Reserve under the Reserve Act.<br>• Submission's acknowledgement that significant planting and restoration work has already been completed in the area by environmental groups. | | |
| 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.<br><br>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. | Accept in part | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S48.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S48.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S48.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S48.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S48.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S48.2 | No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S48.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S48.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S48.2 | Support:<br>• 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.<br><br>Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S48.2 | Support:<br>• Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of passive recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.<br>• Submission's concerns around the visual and environmental damage that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur.<br><br>Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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.<br><br>Support the removal of indigenous vegetation being disallowed on the land. | Accept in part | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S48.3 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S48.3 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S48.3 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S48.3 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S48.3 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S48.3 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S48.3 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S48.3 | Support to protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S48.3 | Support to protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S49.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S49.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S49.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S49.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S49.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S49.1 | No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S49.1 | 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.<br><br>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 | S49.1 | Support:<br>• Submissions list of liabilities associated with a road through the Spur.<br>Removal of site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S49.1 | Support:<br>• Submissions list of liabilities associated with a road through the Spur.<br>Removal of site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S50.1 | Abbie Spiers | Support | | To support the UHCC proposal to rezone the Spur from its existing designation to Natural Open Space.<br><br>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 | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S50.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S50.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S50.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S50.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S50.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S50.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S50.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S50.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S50.1 | Support:<br>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 | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S50.1 | Support:<br>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. | | |
| 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 | 7 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S50.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S50.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S50.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S50.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S50.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S50.2 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S50.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S50.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S50.2 | Support:<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>Submission's acknowledgement that significant planting and restoration work has already been completed in the area by environmental groups. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S50.2 | Support: | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | • Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>Submission's acknowledgement that significant planting and restoration work has already been completed in the area by environmental groups. | | |
| S50.3 | Abbie Spiers | Oppose | Urge UHCC to reject any such site-specific provisions. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S50.3 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S50.3 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S50.3 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S50.3 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S50.3 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S50.3 | No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S50.3 | 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.<br><br>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 | S50.3 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S50.3 | Support:<br>• Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of passive recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.<br>• View to the Spur being designated a Reserve under the Reserve Act.<br>• 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<br><br>Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S50.3 | Support:<br>• Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of passive recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.<br>• 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<br><br>Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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 | 6 and 7 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S51.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S51.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S51.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S51.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S51.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S51.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S51.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | | Support | S51.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S51.1 | Support:<br>• 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.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S51.1 | Support:<br>• 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.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |
| S51.2 | Derek Reeves | Oppose | | To prohibit site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S51.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S51.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S51.2 | Agree with submission. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S51.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S51.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S51.2 | No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S51.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S51.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S51.2 | Support:<br>• Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of passive recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.<br>• 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.<br><br>Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S51.2 | Support:<br>• Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of passive recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.<br>• 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.<br><br>Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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 | 6 and 7 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S52.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S52.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S52.1 | Agree with submission. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S52.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S52.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S52.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S52.1 | 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.<br><br>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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S52.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S52.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S52.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>• Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur. | | |
| S52.2 Phil Hancock | Oppose | | To provide public access for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. | Accept in part | 4 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S52.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S52.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S52.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S52.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S52.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S52.2 | No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S52.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S52.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S52.2 | Support:<br>• Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of passive recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>• View to the Spur being designated a reserve under the Reserve Act.<br>• 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<br>• A road through the Spur is incompatible with Natural Open Space.<br><br>Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S52.2 | Support:<br>• Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of passive recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>• View to the Spur being designated a reserve under the Reserve Act.<br>• 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<br>• A road through the Spur is incompatible with Natural Open Space.<br><br>Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S53.1 Steven Robertson | Support | | To rezone the Spur to Open Space. Then as soon as the Spur is rezoned to Open Space an application should be made (and | Accept in part | 5, 6 and 7 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | followed through on this time) to make it a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.<br><br>To approve the SNA designation. | | |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S53.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S53.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S53.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S53.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S53.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S53.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S53.1 | 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.<br><br>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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S53.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S53.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>• Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur<br>• Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of passive recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>• View to the Spur being designated a reserve under the Reserve Act. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S53.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>• 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.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>• View to the Spur being designated a reserve under the Reserve Act. | | |
| S53.2 | Steven Robertson | Oppose | | To remove the provision to allow a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S53.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S53.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S53.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S53.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S53.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S53.2 | No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S53.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S53.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S53.2 | 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.<br><br>Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S53.2 | 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.<br><br>Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| S54.1 | Suilva Fay McIntyre | Support | | To retain the Natural Open Space in perpetuity. | Accept | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S54.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S54.1 | With provision of opposed to Transport/roading corridor. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S54.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S54.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S54.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S54.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S54.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | | Support | S54.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S54.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S54.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| S55.1 | Jason Durry | Support | | To rezone all of the Spur to Natural Open Space. | Accept | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S55.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S55.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S55.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S55.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S55.1 | Agree with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S55.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S55.1 | 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 | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | | Support | S55.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S55.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S55.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| 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. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S55.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S55.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S55.2 | Agree with submission. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S55.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S55.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S55.2 | No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S55.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S55.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S55.2 | Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S55.2 | Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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 | 7 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S55.3 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S55.3 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S55.3 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S55.3 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S55.3 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S55.3 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S55.3 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S55.3 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S55.3 | Support the correction of SNA mapping on the Silverstream Spur. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S55.3 | Support the correction of SNA mapping on the Silverstream Spur. | | |
