



Te Kaunihera o
Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta
Upper Hutt City Council

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 49

Open Spaces—Variation 1

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

FEBRUARY 2023



Guide to Submission Summary

The following format is used to summarise submissions received on Variation 1 to Proposed Plan Change 49 – Silverstream Spur:

| Submission Point | Provision | Support/Oppose/Seek amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|-----------------|---------|
| Submitter xx | | | | |
| S1.1 | | | | |

These submissions are ordered by submitter number. Each decision requested by a submitter is individually listed (SX.X)

The accompanying volume “Submissions on Variation 1 to Proposed Plan Change 49 – Silverstream Spur” contains full copies of the submissions received on Variation 1 – Silverstream Spur.

Where the submitter proposes an amendment to the proposed new or existing text or provision, the amendment proposed by the submitter is shown underlined. Where the submitter proposes the deletion of proposed new or existing text, this is shown ~~striketrough~~.

Making a Further Submission

Clause 8 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act outlines the persons that may make a further submission, being:

- (a) any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; and,
- (b) any person that has an interest in the proposed plan greater than the interest that the general public has; and
- (c) the local authority itself.

A further submission must be in support of or in opposition to the submissions that have already been made and which are summarised in this document.

Further submissions should be made in writing, in general accordance with Form 6 of the Resource Management Act (Forms, Fees, and Procedure) Regulations 2003. Copies of Form 6 are available from:

- HAPAI Building, 879- 881 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt
- Upper Hutt Library, 844 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt
- Pinehaven Branch Library, corner of Pinehaven Road and Jocelyn Crescent, Pinehaven, Upper Hutt
- On the Plan Change webpage at letskorero.upperhuttcity.com/pc49

Further submissions may be lodged in the following ways:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------|--|
| Online | letskorero.upperhuttcity.com/pc49 | Email | planning@uhcc.govt.nz |
| In Person | HAPAI Building 879- 881 Fergusson Drive Upper Hutt | Post | Variation 1 to Proposed Plan Change 49 – Silverstream Spur Upper Hutt City Council Private Bag 907 Upper Hutt 5140 |

| Submitter No. | Submitter name | Address for service |
|----------------------|--|--|
| 1 | Bob Alkema | 30 Sylvan Way, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 2 | Doug Fauchelle | 28 York Avenue, Heretaunga, Upper Hutt 5018 |
| 3 | Stuart Grant | 135 Pinehaven Road, Pinehaven, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 4 | Caroline Woollams | 22 Chatsworth Road, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 5 | Lynda Joines | 8B Sierra Way, Blue Mountains, Upper Hutt 5371 |
| 6 | Stephen Butler | 8B Sierra Way, Blue Mountains, Upper Hutt 5371 |
| 7 | Helen Chapman | 38B Field Street, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 8 | Craig Thorn | 25 Sierra Way, Blue Mountains, Upper Hutt 5371 |
| 9 | Duncan Stuart | 1 Chalfont Road, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 10 | Logan McLean | 26B Field Street, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 11 | Carl Leenders | 86 Field Street, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 12 | Jonathan Board | 66 Chatsworth Road, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 13 | Adam Ricketts | 8 Heretaunga Square, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 14 | Howie Rait | 3 Kurth Crescent, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 15 | Lisa Clephane | 21 Deller Grove, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 16 | Herenga ā Nuku/Outdoor Access Commission- David Barnes | PO Box 11181, Manners Street, Wellington 6142 |
| 17 | Kelsey Fly | 82 Pinehaven Road, Pinehaven, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 18 | Silverstream Retreat – John Ross | PO Box 30526, Lower Hutt, 5040 |
| 19 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | PO Box 11646, Manners Street, Wellington 6142 |
| 20 | Colin Rickerby | 11 Dunleith Grove, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 21 | Michael Gray | 44 Aniseed Grove, Timberlea, Upper Hutt 5018 |
| 22 | Jane Derbyshire | 26B Field Street, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 23 | John D O'Malley | PO Box 40 812, Upper Hutt 5140 |
| 24 | Nancy Bramley-Thompson | 4 Moehau Grove, Trentham, Upper Hutt 5018 |

| Submitter No. | Submitter name | Address for service |
|----------------------|----------------------------|--|
| 25 | Maurice Berrington | 36 Aniseed Grove, Timberlea, Upper Hutt 5018 |
| 26 | Ian Price | 2 Sylvan Way, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 27 | Doug Johnston | 1166E Maymorn Road, Maymorn, Upper Hutt 5018 |
| 28 | Lance Hurly | 24 Harewood Grove, Pinehaven, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 29 | Peter Zajac | 155 Pinehaven Road, Pinehaven, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 30 | Laura Johnston | 155 Pinehaven Road, Pinehaven, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 31 | W Gibson | 29 Somerby Mews, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 32 | Tom Halliburton | 95 Wyndham Road, Pinehaven, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 33 | Calvin Berg | 69/20 Racecourse Road, Trentham, Upper Hutt 5018 |
| 34 | John Durry | 17 Titoki Crescent, Pirimai, Napier 4112 |
| 35 | Graham Bellamy | 16 Morepork Close, Riverglade, Upper Hutt, 5018 |
| 36 | Chris and Julie Manu | 7 Sylvan Way, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 37 | Cathy Price | 2 Sylvan Way, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 38 | Gerald and Carleen Bealing | 90/20 Racecourse Road, Trentham, Upper Hutt 5018 |
| 39 | Jennifer Durry | 17 Titoki Crescent, Pirimai, Napier 4112 |
| 40 | Stephen Bell | 11 Milton Street, Trentham, Upper Hutt 5018 |
| 41 | Bob McLellan | 7 Paton Street, Maymorn, Upper Hutt 5018 |
| 42 | Pat van Berkel | 95 Elmslie Road, Pinehaven, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 43 | Heather Frances Beckman | Unit 11, 31 Verbena Road, Birkdale, Auckland 0626 |
| 44 | Lynne McLellan | 7 Paton Street, Maymorn, Upper Hutt 5018 |
| 45 | John Pepper | 24 Courtenay Road, Heretaunga, Upper Hutt 5018 |
| 46 | Chris Cosslett | 54 Elmslie Road, Pinehaven, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 47 | Allan Sheppard | 64 Plateau Road, Te Marua, Upper Hutt 5018 |
| 48 | Donald Keith Skerman | 31 Blue Mountains Road, Pinehaven, Upper Hutt 5019 |

| Submitter No. | Submitter name | Address for service |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 49 | Rick Wheeler | 16 Sylvan Way, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 50 | Abbie Spiers | 148 Pinehaven Road, Pinehaven, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 51 | Derek Reeves | 32 Field Street, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 52 | Phil Hancock | 19 Jocelyn Crescent, Pinehaven, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 53 | Steven Robertson | 6a Chatsworth Road, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 54 | Suilva Fay McIntyre | 18 Harewood Grove, Pinehaven, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 55 | Jason Durry | 21 Rosina Street, Clouston Park, Upper Hutt 5018 |
| 56 | Quintin Towler | 1 Petherick Street, Taita, Lower Hutt 5011 |
| 57 | Christian Woods | 4 Titoki Road, Raumati Beach, Paraparaumu 5032 |
| 58 | Marie Harris | 121 Major Drive, Kelson, Lower Hutt 5010 |
| 59 | Nadine Ebbett | 21 Rosina Street, Clouston Park, Upper Hutt 5018 |
| 60 | Ben Jones | 122c Martin Street, Wallaceville, Upper Hutt 5018 |
| 61 | Scott Fitzgerald | 229 Riverside Drive, Waterloo, Lower Hutt 5011 |
| 62 | Martin E McHue | F6/ 8 Tawai Street, Trentham, Upper Hutt 5018 |
| 63 | Trevor Richardson | 62 Ava Street, Petone, Lower Hutt 5012 |
| 64 | Elizabeth Maria Christensen | 62 Elmslie Road, Pinehaven, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 65 | Janice Nancy Carey | 22 Harewood Grove, Pinehaven, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 66 | Anthony Carey | 22 Harewood Grove, Pinehaven, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 67 | Lynette Elizabeth Smith | 33 Sunbrae Drive, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 68 | Leo Parnell Smith | 33 Sunbrae Drive, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 69 | Heather Blissett | C/- 2 Gybe Place, Whitby, Porirua 5024 |
| 70 | Katelin Hardgrave | 14 Gribble Grove, Stokes Valley, Lower Hutt 5019 |
| 71 | Mary Beth Taylor | 165a Katherine Mansfield Drive, Whitemans Valley, Upper Hutt 5371 |
| 72 | Peter Ross | 11 Birch Grove, Pinehaven, Upper Hutt 5019 |