| S56.1 Quintin Towler | Support | | To zone the entire Spur as Natural Open Space and ensure protection of all SNAs. | Accept in part | 6 and 7 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S56.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S56.1 | Not stated. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S56.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S56.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S56.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S56.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S56.1 | 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.<br><br>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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S56.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S56.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S56.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| S56.2 Quintin Towler | Oppose | | To remove all provisions allowing a road/corridor anywhere on the Spur. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S56.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S56.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S56.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S56.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S56.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S56.2 | No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S56.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S56.2 | No reason stated. | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S56.2 | Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S56.2 | Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S57.1 | Christian Woods | Support | | To rezone the entire Spur as Natural Space. | Accept | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S57.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S57.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S57.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S57.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S57.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S57.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S57.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | | Support | S57.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S57.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>• Acknowledgement that the Silverstream Spur was purchased with UHCC Reserve funds and should only be used as Natural Open Space. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S57.1 | Support:<br>• Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>• Acknowledgement that the Silverstream Spur was purchased with UHCC Reserve funds and should only be used as Natural Open Space. | | |
| S57.2 | Christian Woods | Oppose | | To remove provisions for a road or/and infrastructure corridor anywhere on the Silverstream Spur. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S57.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S57.2 | Not stated. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S57.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S57.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S57.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S57.2 | No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S57.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S57.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S57.2 | Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S57.2 | Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S58.1 Marie Harris | Support | | To zone the entire Spur as Natural Open Space. | Accept | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S58.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S58.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S58.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S58.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S58.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S58.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S58.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S58.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S58.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S58.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| S58.2 Marie Harris | Support with amendment | | To correct inadequate SNA areas. | Accept in part | 7 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S58.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S58.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S58.2 | Agree with submission. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S58.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S58.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S58.2 | Spur to be a reserve. No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S58.2 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | Support | S58.2 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S58.2 | Support correction of SNA mapping on the Silverstream Spur. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S58.2 | Support correction of SNA mapping on the Silverstream Spur. | | |
| S58.3 Marie Harris | Oppose | | To remove provisions for building a road and utilities. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S58.3 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S58.3 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S58.3 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S58.3 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S58.3 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S58.3 | No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S58.3 | 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.<br><br>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 | S58.3 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S58.3 | 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.<br><br>Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S58.3 | 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.<br><br>Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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. | Reject | 5 and 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S59.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S59.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S59.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S59.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S59.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S59.1 | Spur to be a reserve so no roads allowed. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S59.1 | 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.<br><br>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 | S59.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S59.1 | Support:<br>• 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.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>• Road/infrastructure corridor is not needed for recreational access to the Spur.<br><br>Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S59.1 | Support:<br>• 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.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | • Road/infrastructure corridor is not needed for recreational access to the Spur.<br><br>Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S60.1 | Ben Jones | Oppose | | To disallow and provision for a road/infrastructure corridor on any part of the Silverstream Spur. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S60.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S60.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S60.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S60.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S60.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S60.1 | Spur to be a reserve so no roads allowed. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S60.1 | 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.<br><br>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 | S60.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S60.1 | 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.<br><br>Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S60.1 | 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.<br><br>Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| S61.1 | Scott Fitzgerald | Oppose | | To remove any provisions for any road or infrastructure corridor on any part of the Silverstream Spur. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S61.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S61.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S61.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S61.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S61.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S61.1 | Spur to be a reserve so no roads allowed. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S61.1 | 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.<br><br>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 | S61.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S61.1 | 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.<br><br>Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49 | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S61.1 | 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.<br><br>Do not support site -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 | 6 and 7 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S62.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S62.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S62.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S62.1 | Agree with submission. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S62.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S62.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S62.1 | 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. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S62.1 | Support:<br>• 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.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S62.1 | Support:<br>• 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.<br>• Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |
| S62.2 Martin McGlue | Oppose | | To disallow any provisions for road/infrastructure corridor on any part of the Spur land. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S62.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S62.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S62.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S62.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S62.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S62.2 | No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S62.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S62.2 | Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S62.2 | Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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 | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | Support | S63.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | Support | S63.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | Support | S63.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support | S63.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S63.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S63.1 | No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S63.1 | 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.<br><br>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 | S63.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S63.1 | Support submission's concerns:<br>• around the negative environmental impact that would result from the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as Natural Open Space.<br>• 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.<br><br>Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S63.1 | 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. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S64.1 | Elizabeth Maria Christensen | Support | To rezone the Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space. | Accept | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S64.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S64.1 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S64.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S64.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S64.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S64.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S64.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | | Support | S64.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S64.1 | Support rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S64.1 | Support rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. | | |
| 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 | 5 and 7 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S64.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S64.2 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S64.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S64.2 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S64.2 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S64.2 | Go the natives. | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S64.2 | 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.<br><br>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 | S64.2 | No reason stated. | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S64.2 | Support to protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S64.2 | Support to protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |
| S64.3 | Elizabeth Maria Christensen | Oppose | | To remove the site specific provisions for infrastructure including a transport corridor from the proposed variation. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S64.3 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S64.3 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S64.3 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S64.3 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S64.3 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S64.3 | No road on a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S64.3 | 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.<br><br>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 | | |
| FS20 Caleb Scott | | Support | S64.3 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S64.3 | Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC4 | | |
| FS624 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S64.3 | Do not support site -specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S65.1 | Janice Nancy Carey | Support | | To make the Silverstream Spur a Natural Open Space for always, for us all. | Accept | 6 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S65.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S65.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support | S65.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | | Support | S65.1 | Agree with submission. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | | Support | S65.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | | Support | S65.1 | Spur to be a reserve. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S65.1 | 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. | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS20 Caleb Scott | | Support | S65.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | | Support | S65.1 | Support rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space forever. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S65.1 | Support rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space forever. | | |
| S66.1 | Anthoney Carey | Support | | Seek to rezone the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space for the entire Upper Hutt community. | Accept | 6 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Support | S66.1 | Agree with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | | Support | S66.1 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S66.1 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S66.1 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | | Support | S66.1 | Agree with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S66.1 | Spur to be a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S66.1 | 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. | | |
| FS20 – Caleb Scott | | Support | S66.1 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S66.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space forever | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S66.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space forever | | |
| S67.1 | Lynette Elizabeth Smith | Oppose | | To delete Variation 1, including a transport corridor, from PC49.<br><br>To establish the Silverstream Spur as a reafforestation project and across valley ecological link for our birdlife.<br><br>To confirm the public ownership of the Silverstream Spur and class it as an ecological corridor. | Reject | 4 |
| FS8 Helen Chapman | | Support | S67.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS9 Graham Bellamy | | Support | S67.1 | Not stated. | | |
| FS10 Save our Hills | | Support in part | S67.1 | 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. | | |
| FS11 Susan Pattinson | Support in part | S67.1 | 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. | | |
| FS13 Duncan Stuart | Support | S67.1 | Agree with all points in the submission. | | |
| FS18 Peter Ross | Support | S67.1 | Spur to be a reserve. No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use. | | |
| FS19 Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S67.1 | 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 | S67.1 | No reason stated. | | |
| FS23 Tony Chad | Support | S67.1 | Support:<br>• Removal of wilding pines on the Silverstream Spur, carried out in a planned manner in the best interests of the regenerating indigenous biodiversity.<br>• Reforestation of Silverstream Spur.<br>• Maintaining the Spur in public ownership.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S67.1 | Support:<br>• Removal of wilding pines on the Silverstream Spur, carried out in a planned manner in the best interests of the regenerating indigenous biodiversity.<br>• Reforestation of Silverstream Spur.<br>• 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. | | |
| S68.1 | Leo Parnell Smith | Oppose | | To delete Variation 1, including a transport corridor, from PC49.<br><br>To become actively involved in establishing the Silverstream Spur as a reafforestation project and across valley ecological link for birdlife etc.<br><br>To confirm the public ownership of the Silverstream Spur and establish it as an ecological corridor. | Reject | 4 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Support | | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | | Support | | Not stated | | |
| 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<br>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 | | |
| 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<br>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 | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | | Support | | Agree with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | | No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use | | |
| 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. | | |
| FS20 – Caleb Scott | | Support | | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | | Support:<br>- 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<br>- Maintaining the Spur in public ownership<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S69.1 | Heather Blissett | Support | | The protection of the Spur in favour of her ecological and recreational and healing value. | Accept in part | 6 |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S69.1 | Spur to be a reserve | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S69.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space | | |
| FS24- Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S69.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space | | |
| 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. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Support | S69.2 | Agree with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | | Support | S69.2 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S69.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S69.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | | Support | S69.2 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S69.2 | No road on a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S69.2 | 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. | | |
| FS20 – Caleb Scott | | Support | S69.2 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S69.2 | 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.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49 | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S69.2 | 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.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49 | | |
| 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 | 5 |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S70.1 | Spur to be a reserve | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S70.1 | 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<br>"The Silverstream Spur to remain as its original intention without any roads or infrastructure." | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S70.1 | 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 | | |
| S70.2 | Katelin Hardgrave | Oppose | | No road or infrastructure corridor through the Spur. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Support | S70.2 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | | Support | S70.2 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S70.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S70.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | | Support | S70.2 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S70.2 | No road on a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S70.2 | 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.<br>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 | S70.2 | No reason stated | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S70.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S70.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S71.1 | Mary Beth Taylor | | | That the Silverstream Spur be zoned Natural Open Space only in its entirety free of any roads, infrastructure corridors and free of any housing<br><br>Seek following for the Silverstream Spur:<br>i. Protect and enhance the draft SNA areas.<br>i. Protect and enhance the draft SAL areas (the entire Spur).<br>ii. Add the Sylvan Way public reserve land to the Silverstream Spur.<br>iii. Stop the Kiln Street paper road and add this land to the Silverstream Spur. | Accept in part | 5, 6, 7 and 10 |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S71.1 | Spur to be a reserve | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S71.1 | Support:<br>- Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>- Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur.<br>- Stop Kiln Street paper road and add this land to the Spur<br>- Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S71.1 | Support:<br>- Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>- Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur.<br>- Stop Kiln Street paper road and add this land to the Spur<br>- Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development | | |
| S71.2 | Mary Beth Taylor | Oppose | | That the Silverstream Spur to be free of any roads, infrastructure corridors.<br><br>Seek the following actions for the Silverstream Spur:<br><br>i. Create public access via Sylvan Way similar to Ecclesfield Reserve in Pinehaven.<br>ii. Create tracks designed for good accessibility for a range of ages and abilities. | Reject | 8 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | iii. Create basic amenities (toilets, water, benches).<br>iv. 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. | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S71.2 | No road on a reserve | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S71.2 | Support:<br>- Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation and customary purposes.<br>- 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<br>Do not support:<br>Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S71.2 | Support:<br>- Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation and customary purposes.<br>- 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<br>Do not support:<br>Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S71.3 | Mary Beth Taylor | Neutral | | Seek the following actions for the Silverstream Spur:<br>i. To remain in community ownership.<br>ii. Protect and enhance the draft SAL areas (the entire Spur).<br>iii. 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 | 4, 5 and 10 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Support | S71.3 | Agree with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | | Support | S71.3 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S71.3 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S71.3 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | | Support | S71.3 | Agree with all points in the submission | | |
| FS16 – Forest and Bird | | Support | S71.3 | 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 | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Act would be appropriate in light of the original intention of the purchase of the land. | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Support | S71.3 | Spur to be a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S71.3 | 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.<br>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.<br>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 | S71.3 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | Support | S71.3 | Support the view to the Spur being designated a reserve under the Reserve Act. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S71.3 | Support the view to the Spur being designated a reserve under the Reserve Act. | | |
| S72.1 | Peter Ross | Seek amendments | To declare the Silverstream Spur, in its entirety, as a public open space.<br><br>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.<br><br>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 | 5, 6 and 7 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | Support | S72.1 | Agree with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | Support | S72.1 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | Support | S72.1 | Agree with submitter | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | Support | S72.1 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | Support | S72.1 | Agree with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Support | S72.1 | My submission | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S72.1 | 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 Spur as a reserve but they were not followed through with. It needs to happen this time around. | | |