| Submitter No. | Submitter name | Address for service |
|----------------------|--|---|
| 73 | Shayne Fairbrother | 12 Sylvan Way, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 74 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Amelia Geary | PO Box 631, Wellington 6140 |
| 75 | Polly Forrest | 7 Dunrobin Grove, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 76 | Kate Hunter | 54 Elmslie Road, Pinehaven, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 77 | Tony Chad | 165a Katherine Mansfield Drive, Whitemans Valley, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 78 | Caleb Scott | 3 Adventure Drive, Whitby, Porirua 5024 |
| 79 | Upper Hutt Branch of Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Barry Wards | C/- 14 Cruickshank Road, Clouston Park, Upper Hutt 5018 |
| 80 | John Campbell | 2 Harewood Grove, Pinehaven, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 81 | Ros Connelly | 19 Penny Lane, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 82 | The Guildford Timber Company Limited | C/- Kendons, PO Box 31045, Lower Hutt 5040 |
| 83 | Pam Hurly | 24 Harewood Grove, Pinehaven, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 84 | Wayne Dolden | 70 Maymorn Road, Te Marua, Upper Hutt 5018 |
| 85 | D Garland | 13 Cezanne Grove, Rolleston 7614 |
| 86 | Simon Edmonds | 17 Whiorau Grove, Lowry Bay, Lower Hutt 5013 |
| 87 | David Grant-Taylor | 14 Collingwood Street, Waterloo, Lower Hutt 5011 |
| 88 | Silver Stream Railway Incorporated | Reynolds Bach Drive, Stokes Valley, Lower Hutt 5019 |
| 89 | Lisa Marshall | remutakabach@gmail.com |
| 90 | Rhys Lloyd | 3 Spyglass Lane, Whitby, Porirua 5024 |
| 91 | Save our Hills (Upper Hutt) Incorporated (SOH) | PO Box 48-070, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5142 |
| 92 | Rachel Stuart | 1 Chalfont Road, Silverstream, Upper Hutt 5019 |
| 93 | Ngāti Toa | Level 2, 1 Cobham Court, Porirua 5022 |
| 94 | Jennifer Ann Dolton | 130 Plateau Road, Te Marua, Upper Hutt 5018 |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| Submitter 1: Bob Alkema | | | | |
| S1.1 | Entire Variation | Support | The adoption of Variation 1 to Plan Change 49. | <p>This submitter states that they support the zoning of the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space as it will help protect and reinforce a natural east-west corridor across the southern end of Upper Hutt.</p> <p>They suggest a possible outcome of the change would be the ability to develop a public walkway (and possibly a cycle way) through the native bush to the south-west of Sylvan Way with possible linkages to other parts of Silverstream and Pinehaven.</p> |
| Submitter 2: Doug Fauchelle | | | | |
| S2.1 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Support with amendment | <p>To dismiss Kiln Street access as an option to the Spur and the SGA and to provide access off Reynolds Bach Drive.</p> <p>To make every effort to mitigate the visual effects of the Reynolds Bach Drive access from State Highway 2, Fergusson Drive, and Eastern Hutt Road.</p> | <p>This submitter states that Reynolds Bach Drive can be more easily developed as a primary access road and will take traffic off already congested roads in the Silverstream Village area and that indigenous vegetation will be irretrievably lost if access is made through extending Kiln Street.</p> <p>The submitter considers that access from Reynolds Bach Drive is less likely to be seen and may avoid much of the Silverstream Spur area that has iconic properties as it can be seen from SH2, Fergusson Drive and Eastern Hutt Road.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| Submitter 3: Stuart Grant | | | | |
| S3.1 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | 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. | <p>This submitter states that access to the Southern Growth Area through the Silverstream Spur provides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the most direct connectivity to arterial Eastern Hutt Road and SH2 for much needed residential development opportunities. ii. easier road access to the Silverstream Spur reserve areas which will enable a wider diversity of people to experience the flora and fauna it contains. <p>That development of the Southern Growth Area will make a case for additional service infrastructure easier to make subdivision of existing residential properties in the area less likely to overload newly expanded infrastructure.</p> <p>Without access to the Southern Growth Area through Silverstream Spur, much needed residential development opportunities will be lost or delayed.</p> <p>Future residential growth will require roading access and adding access only through other existing roads would increase traffic volumes through more residential streets which would make them less safe, cause more congestion, and negatively impact school zones at Silverstream and Pinehaven.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | Other areas of Pinehaven and Silverstream have not suffered loss of biodiversity from having roading in and around them. |
| Submitter 4: Caroline Woollams | | | | |
| S4.1 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | 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. | This submitter states that access could use the existing forest roads from Reynolds Bach Drive. |
| Submitter 5: Lynda Joines | | | | |
| S5.1 | Mapping | Support | To include the entire 35.5 ha of the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space. | This submitter seeks to zone the entirety of the Spur as Natural Open Space. |
| S5.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | 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. | They seek to prohibit any special zoning or provision for any road, infrastructure/transport corridor or similar proposal on any part of the Spur. |
| Submitter 6: Stephen Butler | | | | |
| S6.1 | Mapping | Support | To proceed with including all Silverstream Spur in Plan Change 49. | This submitter states that maintaining Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space is important both ecologically and to preserve the character of the surrounding suburbs. |
| S6.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To disallow any special zoning or provisions for any road or infrastructure/transport corridor, or similar proposal on the Spur. | They oppose the site specific provision to include a transport corridor. Maintaining Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space is important both ecologically and to preserve the character of the surrounding suburbs. |
| Submitter 7: Helen Chapman | | | | |
| S7.1 | Mapping | Seek amendment | That the Silverstream Spur is rezoned to Natural Open Space. | This submitter states that they agree with the |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>provisions to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space.</p> <p>Protect identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development, and to enable site-specific provisions to provide access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes (only).</p> <p>These spaces provide a valuable contribution to the wellbeing of the Upper Hutt community, allowing the undertaking of recreation, customary, and conservation activities in a natural setting.</p> |
| S7.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Seek amendment | That the Silverstream Spur remains exclusively Natural Open Space, with no transport corridor. | <p>This submitter disagrees with these provisions and seeks for them to be removed from the proposed plan change.</p> <p>A road corridor on Natural Open Space is contrary to the definition of the Natural Open Space Zone - <i>'to allow for activities and development of an appropriate scale to occur in identified spaces whilst conserving the natural character and associated ecological and landscape values.'</i></p> <p>Activities and development of a Natural Open Space does not include a road corridor. A road corridor through Natural Open Space will take away its natural character and associated ecological and landscape values and no longer</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | <p>allow the undertaking of recreation, customary, and conservation activities in a natural setting.</p> <p>As a road going through it, it is no longer a Natural Open Space, and instead it is a road corridor with some trees on either side which does not provide a contribution to the wellbeing of the Upper Hutt community.</p> <p>The access road will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. create immense traffic congestion to the main access to Silverstream if the proposed access to the Silverstream Spur and Southern Growth area is via Kiln Street. Increased traffic flows will further exacerbate the congestion and will make it difficult to enter and exit Silverstream. This will have a flow on effect further congesting SH2/Field Street intersection, where traffic flows are already heavy. ii. create parking pressure in Silverstream as the Southern Growth Area is on the hilltops so commuters will drive their cars down the hill, then attempt to park in Silverstream, before catching the train turning Silverstream into a parking lot from the 1000 odd additional cars from the hillside suburbs. iii. significantly increase the number of birds that are killed by cars and will |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | <p>also disrupt nesting because of the increased noise in an area which is currently peaceful and undisturbed.</p> <p>The potential subdivision in the Southern Growth Area is not in line with Regional Policy Statement (RPS Change 1) - <i>'The key to change will be thriving centres where everything you need is a 15-minute walk away, linked throughout the region by efficient public transport and active travel networks that make private car use frankly unnecessary most of the time.'</i></p> <p>The Southern Growth Area is a steep hillside suburb that will be spread over several kilometres. The entry road will be long and steep making walking access impossible, even for a person of average fitness. Therefore, private car use will be necessary most of the time and any bus route would be underutilised as residents will not catch a bus to get their groceries, catch the train, take their children to school or day-care etc.</p> <p>Waka Kotahi NZTA submitted a report to Council recently that stated that any road on the Silverstream Spur would need constant maintenance and upgrades due to the instability of the land, further adding to the ratepayer burden.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Submitter 8: Craig Thorn | | | | |