| FS20 – Caleb Scott | Support | S72.1 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | Support | S72.1 | Support:<br>- 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<br>- Submitter's concerns around the public possibly ending up funding a plan change and infrastructure for a private developer<br>- Submitter's concerns around the GTC submission request to build a road through the Spur<br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S72.1 | Support:<br>- 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<br>- Submitter's concerns around the public possibly ending up funding a plan change and infrastructure for a private developer<br>- Submitter's concerns around the GTC submission request to build a road through the Spur<br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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 | 6 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Support | S73.1 | Spur to be a reserve | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | Support | S73.1 | Support:<br>- Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>- Give the Spur Reserve status and protect forever<br>- Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S73.1 | Support:<br>- Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>- Give the Spur Reserve status and protect forever<br>- Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development | | |
| S73.2 Shayne Fairbrother | Oppose | | Opposition to the creation of a transport corridor being built through the Silverstream Spur area outlined in PC49. | | 8 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | Support | S73.2 | Agree with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | Support | S73.2 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | Support | S73.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | Support | S73.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | Support | S73.2 | Agree with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Support | S73.2 | No road on a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S73.2 | 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.<br>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.<br>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 | S73.2 | No reason stated | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S73.2 | 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. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S73.2 | 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. | | |
| 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 | 6 |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S74.1 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S74.1 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S74.1 | Spur to be a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S74.1 | 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. | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S74.1 | 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 | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S74.1 | 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 | | |
| S74.2 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc | Seek amendment | | Seek that either policy NOSZ-P6 is deleted, or, provided that the effects management hierarchy in policy 7 is amended in line with our submission, retain policy 6, with the below amendments: | Accept in Part | 13 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (Forest and Bird) - Amelia Geary | | | • NOSZ-P6 Silverstream Spur Infrastructure<br>Only consider enabling ~~Enable~~ 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<br>1. Provide for a range of passive recreation opportunities; and<br>~~2. Support for the development of the Southern Growth Area;~~<br>where the effects of such development are managed in accordance with NOSZ-P7 | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support in part | S74.2 | 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, | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support in part | S74.2 | 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, | | |
| FS12 – The Guildford Timber Company | | Support in part | S74.2 | 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.<br><br>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-owned, need not be zoned open space in order to advance native regeneration programmes.<br><br>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 | S74.2 | 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. | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S74.2 | 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<br>- 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<br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S74.2 | Support:<br>- 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<br>- 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<br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S74.3 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Amelia Geary | Seek amendment | Amend policy NOSZ-P7 to clarify that this is an additional consideration not an alternative to other NOSZ policy.<br>NOSZ-P7 Silverstream Spur Natural Area Protect the biodiversity values of Silverstream Spur Significant Natural Areas identified on Map XX by requiring ~~A~~adverse effects from development to: ~~on the identified Silverstream Spur Significant Natural Areas shall be~~:<br>(a) ~~avoided where practicable; and~~ Avoid the following adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity:<br>(i) Loss of ecosystem representation and extent; (ii) Disruption to sequences, mosaics or ecosystem function;<br>(iii) Fragmentation or loss of buffering or connectivity within the SNAs and between other indigenous habitats and ecosystems; and<br>(iv) A reduction in population size or occupancy of threatened species using the SNAs for any part of their life cycle.<br>(b) ~~where adverse effects cannot be demonstrably avoided, they are mitigated where practicable; and~~ Avoid other adverse effects as far as possible; and<br>(c) ~~where adverse effects cannot be demonstrably mitigated, they are remedied where practicable; and~~ Minimise adverse effects on the identified biodiversity values where avoidance under (b) is not possible; | Accept in part | 13 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | (d) ~~where more than minor residual adverse effects cannot be demonstrably avoided, minimised, or remedied, biodiversity offsetting is provided where possible; and~~ Remedy adverse effects where they cannot be avoided or minimised under (b) and (c); and (e) if biodiversity offsetting is not appropriate, the development itself is avoided. | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S74.3 | Respect for the submitter's expertise in this area | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S74.3 | Respect for the submitter's expertise in this area | | |
| FS12 – The Guildford Timber Company | | Oppose | S74.3 | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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. | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S74.3 | 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. | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S74.3 | Support to protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S74.3 | Support to protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | | |
| S74.4 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection | Seek amendment | | The Variation needs to include a definition of biodiversity offsetting, which includes a requirement that an offset proposed meets the | Accept in part | 13 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Amelia Geary | | | principles of offsetting. These should be included in an appendix to the Plan and should be mandatory (rather than guidance). | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S74.4 | Respect for the submitter's expertise in this area | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S74.4 | Respect for the submitter's expertise in this area | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S74.4 | DO support:<br>Inclusion of a definition of 'biodiversity off-setting' | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S74.4 | DO support:<br>Inclusion of a definition of 'biodiversity off-setting' | | |
| S74.5 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Amelia Geary | Oppose | | Seek deletion of Controlled Activity Rule R15. | Reject | 13 |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S74.5 | Respect for the submitter's expertise in this area | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S74.5 | Respect for the submitter's expertise in this area | | |
| S74.6 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Amelia Geary | Support | | Retain NOSZ-R22. | Accept in part | 13 |
| 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. | ~~Reject~~<br>Accept in part | 13 |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S74.7 | Respect for the submitter's expertise in this area | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S74.7 | Respect for the submitter's expertise in this area | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| S74.8 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Amelia Geary | 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 in part | 7 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Support | S74.8 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | | Support | S74.8 | Not stated | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | | Support | S74.8 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS20 – Caleb Scott | | Support | S74.8 | No reason stated | | |
| S75.1 | Polly Forrest | Support | | To declare the Silverstream Spur a Natural Open Space and become a protected reserve. | Reject | 5 and 6 |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S75.1 | Spur to be a reserve | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S75.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S75.1 | Support to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space | | |
| S75.2 | Polly Forrest | Oppose | | No road or residential development. The road must not happen. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Support | S75.2 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | | Support | S75.2 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S75.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S75.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | | Support | S75.2 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S75.2 | No road on a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S75.2 | 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.<br>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 | S75.2 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | Support | S75.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S75.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S76.1 Kate Hunter | Oppose | | That Silverstream Spur is rezoned as Natural Open Space.<br><br>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 | 6 and 7 |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Support | S76.1 | Spur to be a reserve | FS18 – Peter Ross | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | Support | S76.1 | Support:<br>- Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>- Submitter's view that the Silverstream Spur forms part of a larger national conservation movement including public education and awareness of ecological values<br>- Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | FS23 – Tony Chad | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S76.1 | Support:<br>- Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>- Submitter's view that the Silverstream Spur forms part of a larger national conservation movement including public education and awareness of ecological values<br>- Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | |
| S76.2 Kate Hunter | Oppose | | That a transport corridor is not approved, rather a decision is made to explore alternative access mechanisms. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | Support | S76.2 | Agree with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | Support | S76.2 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | Support | S76.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | Support | S76.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | Support | S76.2 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Support | S76.2 | No road on a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S76.2 | 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.<br>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.<br>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 | S76.2 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | Support | S76.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S76.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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.<br><br>Seek the following actions for the Silverstream Spur:<br><br>i. Protect and enhance the draft SNA areas.<br>ii. Protect and enhance the draft SAL areas on the entire Spur.<br>iii. Add the Sylvan Way public reserve land to the Silverstream Spur.<br>iv. Stop the Kiln Street paper road. Add this land to the Silverstream Spur.<br>v. Create public access via Sylvan Way similar to Ecclesfield Reserve in Pinehaven, Wi Tako Ngatata Scenic Reserve, Keith George Memorial Park. | Accept in part | 5, 6 and 7 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | vi. Create tracks designed for good accessibility for a range of ages and abilities.<br>vii. Create basic amenities (toilets, water, benches).<br>viii. 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. | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S77.1 | Spur to be a reserve | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S77.1 | Support:<br>- Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>- Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur.<br>- Stop Kiln Street paper road and add this land to the Spur ☐ Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>- Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation and customary purposes.<br>View to the Spur being designated a reserve under the Reserve Act. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S77.1 | Support:<br>- Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>- Inclusion of Sylvan Heights Reserve in PC49 as a natural entrance by track to the Spur.<br>- Stop Kiln Street paper road and add this land to the Spur ☐ Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>- Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation and customary purposes.<br>- Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>- View to the Spur being designated a reserve under the Reserve Act. | | |
| 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. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Support | S77.2 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | Support | S77.2 | - Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | Support | S77.2 | - Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | Support | S77.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | Support | S77.2 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Support | S77.2 | No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S77.2 | 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.<br>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.<br>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 | S77.2 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | Support | S77.2 | Support:<br>- 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<br>- Submitter's concerns around the lack of pre-planning by GTC, communication and lack of disclosure around their development plans<br>- Submitter's view that the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur is not compatible with Natural Open Space<br>- 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. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S77.2 | Support:<br>- 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<br>- Submitter's concerns around the lack of pre-planning by GTC, communication and lack of disclosure around their development plans<br>- Submitter's view that the inclusion of a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur is not compatible with Natural Open Space<br>- 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<br><br>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 | 6 |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Support | S78.1 | Spur to be a reserve | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | Support | S78.1 | 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. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S78.1 | 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. | | |
| S78.2 Caleb Scott | Oppose | | To disallow any provisions allowing construction of a road/infrastructure corridor. | Reject | 8 |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | Support | S78.2 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | Support | S78.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | Support | S78.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | Support | S78.2 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Support | S78.2 | No road on a reserve | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S78.2 | 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.<br>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 | S78.2 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | Support | S78.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S78.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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 | 6 |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Support | S79.1 | Spur to be a reserve | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | Support | S79.1 | Support:<br>- Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>- Submitter's view that the need for Natural Open Space in the future will increase<br>- Submitter's acknowledgement that significant restoration work has already been done by Forest and Bird Upper Hutt | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S79.1 | Support:<br>- Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>- 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 | | |
| S79.2 | Upper Hutt Branch of Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Barry Wards | 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:<br><br>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) to:</u><br><br><u>1. Allow optimum ecological functioning;</u><br><u>2. Enable appropriate activities to support achieving those values and opportunities</u> | Reject | 10 |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S79.2 | No road on a reserve | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S79.2 | Support:<br>- Protect and enhance identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>- 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.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S79.2 | Support:<br>- Protect and enhance identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>- 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.<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S79.3 | Upper Hutt Branch of Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc | 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:<br><br>NOSZ-P7 – Silverstream Spur Natural Open Space – Management of Effects | Accept in part | 10 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (Forest and Bird) - Barry Wards | | Adverse effects from activities within the Silverstream Spur Natural Open Space shall:<br><br>1. Be avoided where practicable.<br><br>2. Avoid the following adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity values:<br><br>(a) Loss of ecosystem representation and extent;<br>(b) Loss or disturbance to ecosystem functioning;<br>(c) Habitat fragmentation or loss of connectivity within the open space and between other indigenous habitats and ecosystems;<br>(d) The potential for indigenous species recovery or establishment, especially through the functioning of ecological corridors; and<br>(e) Reduction in population size of indigenous flora and fauna.<br><br>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.<br><br>4. If unable to be avoided, minimise adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity values and values identified in 3 above.<br><br>5. If biodiversity offsetting is not appropriate, the activities shall be avoided. | | |
| 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 | 10 |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S79.4 | Support inclusion of a definition of 'biodiversity off-setting' | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S79.4 | Support inclusion of a definition of 'biodiversity off-setting' | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| S79.5 | Upper Hutt Branch of Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Barry Wards | Oppose | | Delete NOSZ-R15. | REject | 10 |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S79.5 | Road and associated network utility infrastructure, including storage tanks or reservoirs, are inappropriate activities on the Silverstream Spur | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S79.5 | Road and associated network utility infrastructure, including storage tanks or reservoirs, are 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 | 10 |
| S79.7 | Upper Hutt Branch of Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Barry Wards | Oppose | | Delete NOSZ-S4. | ~~Reject~~<br>Accept | 10 |
| 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 | 5 and 7 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | Support | S79.8 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | Support | S79.8 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | Support | S79.8 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | Support | S79.8 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | Support | S79.8 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S79.8 | 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.<br>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.<br>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<br>options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA. | | |
| FS20 – Caleb Scott | Support | S79.8 | 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 | 8 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | Support | S80.1 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | Support | S80.1 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | Support | S80.1 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | Support | S80.1 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | Support | S80.1 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Support | S80.1 | No road on a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support in part | S80.1 | 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 providing infrastructure to the SGA.<br>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 | S80.1 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | Support | S80.1 | Support access to GTC from Reynolds Bach Drive provided any road does not cross the Silverstream Spur at any point.<br>Removal of provision for road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S80.1 | Support access to GTC from Reynolds Bach Drive provided any road does not cross the Silverstream Spur at any point.<br>Removal of provision for road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur | | |
| S81.1 Ros Connelly | Oppose | | To remove the provision of the transport corridor. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | Support | S81.1 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | Support | S81.1 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | Support | S81.1 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | Support | S81.1 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | Support | S81.1 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Support | S81.1 | No road on a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S81.1 | 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 | S81.1 | No reason stated | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S81.1 | Support:<br>- Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>- Submitter's concerns around the SGA and the non-alignment with the NPS UD and UHCC IPI<br>- Submitter's concerns around the need to plan housing developments to mitigate the effects of accelerated climate change impacts<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S81.1 | Support:<br>- Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>- Submitter's concerns around the SGA and the non-alignment with the NPS UD and UHCC IPI<br>- Submitter's concerns around the need to plan housing developments to mitigate the effects of accelerated climate change impacts<br><br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S82.1 | The Guildford Timber Company Limited | Seek amendment | | In summary, GTC seeks that either:<br><br>1. The variation be withdrawn/rejected and PC49 continues through the schedule 1 RMA process without affecting the Silverstream Spur; or<br><br>2. The variation is subject to a comprehensive redrafting to address the matters outlined in the 'overall position' section of this submission and<br><br>3. Any alternative or consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in this submission be adopted. | ~~Reject~~<br>Accept in part | 4 |
| FS4 – Pat van Berkel | | Oppose | S82.1 | The stated overall position of GTC does not recognise:<br>a. the significant amenity value of the Silverstream Spur as framing the entrance/exit of Upper Hutt<br>b. the Spur becoming a natural bush reserve in Silverstream that will serve the huge residential developments in St Pats (and presumably the SGA) | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | c. the Spur will be a crucial link in the wildlife corridor between the Wainuiomata Mainland Island and Zealandia as the indigenous bush is restored.<br>Therefore I oppose GTC's narrow view of the Silverstream Spur which is about efficiency and effectiveness, and ignores other important values.<br><br>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. | | |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | Oppose | S82.1 | Not stated | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | Oppose | S82.1 | This party has a financial interest in this plan change | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | Oppose | S82.1 | Strongly disagree with the submitter on all points because:<br>The Silverstream Spur is public property, whereas the proposed Southern Growth Area (i.e. the Guildford Timber Company's proposed<br>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<br>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. | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | Oppose | S82.1 | Strongly disagree with the submitter on all points because:<br>The Silverstream Spur is public property, whereas the proposed Southern Growth Area (i.e. the Guildford Timber Company's proposed<br>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<br>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. | | |
| FS14 – Duigald Myers | Oppose | S82.1 | 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 | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS16 – Forest and Bird | Oppose | S82.1 | 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. | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Oppose | S82.1 | Against public spending to support a private company via a public change request | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Oppose | S82.1 | 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 principals of a democratically elected local government.<br><br>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".<br><br>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. | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | Oppose | S82.1 | Do not support:<br>- 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<br>- 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<br>- Submitter's inclusion of an overwhelming and often irrelevant amount of material in their submission<br>- This submitter expresses frustration at competing goals of 1) establishing a transport corridor and | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 2) protecting SNAs and indigenous biodiversity. The simple solution is to remove all reference to a transport corridor from PC49 Variation 1.<br><br>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."<br><br>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."<br>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 | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Oppose | S82.1 | Do not support:<br>- 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<br>- 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<br>- Submitter's inclusion of an overwhelming and often irrelevant amount of material in their submission | | |