| S8.1 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | 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. | This submitter asks why the access needs to go through Silverstream via the Spur instead of the developer using the existing forestry roads to connect from Reynolds Bach Drive. They consider it a much better road than anything in Silverstream. |
| S8.2 | Public Transport | Neutral | Answer questions on Public Transport Rail commuter parking. | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> |
| Submitter 9: Duncan Stuart | | | | |
| S9.1 | Mapping and Significant Natural Areas. | Support | 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). | <p>This submitter states that the Silverstream Spur should be modelled on Polhill Reserve in Wellington which they consider a beautiful area, full of walking and biking tracks which is treasured by the community with no shortage of volunteers to plant native trees and build tracks.</p> <p>The residents of Silverstream, and Upper Hutt could build a similar place over time that would be a taonga to the city.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| | | | | They agree with the provisions to protect identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development and enable site-specific provisions to provide access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes (only). |
| S9.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | As above | <p>This submitter disagrees with these provisions due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The Spur being an important area for birds and birds will get killed by cars. ii. Housing on the hills will create immense traffic pressure in Silverstream with not enough parks for those who wish to catch the train as streets in Silverstream are already full on weekdays currently. iii. Horizontal infrastructure is expensive to maintain, especially up hills, and the cost of building will likely never get recovered from the associated rates and development contributions. iv. Waka Kotahi submitted a report to Council saying a road on the Silverstream Spur would need constant maintenance and upgrades due to the instability of the land, costing the ratepayers. <p>A Natural Open Space, with an infrastructure corridor, doesn't meet the definition of a</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| | | | | <p>Natural Open Space Zone due to the disruption that will be created by the road.</p> <p>Ratepayers should not have to pay for this road to enable development when the developer already has existing access to their land. The submitter states that they are a millennial who is deeply concerned about the housing crisis, and access to housing, but believes a development on the hill will not create affordable housing but will contribute to an infrastructure crisis that will affect our way of life forever.</p> <p>Housing on the hills will be car-dependant and cannot be adequately serviced by public transport like Riverstone or Maungaraki. People simply won't get the bus if it only comes every 30 or 60 mins and the long-term carbon footprint of this will be immense. We need to incentivise developers to go up, and not out.</p> <p>The recent slips in Stokes Valley and around the country are a stark reminder of the costs and dangers of building on hillsides.</p> <p>The proposal is not aligned with the Regional Council's RPS Change 1 which states <i>'The key to change will be thriving centres where everything you need is a 15-minute walk away, linked throughout the region by efficient public transport and active travel networks that make private car use frankly unnecessary most of the</i></p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <i>time.</i> These houses will be more than 15 minutes away, and up a steep hill. |
| Submitter 10: Logan McLean | | | | |
| S10.1 | Entire Variation | Seek amendment | <p>To see the Silverstream Spur in full protected as a Natural Open Space Zone - without the addition of a road corridor.</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>This submitter states that there are ample alternative options to access the Southern Growth Area without having to sacrifice portions of an area that was purchased as a reserve with money specifically earmarked for that purpose.</p> <p>The community have not asked for roading to be able to access this area for recreation so any suggestion that the addition of a road serves anyone other than the Guilford Timber Company is disingenuous.</p> |
| Submitter 11: Carl Leenders | | | | |
| S11.1 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To remove the ability for an access corridor to be included in the plan for the area. | <p>This submitter states that the majority of the changes proposed are great with protection of the Spur paramount.</p> <p>They oppose strongly adding a corridor and provision for access to the SGA as adding a road and other services in there would destroy the natural significance of the area.</p> |
| Submitter 12: Jonathan Board | | | | |
| 12.1 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To remove the provision for a transport corridor crossing the Spur. | This submitter states that there is no reason to provide a provision for a transport corridor for recreation, conservation, and other customary purposes, as the land has survived perfectly well without this for the last few hundred years. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>The only reason to provide immediate provisions for a transport corridor is to provide access to the Southern Growth Area and facilitate the development of the hills above Pinehaven and Silverstream which they oppose.</p> <p>Any development would destroy the habitats and migration corridors of several protected and endangered species present on the Spur and the ridge and it would fundamentally change the general character of the area by destroying the look of the hills and significantly increase the risk of flooding to the valley below according to reports generated independently of the Council.</p> <p>The entire area seems to be covered by the recently distributed PC47 for Natural Hazards, specifically high and unstable slopes; therefore, the building of a road would be significantly more costly for all ratepayers and dangerous for houses below the development.</p> |
| Submitter 13: Adam Ricketts | | | | |
| S13.1 | Mapping | Support | To rezone Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space. | <p>This submitter states that they support the rezoning which will protect the Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space for generations to come.</p> <p>The Silverstream Spur is a place of beauty and full of birdlife which could be well utilized by the community.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>Development of Silverstream Spur would be catastrophic, especially given the unchecked systematic destruction of the suburbs through development/intensification that is currently happening.</p> <p>The roading system is unable to take any more traffic as it is congested every morning and evening along Fergusson Drive, to Stokes Valley, and the motorway.</p> |
| Submitter 14: Howie Rait | | | | |
| S14.1 | Entire Variation | Seek amendment | <p>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.</p> <p>Otherwise remove all wording regarding a transport corridor and potential future access to the Southern Growth Area from the variation.</p> | <p>This submitter supports the zone change to Natural Open Space but seek amendment as they have grave reservations relating to access of the area, in that nothing has (supposedly) formally been proposed or identified.</p> <p>They do not believe this land use can be changed until access and utilization of the access has been identified for the public. There is mention of transport corridor with no further information provided.</p> |
| Submitter 15: Lisa Clephane | | | | |
| S15.1 | Entire Variation | Support | To re-zone the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space. | This submitter states that they support the re-zoning of the Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space and that the re-zoning protects the Natural Open Space and would also protect identified Significant Natural Areas. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | They also consider that it makes sense to put a road through the Spur to give access to the Southern Growth Area. |
| Submitter 16: Herenga ā Nuku/Outdoor Access Commission – David Barnes | | | | |
| S16.1 | Entire Variation | Support with amendment | <p>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.</p> <p>That consideration should also be given to identifying access to the western corner, where it is adjacent to Reynolds Bach Drive.</p> | <p>This submitter states that they commend and support the Council's proposal to set aside this land for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes.</p> <p>They suggest that this be secured for future generations by making the land a recreation reserve or scenic reserve.</p> |
| Submitter 17: Kelsey Fly | | | | |
| S17.1 | Mapping | Support | To approve the proposal to make Silverstream Spur a designated Natural Open Space. | This submitter states they fully support Council's proposal to rezone Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space as the Spur is a crucial area in the valley, both in terms of biodiversity and the potential for recreational enjoyment, for Upper Hutt residents. |