| S82.2 | The Guildford Timber Company Limited | Seek amendment | | Amend the proposed zoning of the Silverstream Spur as follows:<br><br>1. Retain the General Residential Zone over that portion of the land subject to that zoning in the Operative Plan.<br><br>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.<br>NB - Alternative zoning options may also be appropriate. | Accept in part | 6 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 3. Consequentially delete the spatial notation labelled UH070 as shown on the proposed rezoning map. | | |
| FS4 – Pat van Berkel | | Oppose | S82.2 | 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.<br>I oppose GTC's wish to retain the General Residential Zone.<br>I oppose GTC's wish to delete UH070 off the rezoning map. | | |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Oppose | S82.2 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Oppose | S82.2 | 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 | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Oppose | S82.2 | 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 | | |
| FS16 – Forest and Bird | | Oppose | S82.2 | 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.<br>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. | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Oppose | S82.2 | Spur to be marked as a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Oppose | S82.2 | 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. | | |
| FS22 – Martin McGlue | | Oppose | S82.2 | I oppose this amendment in full. The entire Spur must be rezoned as natural open space. As was the intention of the council previously | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Oppose | S82.2 | Do not support:<br>- Submitter's desire to retain any residential zoning on the Spur | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Submitter's 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 | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Oppose | S82.2 | Do not support:<br>- Submitter's desire to retain any residential zoning on the Spur<br>- Submitter's 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 | | |
| S82.3 | The Guildford Timber Company Limited | Support in part | | Amend proposed Policy NOSZ-P6 as follows (or similar):<br><br>Enable 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:<br><br>1. provide for a range of passive recreation opportunities; ~~and~~<br><br>2. support ~~for~~ the development of the Southern Growth Area, including the construction and operation of new community water infrastructure;<br><br>3. service residential development within the Spur;<br><br>4. facilitate the revegetation of retired plantation forestry with appropriate native species. | Accept in part | 8 and 10 |
| FS4 – Pat van Berkel | | Oppose | S82.3 | I oppose GTC's wish to include a "transport corridor within the Silverstream Spur"<br>I oppose GTC's wish to include "service residential development within the Spur". | | |
| FS5 – Heather Blissett | | Oppose | S82.3 | 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 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.<br>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.<br>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.<br>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.<br>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).<br>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.<br>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 utilizinig 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 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.<br>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 | S82.3 | I oppose the entire submission. Particularly in relation to construction of a road / infrastructure corridor on the spur.<br>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 | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS7 – Carl Leenders | Oppose | S82.3 | 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!<br>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. | | |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | Oppose | S82.3 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | Strongly oppose | S82.3 | 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<br>Request for residential development on the spur. | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | Strongly oppose | S82.3 | 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<br>Request for residential development on the spur. | | |
| FS16 – Forest and Bird | Oppose | S82.3 | 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. | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Oppose | S82.3 | No public support for public spending on a road for GTC to use | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Oppose | S82.3 | Use of Guildford Land for future reservoirs.<br>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.<br>We do not support the GTC submission that an infrastructure corridor "would facilitate the removal of pines from the Spur".<br>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<br>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 | S82.3 | 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 | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | Oppose | S82.3 | Do not support:<br>- 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<br>- 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 | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | Oppose | S82.3 | Do not support:<br>- 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<br>- 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 | Reject | 7 and 13 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Oppose | S82.4 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Oppose | S82.4 | Disagree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Oppose | S82.4 | Disagree with submitter | | |
| FS16 – Forest and Bird | | Oppose | S82.4 | 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 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 | S82.4 | 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. | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Oppose | S82.4 | Do not support the submitter's vexatious and petty assertions regarding the existing draft SNA on the Spur | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Oppose | S82.4 | Do not support the submitter's vexatious and petty assertions regarding the existing draft SNA on the Spur | | |
| S82.5 | The Guildford Timber Company Limited | Seek amendment | | Amend proposed Rule NOSZ-R15, and make consequential amendments to the Network Utility, Earthworks, Transport & Parking, Ecosystems & Indigenous Biodiversity, and General Residential Chapters to address the matters summarised in the reasons for the submission immediately to the left, including:<br><br>1. Amend the wording of the rule description as follows (or similar):<br><br>Road and associated network utility infrastructure, including any associated earthworks and vegetation clearance ~~storage tanks or reservoirs~~ on the Silverstream Spur Natural Area (PT Sect 1 SO 34755, Parcel ID: 3875189)<br><br>2. Delete clause a) requiring compliance with proposed standard NOSZ-S4. | Accept in part | 13 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 3. Amend clauses b), c) and e) to establish a more objective basis for assessment at consent stage in relation to landscaping, road alignment location & design, earthworks and associated vegetation clearance.<br><br>4. Delete clauses f), g) and h).<br><br>5. Consequentially amend the Network Utility, Earthworks, Transport & Parking, Ecosystems & Indigenous Biodiversity Chapters to exclude activities subject to proposed Rule NOSZ-R15 from corresponding provisions in those chapters.<br><br>6. 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.<br>*NB – alternative drafting solutions may be appropriate for the purposes of affecting this relief.* | | |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Oppose | S82.5 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Strongly oppose | S82.5 | 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. | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Strongly oppose | S82.5 | 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. | | |
| FS16 – Forest and Bird | | Oppose | S82.5 | The SNA on Silverstream Spur does span the width of 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. | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Oppose | S82.5 | 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. | | |
| S82.6 | The Guildford Timber Company Limited | Oppose | | Delete proposed Rule NOSZ-R22 | Reject | 13 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Oppose | S82.6 | Not stated | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Oppose | S82.6 | Disagree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Oppose | S82.6 | Disagree with submitter | | |
| FS16 – Forest and Bird | | Oppose | S82.6 | 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. | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Oppose | S82.6 | No reason stated | | |
| S82.7 | NOSZ-S4 | Oppose | | Delete proposed standard NOSZ-S4 | ~~Reject~~<br>Accept | 13 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Oppose | S82.7 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support in part | S82.7 | 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<br>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 | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support in part | S82.7 | 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<br>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 | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | | Oppose | S82.7 | 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. | | |
| FS16 – Forest and Bird | | Support in part/ oppose in part | S82.7 | 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. | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Oppose | S82.7 | 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<br>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 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 | S82.7 | No reason stated | | |
| 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 | 6 and 7 |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S83.1 | Spur to be a reserve | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S83.1 | DO support:<br>- Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S83.1 | DO support:<br>- Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.<br>Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development | | |
| S83.2 | Pam Hurly | Oppose | | To withdraw any intention to establish a transport corridor. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Support | S83.2 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | | Support | S83.2 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S83.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S83.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | | Support | S83.2 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S83.2 | No road on a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S83.2 | 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.<br>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<br>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.<br>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<br>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. | Reject | 8 |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S84.1 | No road on a reserve | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S84.1 | DO NOT Support:<br>Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S84.1 | DO NOT Support:<br>Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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 | 5 and 6 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Support | S84.2 | Agree with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | | Support | S84.2 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S84.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S84.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | | Support | S84.2 | Agree with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S84.2 | Spur to be a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S84.2 | 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.<br>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<br>options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA. | | |
| FS20 – Caleb Scott | | Support | S84.2 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S84.2 | DO support:<br>Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space, retain as a reserve | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S84.2 | DO support:<br>Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space, retain as a reserve | | |