| S17.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To remove the provisions to enable infrastructure, including a transport corridor, through the Spur. | <p>They do not support the site-specific provision as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. they disagree with that the Silverstream Spur is critical to enable infrastructure including a transport corridor to access the SGA as there are already established alternatives which would not involve bisecting a Natural Open Space. ii. a road through the Spur will create many problems, including disruption |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| | | | | <p>to wildlife from traffic, road hazards and noise, as well as littering and pollution, unfortunate side effects of all thoroughfares.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Upper Hutt residents need green space more than anything with access to these spaces for future generations to enjoy with the incredible biodiversity they provide which is proven to benefit mental health. iv. it is also a critical mission for Aotearoa to protect our taonga species before it's too late and a transport corridor goes directly against these values by disrupting the natural cohesiveness of the land. v. we don't need a road to access this beautiful space - trails are more than enough, as seen in Ecclesfield Reserve, Keith George Memorial Park and similar nearby reserves. vi. an area of ecological importance, the Spur should be prioritised as a space where nature is allowed to flourish, away from transport corridors. vii. the potential for more native bush to take hold once the pines are dealt with and UHCC should focus on enhancing native flora and fauna on the Silverstream Spur. viii. the Silverstream Spur is an indispensable link to the hills across the valley, as well as other reserves in Pinehaven and Silverstream. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|---|-----------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>ix. with further roads breaking up our native bush, birds and other species will find it more difficult to establish the corridor they desperately need to thrive in this human-dominated world.</p> <p>While it is crucial that we set aside the Spur as a Natural Open Space, it is by no means necessary that we disrupt this special green space with a transport corridor.</p> <p>Protect this space for future generations to enjoy the natural world, away from infrastructure. Allow our precious native species to thrive, uninterrupted.</p> |
| Submitter 18: Silverstream Retreat – John Ross | | | | |
| S18.1 | Mapping | 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. | <p>This submitter states that this is their backyard and they do not support the zone change proposal.</p> <p>The land was once zoned for residential purposes. As the Hutt Valley population has grown the attitude towards building homes close to existing infrastructure has become more popular so the Silverstream Spur is an even more important solution to housing needs than ever before and will be more so in the future.</p> <p>They cannot find a compelling reason for this proposed zone change.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| Submitter 19: Greater Wellington Regional Council | | | | |
| S19.1 | Significant Natural Areas | Support with amendment | <p>Greater Wellington broadly supports the variation at this stage and seeks some amendments relating to the transport corridor and indigenous biodiversity provisions.</p> | <p>This submitter states that they support the protection of identified Significant Natural Areas in the Silverstream Spur plan change, as this is consistent with the Regional Policy Statement (RPS) Objective 16 and Policies 23 and 24.</p> <p>They note that the District Plan does not currently give effect to RPS Policies 23-28 to identify and protect significant indigenous biodiversity values and landscapes. Given the delay with the Tiaki Taiao Plan Change 48 for Significant Natural Areas and Landscapes, there is currently limited protection of indigenous biodiversity in the District Plan beyond indigenous vegetation clearance provisions.</p> <p>They submitted to this effect on Proposed Plan Change 49; seeking greater protection of indigenous biodiversity through the Natural Open Space Zone.</p> |
| S19.2 | NOSZ-P6 NOSZ-S4 | Support with amendment | <p>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.</p> <p>This should include providing for public transport and multi-modal and low/zero-carbon transport options along the proposed transport corridor.</p> | <p>This submitter notes the provision of a transport corridor to the Southern Growth Area being provided for in the Silverstream Spur. Little information on the location or nature of the transport corridor, nor the nature of development in the Southern Growth Area, is provided at this stage.</p> <p>They support provision for future infrastructure to support future urban</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | Amendments to the provisions providing for this transport corridor may be appropriate to signal multi-modal transport connections. | <p>development, and this aligns with Regional Policy Statement direction.</p> <p>However, they state that they do not have sufficient information on the Southern Growth Area or the transport corridor to be fully supportive at this stage.</p> <p>The Silverstream Spur is located close to Silverstream Station, and the submitter considers that the provisions could signal an initial preference for public transport and multi-modal transport connections at this initial stage.</p> |
| S19.3 | NOSZ-P7 | 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. | That the wording of this policy is inconsistent with the national and regional effects management hierarchy direction to 'avoid, minimise, remedy' and should be amended to ensure consistency. |
| Submitter 20: Colin Rickerby | | | | |
| S20.1 | Mapping and Significant Natural Areas | Support | To rezone the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space and protect Significant Natural Areas. | <p>This submitter fully supports the rezoning of Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space and commends the effort to make this proposed change. They also support the identification and protection of Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur.</p> <p>The Spur helps link the bush zones, for ecological value, across the valley at this</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>narrow point which is assisted by the recent planting on Hulls Creek and the north end of the Manor Park Golf course.</p> <p>They would like to see Silverstream Spur classified as reserve as they consider it provides a pleasant natural entry and exit to and from Upper Hutt City.</p> <p>They are pleased to see the regenerating bush on the Spur but considers that there is a problem with wilding pines with unmaintained pine plantings on the Spur and further up the ridge back to Pinehaven.</p> |
| S20.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To not include a transport and infrastructure corridor that would negatively impact the Natural Open Space and Significant Natural Areas. | <p>This submitter does not support these provisions as they consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. it will have a detrimental impact to the Natural Open Space which goes completely against the purpose of Significant Natural Areas. ii. the clearing of bush, earth works, roading and traffic brings changes to run off, pollution, noise, rubbish, introduces weeds and negatively impacts the visual effect of the Natural Open Space. iii. if the Southern Growth Area is to be as large as it is proposed this will be a significant amount of traffic requiring a sizeable road, producing a lot of noise due to the gradient and need for corners. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. to maintain a gradient no steeper than 1 in 8 will require a long windy road with a lot of earthworks which will eat significantly into the Natural Open Space and will not be able to avoid the Significant Natural Areas. v. that should a road have to go in, then in accordance with proposed policy NOSZ-P7, there will need to be a lot of mitigation, offsetting and avoidance taking place to maintain the natural area's biodiversity, health, and appearance. <p>That access has become more difficult in recent years with the development at the foot of the Spur so suggest that track access off Kiln Street is needed as at the moment there is just access from a disused logging track/firebreak from the ridge above the Spur.</p> |
| Submitter 21: Michael Gray | | | | |
| S21.1 | Mapping and Significant Natural Areas | 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. | <p>This submitter states that they support the provision to rezone the Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space as it allows a range of recreational activities and moves the Silverstream Spur closer towards being designated as a reserve.</p> <p>They also support the provision to protect identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development to ensure additional protections as the Spur is an ecological corridor for native birds.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| S21.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To remove the provision to enable site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor. | This submitter opposes these provisions as they consider this will cause destruction to the Spur and harm to the Natural Open Space and that roads are not required for recreational access. |
| Submitter 22: Jane Derbyshire | | | | |
| S22.1 | Entire Variation | Seek amendments | <p>To see 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.</p> <p>UHCC progress this area as intended - to reserve status.</p> <p>Support zoning of Significant Natural Areas within the Spur area.</p> | <p>This submitter states that there are ample alternative options to access the Southern Growth Area without having to sacrifice portions of an area that was purchased as a reserve in 1990 with money specifically earmarked for that purpose and therefore disagrees with the assertion that it is "critical" to unlocking that area for potential growth.</p> <p>That a road/infrastructure corridor is not required for public recreational access to the Spur, as other local reserves, such as Ecclesfield Reserve, Wi Tako Ngatata Scenic Reserve and Keith George Memorial Park, do not have a road or infrastructure corridor through them and they are still fully accessible to the public for a range of recreational activities.</p> <p>They would prefer to see a greater area of reserve that is not bisected by what will be a busy road which will impact on the amenity of the reserve as well as the wildlife within it.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| Submitter 23: John D O'Malley | | | | |
| S23.1 | Mapping | Support | To support the rezoning of the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space. | <p>This submitter states that they support the rezoning of the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space as they consider that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. when this piece of land was acquired, it was for the purpose of it becoming a permanent reserve in public ownership and was for the potential use of the public in some form of recreational purpose suitable to its terrain, and the wildlife that lives there. ii. the public own this facility to be enjoyed by future generations, as once it is lost to any form of development, other than a reserve enhancement, it will be lost for ever. iii. moving to Natural Open Space is a step in it being developed as a public reserve. iv. it is a unique feature of the landscape, visually distinguishing and linking Upper Hutt with its southern neighbours and thus gives geographical identity to Upper Hutt City. v. with intensification of residential housing occurring and high-rise accommodation, Natural Open Spaces are at a premium for an increasing population. vi. mental health of a community needs recreational facilities of all kinds within |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>its community as a relief and refreshing of the human spirit.</p> <p>vii. development of the Spur as a reserve with its unique features of ruggedness and bush beauty, when capitalised on, would make a significant contribution to community wellbeing.</p> |
| S23.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To oppose the enablement on the site for specific provisions for infrastructure including a transport corridor to access the Southern Growth Area. | <p>This submitter opposes these provisions as they consider that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the design of such a road, where it will be situated, and its intersection with other arterial routes is missing, nor is there any indication of where such a road may sit on the site, to consider its impact on adjacent properties, including its visual impact. ii. traffic flows at present on the intersection of Kiln Street and Field Street, are already heavily congested and the proposed Southern Growth Area of 1000 to 1750 homes would add an additional 2000 to 3000+ vehicles. iii. the Silverstream park and ride provision are already at maximum so additional motorists would park all around the Silverstream Streets, reducing the width of the roads to single lane, thereby interfering with normal traffic flow. iv. ease of access to the Silverstream shopping and medical centre would |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| | | | | <p>also be severely impeded due to the resulting traffic density.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> v. the additional flow on effect to a heavily congested Fergusson Drive arising from the neighbouring residential development of land adjacent to St Patricks College, can only result in gridlock at peak traffic times. vi. when the subdivision of Sylvan Way was being developed, the noise of earth moving equipment and diesel fumes caused a large native bird population to leave the site so a road of the magnitude proposed will severely disturb local native habitat to the detriment of the current native bird life. vii. many New Zealand birds are today threatened with reducing numbers, and we must preserve as much as possible of their natural habit. viii. there is an assertion by Council that a road to adjoin Kiln Street for traffic access to the Southern Growth Area is essential and is the only option and then Council mentions a road access off Reynolds Bach Drive is possible. These two statements are contradictory and there are other options of possible access to Eastern Hutt Road and the developers of the Southern Growth Area have failed to explore this. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1630 177 2166 564">ix. there is currently no plan to develop the Silverstream Spur as a reserve so the only reason for the road request is to open the Southern Growth Area. A road for social access for enjoyment to a reserve is a totally different type of road. The objectives for each of these two roads are in conflict which will result in limited choices for a reserve road access and parking facilitation, should the proposal succeed. <li data-bbox="1630 564 2166 746">x. traffic noise and vehicle exhaust would further impinge on the peaceful nature of a public bush reserve. Community needs must come before individual commercial imperatives. <li data-bbox="1630 746 2166 1070">xi. contentions that road access for a reserve must be considered now is false. When a development plan to turn the Spur into a reserve under Reserves and Parks legislation, all road access requirements can be considered then. That way the public will know what it is supporting and can make its contribution to the design. <li data-bbox="1630 1070 2166 1321">xii. what is being proposed by road request is an “open ticket” without any indication of its proposed location, or its impact on the environment and native life and indications that such a road would have to pass through a SNA is unacceptable. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| S23.3 | Significant Natural Areas | Support | Support the protection of identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | <p>This submitter states that they support the protection of identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development because they consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. a significant feature of Upper Hutt is the beauty of native bush on the hills that surround it. ii. many of New Zealand native birds' wellbeing is threatened due to their natural habitat being destroyed through land development of one form or another for commercial and or residential uses. iii. that we need to protect all native bird species who are stable in population and facilitate growth in those birds whose numbers are declining. iv. that the SNA contains the insect life that birds feed on for their life and must not be violated in any way. |
| Submitter 24: Nancy Bramley-Thompson | | | | |
| S24.1 | Mapping and Significant Natural Areas | 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. | <p>This submitter states that they would like to see all the pine trees on Silverstream Spur removed and a program of regeneration commenced using local eco-sourced native plants which will go a long way towards providing increased habitat for the wildlife community.</p> <p>They encourage Upper Hutt City Council to work towards the creation of a Silverstream Spur Reserve which could include walking and</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | cycling tracks for humans to achieve customary, recreation, and conservation goals. |
| S24.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To not support the enablement of site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor, within Silverstream Spur. | <p>They state that Goal 2 of Upper Hutt City Council’s current Sustainability Strategy states: <i>‘we will prioritise protecting and enhancing our natural environment’</i> including</p> <p><i>2.1 Evaluate opportunities to protect and enhance existing biodiversity and focus on regeneration, reforestation and enhancement of soil health, native flora and fauna and</i></p> <p><i>2.2 Invest in current and new opportunities to integrate biodiversity within the community and encourage it to be a prominent part of the social landscape.</i></p> <p>Therefore, they do not support the enablement of site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor, within Silverstream Spur.</p> |
| Submitter 25: Maurice Berrington | | | | |
| S25.1 | Entire Variation | Seek amendment | To seek to have the Silverstream Spur as a reserve with cycle paths and walkways for the public to enjoy for the future to come. | <p>This submitter states that they want to have the Spur zoned as Natural Open Space and as a reserve.</p> <p>They oppose using the Silverstream Spur as development for housing and they do not want to see a transport corridor through it.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Submitter 26: Ian Price | | | | |
| S26.1 | Mapping and Significant Natural Areas | Support | To rezone the Silverstream Spur completely as a Significant Natural Area and permanently protect all Significant Natural Areas. | This submitter fully supports rezoning, and supports protection of the SNA. |
| S26.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To disallow any provision for any road or infrastructure corridor on any part of Silverstream Spur permanently. | They strongly object to any provision of rules to allow access to the SNA on any part of the Silverstream Spur. |
| Submitter 27: Doug Johnston | | | | |
| S27.1 | Entire Variation | 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. | <p>This submitter states that they do not believe this one off transaction for housing development acts in the best interest of the local community.</p> <p>The Silver Stream Railway has been an important asset in the local community since 1978 that is driven by a dedicated voluntary work force to not only provide an attractive heritage railway facility for the community but to provide the experience of yester year to the thousands of people who have visited over the years.</p> |
| Submitter 28: Lance Hurly | | | | |
| S28.1 | Mapping | Support | To rezone the Spur to Natural Open Space. | This submitter supports rezoning the Spur to Natural Open Space. |
| S28.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | Withdraw any intention to establish a transport corridor. | They do not support site-specific provisions including a transport corridor. |