| S85.1 | D Garland | 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 Silverstream Spur. | Rejected | 8 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Support | S85.1 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | | Support | S85.1 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S85.1 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S85.1 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | | Support | S85.1 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S85.1 | Spur to be a reserve. No road on a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S85.1 | 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 | S85.1 | No reason stated | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S85.1 | Support:<br>- 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<br>- Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>- Submitter's gratitude that UHCC is finally working toward realising the Spur as Natural Open Space as per original designation<br>- 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<br>- Submitter's concern over the negative ecological impacts that a road/infrastructure corridor will have on the Spur<br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S85.1 | Support:<br>- 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<br>- Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.<br>- Submitter's gratitude that UHCC is finally working toward realising the Spur as Natural Open Space as per original designation<br>- 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<br>- Submitter's concern over the negative ecological impacts that a road/infrastructure corridor will have on the Spur<br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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.<br><br>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. | | 5 and 6 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S86.1 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S86.1 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S86.1 | Spur to be a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S86.1 | 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. | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S86.1 | Support:<br>- 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<br>- Submitter's desire for UHCC to begin the process to formalise the Spur as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977<br>- Submitter's indication that having the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space will provide a needed buffer for the Silverstream Railway | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S86.1 | Support:<br>- 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<br>- Submitter's desire for UHCC to begin the process to formalise the Spur as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977<br>- Submitter's indication that having the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space will provide a needed buffer for the Silverstream Railway | | |
| S86.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | | To remove all provisions for a road/transport and/or network utility infrastructure corridor on any part of the Silverstream Spur. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Support | S86.2 | Agree with all points in the submission | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S86.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S86.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S86.2 | No road on a reserve | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S86.2 | 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<br>options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA. | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S86.2 | Support:<br>- Submitter's concern over the negative ecological impacts that a road/infrastructure corridor will have on the Spur<br>- Submitter's assertion that a road through the middle of the Spur is not required for access to a recreational reserve<br>- Submitter's assertion that a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur would be destructive and not compatible with it being a Natural Open Space<br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S86.2 | Support:<br>- Submitter's concern over the negative ecological impacts that a road/infrastructure corridor will have on the Spur<br>- Submitter's assertion that a road through the middle of the Spur is not required for access to a recreational reserve<br>- Submitter's assertion that a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur would be destructive and not compatible with it being a Natural Open Space<br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S86.3 | Significant Natural Areas | 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 | 7 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Support | S86.3 | Agree with all points in the submission | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S86.3 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S86.3 | Agree with submitter | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S86.3 | 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. | | |
| S86.4 | General | 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 | 4 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Support | S86.4 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | | Support | S86.4 | Not stated | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | | Support | S86.4 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S86.4 | 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. | | |
| FS20 – Caleb Scott | | Support | S86.4 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S86.4 | DO support:<br>Submitter's call to put together a reference group to plan for the future of the Silverstream Spur | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S86.4 | DO support:<br>Submitter's call to put together a reference group to plan for the future of the Silverstream Spur | | |
| 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 | 5 |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | | Spur to be a reserve | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | | Support:<br>- 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<br>- Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development and ensure that mapping includes the total extent | | |
| 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<br>- Protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development and ensure that mapping includes the total extent | | |
| S87.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | | To remove provision for roading and provision for access to the Southern Growth Area. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Support | S87.2 | Agree with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | | Support | S87.2 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S87.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S87.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | | Support | S87.2 | Agree with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S87.2 | No road on a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S87.2 | 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<br>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.<br>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<br>options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA. | | |
| FS20 – Caleb Scott | | Support | S87.2 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S87.2 | DO support:<br>Submitter's concern over funding of a potential developer's road<br>DO NOT Support:<br>Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S87.2 | DO support:<br>Submitter's concern over funding of a potential developer's road | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | DO NOT Support:<br>Site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S88.1 | Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | | To zone the entire Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space. | Accept | 6 |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S88.1 | Agree with submitter and petition | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S88.1 | Agree with submitter and petition | | |
| FS15 – Fraser Robertson | | Support | S88.1 | We should be making efforts to protect Silverstream spur and it's ecosystem, wildlife along with it's 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 | | |
| FS16 - Forest and Bird | | Support | S88.1 | Zoning Silverstream Spur as NOS would meet UHCC's obligations under the Emissions Reduction Plan and s7(i) of the RMA. | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S88.1 | Per the petition | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S88.1 | 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 | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S88.1 | 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 | | |
| 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. | Reject | 8 |
| FS7 – Christian Woods | | Support | S88.2 | I support the entire submission.<br>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 | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S88.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S88.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS16 – Forest and Bird | | Support | S88.2 | 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. | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Support | S88.2 | No road on a reserve | | |
| FS21 – June Harwood | Support | S88.2 | I oppose any development or transport corridor. Leave it as it is. A natural environment | | |
| FS22 – Martin McGlue | Support | S88.2 | 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 a open space for all as is evidenced by the large amount of supporting documents in this submission | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | Support | S88.2 | Support:<br>- Submitter's assertion that a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur would be destructive and not compatible with it being a Natural Open Space<br>- 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<br>- Submitter's concern that a proposed road/infrastructure corridor though the Spur would damage Silverstream Railway's ability to operate<br>- Submitter's concerns over reverse sensitivity and complaints if a road/infrastructure corridor is permitted through the Spur<br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S88.2 | Support:<br>- Submitter's assertion that a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur would be destructive and not compatible with it being a Natural Open Space<br>- 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 though the Spur would damage Silverstream Railway's ability to operate<br>- Submitter's concerns over reverse sensitivity and complaints if a road/infrastructure corridor is permitted through the Spur<br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| 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 | 5 |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S88.3 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S88.3 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS16 – Forest and Bird | | Support | S88.3 | 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. | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S88.3 | Support submitter's desire for UHCC to begin the process to formalise the Spur as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977 | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S88.3 | Support submitter's desire for UHCC to begin the process to formalise the Spur as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977 | | |
| 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 | 7 |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S88.4 | Agree with submitter. SEE ALSO SOH FULL SUBMISSION – APPENDIX 2 - REVIEW OF Boffa Miskell ecological assessment by Forestry Ecologist John Campbell | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S88.4 | Agree with submitter. SEE ALSO SOH FULL SUBMISSION – APPENDIX 2 - REVIEW OF Boffa Miskell ecological assessment by Forestry Ecologist John Campbell | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S88.4 | Support to protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development and ensure that mapping includes the total extent including the streams | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S88.4 | Support to protect identified significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development and ensure that mapping includes the total extent including the streams | | |
| S88.5 | Silver Stream Railway | 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 | Reject | 10 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Incorporated | | | 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. | | |
| FS12 – The Guildford Timber Company | | Oppose | S88.5 | 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.<br>GTC does not consider that there is any evidential or technical basis for the imposition of such an overlay.<br>Submission point S88.5 is accordingly opposed. | | |
| FS16 – Forest and Bird | | Support | S88.5 | Including Silverstream Spur as a Special Amenity Landscape would be consistent with UHCC's obligations under s7(c) of the RMA. | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S88.5 | DO support:<br>Submitter's call for the Silverstream Spur to be designated a SAL (Special Amenity Landscape) | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S88.5 | DO support:<br>Submitter's call for the Silverstream Spur to be designated a SAL (Special Amenity Landscape) | | |
| 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 | 4 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Support | S88.6 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | | Support | S88.6 | Not stated | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | | Support | S88.6 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS16 – Forest and Bird | | Support | S88.6 | Forest & Bird would be interested in being part of a stewardship group. | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S88.6 | No reasons given. Original submission is their own. | | |
| FS20 – Caleb Scott | | Support | S88.6 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S88.6 | DO support:<br>Submitter's call to put together a stewardship group to plan for the future and ongoing protection of the Silverstream Spur | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S88.6 | DO support:<br>Submitter's call to put together a stewardship group to plan for the future and ongoing protection of the Silverstream Spur | | |
| S89.1 | Lisa Marshall | Support | | To rezone the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space, leading towards the Reserves Act process. | Accept in part | 5 and 6 |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S89.1 | Spur to be a reserve | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S89.1 | 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. | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | Support | S89.1 | Support:<br>- 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<br>- Protect identified significant natural areas and biodiversity on the Silverstream Spur from development and restore indigenous biodiversity | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S89.1 | Support:<br>- 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<br>- Protect identified significant natural areas and biodiversity on the Silverstream Spur from development and restore indigenous biodiversity | | |
| S89.2 Lisa Marshall | Oppose | | To investigate alternative opportunities for transport corridor access to the Southern Growth Area. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | Support | S89.2 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | Support | S89.2 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | Support | S89.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | Support | S89.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | Support | S89.2 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Support | S89.2 | No road on a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support in part | S89.2 | 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<br>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.<br>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 | S89.2 | Support access to GTC from Reynolds Bach Drive provided any road does not cross the Silverstream Spur at any point.<br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S89.2 | Support access to GTC from Reynolds Bach Drive provided any road does not cross the Silverstream Spur at any point.<br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49. | | |
| S90.1 | Rhys Lloyd | Support | | To rezone the Spur as Natural Open Space. | Accept | 6 |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S90.1 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S90.1 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S90.1 | Spur to be a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S90.1 | 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. | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S90.1 | 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 | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S90.1 | 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 | | |
| 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. | Reject | 8 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | | No road on a reserve | | |
| 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. | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49 | | |
| FS24 - Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49 | | |
| 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 | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S90.3 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | | Support | S90.3 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S90.3 | 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<br>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<br>enhance these areas in perpetuity. | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S90.3 | Support to identify and protect significant natural areas and biodiversity on the Silverstream Spur from development and ensure that mapping includes the total extent | | |
| Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S90.3 | Support to identify and protect significant natural areas and biodiversity on the Silverstream Spur from development and ensure that mapping includes the total extent | | |
| S90.4 | Rhys Lloyd | Seek amendment | | Introduce a Special Amenity Landscape overlay on the entire Spur. | Reject | 10 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Support | S90.4 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | | Support | S90.4 | Not stated | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | | Support | S90.4 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S90.4 | The Spur easily meets the threshold as a SAL area, this overlay should be added to the zoning change and SNA's. | | |
| FS20 – Caleb Scott | | Support | S90.4 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S90.4 | Support submitter's call for the Silverstream Spur to be designated a SAL (Special Amenity Landscape) | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S90.4 | Support submitter's call for the Silverstream Spur to be designated a SAL (Special Amenity Landscape) | | |
| 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 | 5 and 6 |
| FS2 – Beatrice McCaul | | Support | S91.1 | I support the rezoning of the Spur as "Natural Open Space" | | |
| FS3 – Shirley Anne Taylor | | Support | S91.1 | As outlined in the Save our Hills submission | | |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Support | S91.1 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S91.1 | Spur to be a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | | Support | S91.1 | 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 to their claim that "the spur was<br>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 | | |
| 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 | | |
| S91.2 | Save our Hills | Support with amendment | | To protect the identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development and protect the remainder of | Accept in part | 5 and 7 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (Upper Hutt) Incorporated | | | the entire 35ha of Silverstream Spur from development. Regenerate the entire Spur with native plants and bush. | | |
| FS3 – Shirley Anne Taylor | | Support | | As outlined in the Save our Hills submission | | |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Support | | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | | Spur to be a reserve | | |
| 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<br>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<br>enhance these areas in perpetuity. | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | | Support:<br>- 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<br>- 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. | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | | Support:<br>- 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<br>- 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. | | |
| 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.<br><br>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. | Reject | 8 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS2 – Beatrice McCaul | Support | S91.3 | Environmental and safety issues. The road proposed is the first step for upcoming building residential properties along Pinehaven hills which I highly oppose | | |
| FS3 – Shirley Anne Taylor | Support | S91.3 | As outlined in the Save our Hills submission | | |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | Support | S91.3 | Agree with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Support | S91.3 | No road on a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S91.3 | 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. | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | Support | S91.3 | Support Submitter's concerns over the lack of information, detail, feasibility study around the GTC proposal for a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur<br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49 | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S91.3 | Support Submitter's concerns over the lack of information, detail, feasibility study around the GTC proposal for a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur<br>Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur. Remove from PC49 | | |
| 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 | 8 |
| FS3 – Shirley Anne Taylor | support | S91.4 | As outlined in the Save our Hills submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | Support | S91.4 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | Support | S91.4 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | Support | S91.4 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | Support | S91.4 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS14 – Duigald Myers | Support | S91.4 | Submission supported in total. I agree in total with the reasoning | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S91.4 | 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<br>options for accessing and providing infrastructure to the SGA. | | |
| FS20 – Caleb Scott | | Support | S91.4 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S91.4 | Support 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 | S91.4 | Support:provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation and customary purposes | | |
| S92.1 | Rachel Stuart | Support | | That the Silverstream Spur be rezoned as Natural Open Space.<br><br>To designate the Spur as a reserve (Reserves Act 1977). | Accept in part | 5 and 6 |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S92.1 | Spur to be a reserve | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S92.1 | Support:<br>- 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<br>- 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<br>- 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 | S92.1 | Support:<br>- 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<br>- 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<br>- Provision of site-specific provisions to provide track access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation and customary purposes. | | |
| S92.2 | Rachel Stuart | Oppose | | That the Silverstream Spur remains exclusively Natural Open Space, with no transport corridor (now or in the future). | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Support | S92.2 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | | Support | S92.2 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | | Support | S92.2 | Agree with submitter | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | Support | S92.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | Support | S92.2 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Support | S92.2 | No road on a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S92.2 | 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.<br>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 | S92.2 | No reason stated | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | Support | S92.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur ("Now or in the future"). Remove from PC49 | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S92.2 | Do not support site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur ("Now or in the future"). Remove from PC49 | | |
| S93.1 (late) Ngāti Toa Rangitira | 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 | 6 |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | Support | S93.1 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | Support | S93.1 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support in part | S93.1 | 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.<br>I seek that this part of the submission be allowed. | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | Support | S93.1 | Support:<br>- 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 | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S93.1 | Support:<br>- Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>- Submitter's intention to protect cultural, ecological and environmental values in the District Plan from inappropriate subdivision and development | | |
| 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 Silverstream Spur. | Accept in part | 12 |
| 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 in part | 13 |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S93.3 | Support submitter's request to add NOSZ-22 to further protect indigenous vegetation | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S93.3 | Support submitter's request to add NOSZ-22 to further protect indigenous vegetation | | |
| 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 | 11 |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S93.4 | 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 | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | | Support | S93.4 | 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 | | |
| 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. | Accept in part | 4 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | | Support | S93.5 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | | Support | S93.5 | Not stated | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | | Support | S93.5 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| 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 | 6 |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | | Support | S94.1 | Spur to be a reserve | | |
| FS23 – Tony Chad | | Support | S94.1 | Support:<br>- 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 | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | Support | S94.1 | Support:<br>- Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space<br>Protect identified significant natural areas and biodiversity on the Silverstream Spur from development and restore indigenous biodiversity | | |
| 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. | Reject | 8 |
| FS8 – Helen Chapman | Support | S94.2 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS9 – Graham Bellamy | Support | S94.2 | Not stated | | |
| FS10 – Save our Hills | Support | S94.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS11 – Susan Pattinson | Support | S94.2 | Agree with submitter | | |
| FS13 – Duncan Stuart | Support | S94.2 | Agreed with all points in the submission | | |
| FS18 – Peter Ross | Support | S94.2 | No road on a reserve | | |
| FS19 – Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Support | S94.2 | 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.<br>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 | | |
| 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 | | |
| FS24 – Mary Beth Taylor | 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 | | |