| S28.3 | Significant Natural Areas | Support | Protect the Significant Natural Areas on the Spur from development. | They support protecting the Significant Natural Areas on the Spur from development. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| Submitter 29: Peter Zajac | | | | |
| S29.1 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To remove the provisions for a road and transport corridor over the entire Silverstream Spur. | <p>This submitter states that the Spur is an important and irreplaceable ecological and environmental asset to Upper Hutt which should be protected and allowed to regenerate for the benefit of wildlife, the environment, and the future inhabitants of Upper Hutt. A road and infrastructure corridor would be hugely detrimental to this.</p> <p>The purpose of the road is to unlock land in the hills above Silverstream to allow the 'Silverstream Forest' development to proceed. This development should be a red flag to the council due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. proximity to Silverstream Landfill with smell and health risks. ii. multiple significant fire risk factors including pine forest, uphill, ridgeline, and single road access. iii. distance from amenities and transport, meaning residents will be car dependent. iv. topography means slips will be likely. v. an isolated community provides lower economic benefit compared to urban intensification. vi. release of mammalian predators into a recovering ecosystem. <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Submitter 30: Laura Johnston | | | | |
| S30.1 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To remove the provisions for a road and transport corridor over the entire Silverstream Spur. | This submitter states that they are opposed to these provisions as well as a housing development in the hills above Silverstream/Pinehaven. |
| Submitter 31: W Gibson | | | | |
| S31.1 | Entire Variation | Seek amendment | For the Silverstream Spur to be Natural Open Space and to protect the native flora and fauna for future generations. | This submitter strongly opposes provisions for infrastructure including a transport corridor on the Silverstream Spur stating that UHCC purchased the Spur as a reserve in the 1990's and therefore the Spur should be zoned as Natural Open Space. |
| Submitter 32: Tom Halliburton | | | | |
| S32.1 | Entire Variation | 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. | <p>This submitter states that the Silverstream Spur is unsuitable for housing as this area has important natural environmental values and potential recreational value.</p> <p>The Southern Growth Area is no longer a desirable area for development as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. such development would not be consistent with the need to transition housing to a more sustainable and more dense form. ii. it would become a car dependent area especially due to the hilly nature of the area. iii. Council should not be facilitating car dependent urban sprawl. iv. a climate emergency exists. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|---|------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | Therefore, planning for access to this area through the Silverstream Spur should not be carried out and provision should be made for active modes of access only. <i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i> |
| Submitter 33: Calvin Berg | | | | |
| S33.1 | Mapping | Support in part | The Council take action to have the Spur zoned as a Natural Open Space. The Council to stop supporting private interests trying to develop the Spur as appears to be the case at present. | This submitter states that the Spur was intended as a Natural Open Space and is part of the eco system of the valley. The Council must proceed to have the Spur declared a Natural Open Space to stop private interests trying to chip into it for their own benefit. |
| Submitter 34: John Durry | | | | |
| S34.1 | Entire Variation | Seeks amendment | 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. | This submitter states that they want the Spur to stay as it was originally intended (as decided by previous Council members) as a reserve with no roads or infrastructure and stay as Natural Open Space. |
| Submitter 35: Graham Bellamy (petition attached) | | | | |
| S35.1 | Mapping | Support in part | 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. | This submitter states that the Silverstream Spur should be rezoned as Natural Open Space. The provisions should ensure that the underlying zone and the natural character of the site is recognised and provide for the protection of identified indigenous vegetation. They consider that the Silverstream Spur: |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. is an iconic feature of the southern end of Upper Hutt and should be rezoned as a Natural Open Space. ii. will form the connectivity between the east and west sides of the valley at its narrowest point that will provide a native corridor for migration of wildlife and birds in the area. iii. will connect Keith George Memorial Park, Silverstream Spur, Ecclesfield Reserve, Wi Tako Ngatata Scenic Reserve and further south to Wainuiomata Mainland and north to Pākuratahi Forest. iv. would add to the biodiversity of the area and provide an opportunity to provide walking/biking tracks through the area for recreational use. <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details and attached petition.</i></p> |
| S35.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | 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. | <p>This submitter states that they do not support the introduction of these provisions through the Spur to enable the development of the Southern Growth Area, which is on private land and been identified as a future growth area.</p> <p>They state that the transport corridor, plus associated services, will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. cause considerable damage to the current flora and fauna on the Spur |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>and have adverse effects on the surrounding environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. adversely impact on the surrounding wildlife in the area, with road noise, vehicle fumes and light pollution during night-time. iii. add to a runoff from the road and allow a corridor for pests, weeds and other rubbish which will impact on the ecology of the surrounding habitat. iv. be a major divisional factor to the integrity of the Natural Open Space. v. limit the migration of wildlife and birds in the area and their ability to set up viable colonies. vi. go through an area identified as a High Slope Hazard in PC47 Natural Hazard increasing the risk of subsidence when the planting of native bush will decrease subsidence risk. <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details and attached petition.</i></p> |
| S35.3 | Significant Natural Areas | 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. | <p>The Spur needs to have identified Significant Natural Areas protected from any type of development as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. from the point of view of Climate Change, it will enhance the carbon absorption within Upper Hutt both with the vegetation and the ground litter from leaves, etc. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. with appropriate pest control measures this would add significant enhancement to the native flora and fauna and biodiversity in the area, adding to the areas already identified significant indigenous vegetation. iii. there is significant native regrowth on the Spur, including many beech trees of a significant size. <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details and attached petition.</i></p> |
| Submitter 36: Chris and Julie Manu | | | | |
| S36.1 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To deny the enablement of site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor. | <p>These submitters state that a road or infrastructure corridor placed anywhere through the proposed rezoning of the Silverstream Spur (including developing the paper road from Kiln Street to above Sylvan Way) would have significant impact on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the ecological corridor for our native birds - linkage between the Spur, Wainuiomata, Akatarawa and Keith George reserve. ii. re-generation of native fauna and wildlife due to impact of roading construction, machinery, possible diesel spills that could leach into the natural waterways (there is a known waterfall on the Spur). iii. instability of land under heavy rainfall with the removal of fauna and soil. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>iv. splitting the natural Spur and creating 'communities' of wildlife which may have an impact on their breeding and safety.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| Submitter 37: Cathy Price | | | | |
| S37.1 | Mapping and Significant Natural Areas | Support | Rezone the Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space completely, protect all SNA areas on the Silverstream Spur. | This submitter supports the rezoning in full and supports protection of SNA areas. |
| S37.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | Disallow any provision for a road, infrastructure corridor on any part of the Silverstream Spur. | They strongly object to the provision of rules allowing any form of access to the Southern Growth Area on any part of the Silverstream Spur. |
| Submitter 38: Gerald and Carleen Bealing | | | | |
| S38.1 | Mapping and Significant Natural Areas | Support | To seek Council's approval of the variation subject to removal of provision of a transport corridor. | <p>These submitters state that they support the proposed plan change to rezone the Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space as this is consistent with Council's reason for purchasing this land in 1990 using funds intended to be used for purchase of land to be held as public reserve.</p> <p>They support the proposal to protect identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development as this is consistent with our support for the proposed rezoning as Natural Open Space and with our opposition to the inclusion of provision for a transport corridor.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| S38.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | As above | <p>They oppose these provisions as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. a road is not necessary to enable public participation in passive recreation and conservation and walking and cycling tracks will enable these activities with far less impact than a road allowing access to the SGA. ii. a road would have to provide multiple lanes and services for development of the SGA such as water supply, drainage, sewage removal, power, and IT services. iii. this road would have a major impact on the natural environment which the Natural Open Space zoning is intended to encourage. |
| Submitter 39: Jennifer Durry | | | | |
| S39.1 | Mapping | Support | To remain as originally intended as a reserve and remove any provision in the Plan Change allowing the building of any type of road or any infrastructure on the whole of the Spur and rezone as Natural Open Space. | This submitter states that the Spur is a Natural Open Space zone and needs to stay as that. |
| S39.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | As above. | They oppose the road and any potential development of housing as it would cause considerable storm water runoff to Silver Stream Railway's historic infrastructure. |
| Submitter 40: Stephen Bell | | | | |
| S40.1 | Mapping | Support | To rezone the Spur as a Natural Open Space. | This submitter states that they support the Council proposal to change the status of the |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space to protect the natural areas from development.</p> <p>The submitter was attracted to Upper Hutt by the surrounding bush, parks and reserves, and green spaces that for many years have gradually been opened for development.</p> <p>The Spur is one side of the gateway to Upper Hutt and should remain a green space and it would be better if it was designated a reserve.</p> |
| S40.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To remove the provision providing for an infrastructure and transportation corridor from the proposal. | <p>They do not support these provisions as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. with no details as to the route, or extent of the infrastructure proposed it is difficult to accurately assess possible impacts. ii. roads, in general, impact noise in the area, air pollution, and water run-off, which may contain combustion by-products and other pollutants adversely impacting the adjacent area. iii. there is considerable disruption caused by construction of such corridors which is likely to adversely impact the on-going regeneration. iv. the running of a road through the bush will separate the whole area into smaller and less dynamic and resilient blocks. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Submitter 41: Bob McLellan | | | | |
| S41.1 | Mapping | 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. | <p>This submitter states that the Spur is part of the gateway to Upper Hutt or the gateway to the gateway to the great outdoors and as such, the more it presents a natural view the better it supports Upper Hutt's ethos.</p> <p>There is no analysis of the effect of road and infrastructure on the amenity and image values of the gateway.</p> |
| S41.2 | Significant Natural Areas NOSZ-P7 | Support | To approve the provision to protect identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. | <p>They support protecting identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.</p> <p>What does proposed NOSZ-P7 mean in practice?</p> |
| S41.3 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor NOSZ-P6 | Oppose | To decline (not approve) the provision to enable site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor. | <p>They oppose NOSZ-P6 as there is no requirement for this infrastructure to 'provide for a range of passive recreation opportunities' so this point should be deleted.</p> <p>The provision for infrastructure has got the cart before the horse. There is no proposal before the Council to develop the SGA so there is no way to judge what it would require. This provision should be part of a Private Plan Change to enable the development of the SGA, it would then be part of an integrated plan where decisions could be made on specific requirements.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>There is no geological report to identify whether the Spur is suitable for any development and given the recent major slip at nearby Stokes Valley this lack of information affects sound decision making.</p> <p>The S32 report offers two options and critically it does not include the third option to 'Rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space' without 'Enable site specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor' - option 3 should be included in the S32 report.</p> |
| Submitter 42: Pat van Berkel | | | | |
| S42.1 | Mapping | Support with amendment | <p>To zone the entire Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space.</p> <p>Extend the area of Silverstream Spur to include Sylvan Heights reserve (Parcel 3824934. Lot 46 DP 90006).</p> <p>Additionally, zone the extended Silverstream Spur (described above) as Natural Open Space.</p> | <p>This submitter states that they support rezoning the (extended) Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space.</p> <p>The Spur has significant amenity value as the natural entrance/exit way to Upper Hutt which has been recognised in numerous UHCC documents. There is therefore no sense in continuing to zone it for housing.</p> <p>The Spur should eventually become a Scenic Reserve, for the benefit of future citizens of Upper Hutt.</p> <p>The most appropriate zoning for land that is to become a reserve is Natural Open Space.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>There is no discussion in the Variation of including UHCC land that is adjacent to the Spur. The definition of Silverstream Spur should be extended to include the portion of unformed Kiln St that is adjacent to Parcel 3875189 plus the UHCC owned parcel 3824934 that is adjacent to the unformed Kiln St. This enables a management plan to be developed for the extended Silverstream Spur.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| S42.2 | Significant Natural Areas NOSZ-P7, NOSZ-R22 | Support with amendment | <p>To protect the Significant Natural Area delineated on the Map in the Variation from development.</p> <p>Extend the Significant Natural Area (delineated on the Map in the Variation) to include the 6 recovering areas of native bush.</p> <p>Additionally, protect the extended Significant Natural Area from development.</p> <p>Recognise the whole Silverstream Spur as a Special Amenity Landscape.</p> <p>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).</p> | <p>This submitter states that they support protecting the (extended) Significant Natural Areas on the Spur from development and support the Spur being classified as a Special Amenity Landscape.</p> <p>The map in Appendix 1 of the Section 32 report on the Variation delineates a Significant Natural Area on, and adjacent to, the Spur. This delineated area is incomplete. Map 2 shows further areas that should be part of the SNA.</p> <p>The SNA should be extended to include these 6 areas which collectively add over 50% to the SNA size inside the Spur.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| S42.3 | <p>Infrastructure including a transport corridor</p> <p>NOSZ-P6, NOSZ-R15, NOSZ-S4</p> | Oppose | <p>Remove provision for infrastructure and/or transport corridor on any part of the Silverstream Spur.</p> <p>Stop (in the legal sense) the unformed road Kiln St (from Sylvan Way to the westernmost extent of Kiln St).</p> <p>Extend the area of Silverstream Spur to include the stopped road.</p> | <p>This submitter states that they oppose enabling a transport corridor or network utility infrastructure corridor through the Spur.</p> <p>The inclusion of an allowance for infrastructure including a transport corridor to the SGA is inappropriate for a zoning change relating to Open Space.</p> <p>Infrastructure for the Southern Growth Area will be a major planning exercise that will be conducted at some time in the future. At that time options for the location of that infrastructure will be recommended and decided.</p> <p>As with other small hill natural open spaces it is appropriate to put in walking/cycling/mobility tracks for access to the Spur itself as they have minimal ecological impact - but not vehicle roads.</p> <p>A road would have a large impact on the ecology of the Spur.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| S42.4 | s32 Report | Seek amendments | <p>Acknowledge that the Section 32 report on the Variation is incomplete because:</p> <p>a. It does not include analysis on road corridor options (despite the stated “critical” importance of a road corridor).</p> | <p>This submitter states that Section 12.4.4 asserts that <i>‘The importance of the SGA in terms of potentially delivering development for future housing needs in Upper Hutt, something which is recognised within local and regional strategies and plans, cannot be disregarded’</i>.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | <p>b. It does not include analysis on the changed emphasis in the updated NPS-UD that means Upper Hutt can meet urban growth in the foreseeable future through intensification rather than greenfield development (and hence no road corridor is needed) such as the SGA.</p> <p>c. It does not identify the strategic importance of the Spur as part of a significant wildlife/bird corridor.</p> <p>d. The Ecological Values Assessment is a point-in-time assessment that is inappropriate for the discussion about the Spur's future. The assessment should cover its potential for the next 50 years.</p> <p>e. The Ecological Values Assessment needs to be updated, as nature has expanded the areas of significant native bush (as previously stated).</p> <p>Complete the Section 32 report in the 5 incomplete areas (described above).</p> | <p>The importance of the SGA is not at all clear since the changes to the National Policy Statement – Urban Development were promulgated by the Government earlier this year. The updated NPS-UD now has an emphasis on urban intensification rather than urban sprawl as there is recognition of the loss of land to housing that is needed for farming and for forestry for carbon storage.</p> <p>They agree with Section 12.4.5 of the Section 32 report on Variation 1 which notes the fundamental incompatibility of the infrastructure, including a transport corridor, with the Spur zoned as Natural Open Space.</p> <p>The Section 32 report delineates a Significant Natural Area, but the report (and Variation) omits the significant amenity value of the Spur.</p> <p>The Spur is one of the key visual amenity landscapes of Upper Hutt as it frames the entranceway to Upper Hutt and exit from Upper Hutt.</p> <p>This amenity will become increasingly noticeable as the Spur restores including rata blooming in red in December. The Spur should be recognised as a Special Amenity Landscape.</p> <p>The Section 32 report is incomplete as it does not look at the strategic importance of the Spur as part of a significant bird/wildlife corridor.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|--|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>The Section 32 report states that '<i>Silverstream Spur is critical to enable infrastructure including a transport corridor to access the SGA</i>' yet gives no analysis of road corridor options (other than one sentence in section 10.4.4).</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| Submitter 43: Heather Frances Beckman | | | | |
| S43.1 | Mapping and Significant Natural Areas | Support | To approve the rezoning of the entire Spur as Natural Open Space and the protection of Significant Natural Areas. | <p>This submitter states that the Spur was originally purchased using funds held by UHCC under its Reserve Fund and believe it should be rezoned as a Natural Open Space and consequently put forward for designation as a Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.</p> <p>The Spur needs to be protected from development now and into the future.</p> <p>This land should be rezoned as a Natural Open Space and ultimately given reserve status so that the community can enjoy the outdoors and the indigenous vegetation can regenerate. This would hopefully encourage more bird and wildlife to the area.</p> <p>This taonga needs to be preserved for current and future generations.</p> <p>They support the protection of Significant Natural Areas and suggest that the whole Spur</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | is a SNA and should be given this higher level of protection. |
| S43.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To not approve the provision for a road/infrastructure corridor to the neighbouring privately owned land. | <p>This submitter strongly disagrees with these provisions for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. This variation does not fit with the stated purpose of the zone, in fact it is contradictory to the purpose. ii. A road is not required for public recreational access to the Spur. The less disruption to the natural landscape the better. iii. The entire spur is an important ecological corridor, and an infrastructure/transport corridor would severely limit the ecological function of the Spur and destroy the natural environment of the Natural Open Space. iv. The significance of the Spur must be considered in the broader regional context, being the only remaining corridor link south of Kaitoke to the western side of the valley. v. With the increase of mental health problems, we need to be getting back to nature, not putting more infrastructure into our precious open spaces. A road through the Spur would be detrimental to the wellbeing benefits of the Natural Open Space. vi. The recreational, environmental and conservation opportunities will be |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>compromised by allowing this provision.</p> <p>The submitter asks how this variation fits the UHCC Sustainability Plan?</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| Submitter 44: Lynne McLellan | | | | |
| S44.1 | Mapping and Significant Natural Areas | Support | <p>To approve the provision to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and General Residential Zone to Natural Open Space.</p> <p>To approve the provision to protect identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.</p> | <p>This submitter considers that Upper Hutt is very special, a community surrounded by bush clad hills, the 'Gateway to the Great Outdoors'. The Silverstream Spur is integral to the Upper Valley's iconic and much loved landscape. The rezoning of the Spur as Natural Open Space will enhance and preserve it for future generations.</p> <p>The Silverstream Spur has proposed Significant Natural Areas identified within it. These are mostly gully areas and contain trees that were probably tiny saplings 100 years ago. There is a photo showing a steam train from the early 1920s with the very bare Spur as a background in the Silver Stream Steam Railway collection.</p> <p>Upper Hutt's proposed SNAs have been on the radar for Plan Change for a very long time, longer than many other Local Authorities. They should have been in place before the proposed PC49 and PC49 Variation 1 occurred.</p> <p>The extra layer of protection provided by the SNA designation will preserve a vital seed</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | source for the regeneration of the Spur. Beech, kamahi, rata and manuka all have windblown seed. In addition, the Spur is an almost ideal shape to become a reserve in the future where biodiversity can flourish in a vital link across the narrowest part of the Hutt Valley. |
| S44.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To decline (not approve) the provision to enable site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor. | <p>They state that a road through the Silverstream Spur in the future (to where, for what) would negate any value from creating the Natural Open Space and the Significant Natural Area designations.</p> <p>The edge effects from cutting the Spur in two, storm water and erosion possibilities together with the increased pests, cats, dogs, mustelids gaining access mean yet more fragmentation of our iconic landscape.</p> |
| Submitter 45: John Pepper | | | | |
| S45.1 | Mapping and Significant Natural Areas | Support and seek amendment | <p>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.</p> <p>That Council give full protection to identified areas of Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur.</p> | <p>This submitter states that they support the rezoning of the land known as the Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space. They request that Council proceed with designating the area as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.</p> <p>The use of this land should remain solely for recreational, conservation but above all else, should be preserved for the future generations of Upper Hutt and the greater Wellington Region. This should be the priority of Council in the proposed rezoning of the Spur.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | They support retaining and protecting the Significant Natural Areas of the Spur and any development should not include road/infrastructure that could jeopardize these areas. |
| S45.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | That Council decline any proposal to construct a road/infrastructure corridor within the boundaries of the Silverstream Spur. | <p>This submitter strongly opposes these provisions.</p> <p>The construction of such a road would be detrimental to the Natural Open Space and ecological function of the Spur.</p> <p>In addition, construction of a road on the Spur would seriously affect natural drainage, and stability of the soil structures, leading to excessive scarring of the reserve.</p> |
| Submitter 46: Chris Cosslett | | | | |
| S46.1 | Mapping NOSZ-P7 NOSZ-R22 | Support with amendment | To adopt the Natural Open Space Zoning for Silverstream Spur. | <p>This submitter states that they support the rezoning of the Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the entrance to Upper Hutt is defined by the Silverstream Spur projecting across the valley floor to almost meet the northern escarpment at Keith George Memorial Park. ii. the Spur has great potential for public recreation as currently the only natural open spaces in the southern part of the city where public recreation is provided for are |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | <p>Ecclesfield/Witako and Keith George Memorial Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. the Spur can be easily reached on bike or foot from nearby residential areas and the Silverstream Railway Station. iv. as urban density increases the value of natural open spaces will increase, both as a visual backdrop for urban areas and as places for recreation and the quiet enjoyment of nature. v. future generations will be grateful to those who act now to preserve the Silverstream Spur. vi. the cross-valley bird connection created by the Spur and the community planting is the most direct link between the proposed Gondwana Sanctuary and the Zealandia Sanctuary. vii. while the forest on the Spur is currently dominated by pines, the site includes some high quality remnant broadleaf/podocarp/beech forest in gullies and significant native regeneration is already present under the pine canopies and with careful management the pine forest could be transitioned to high quality native forest. <p>I would strongly support not only the zoning of the Spur as Natural Open Space but also its gazetting as a Scenic Reserve.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i> |
| S46.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor NOSZ-P6, NOSZ-R15 NOSZ-P4 | Oppose | To delete provision for a road corridor through Silverstream Spur. | This submitter states that the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. presence of a busy, noisy road through an area of otherwise quiet forest would impact negatively on the enjoyment of the forest by recreational users. ii. road would necessarily occupy the easier ground on top of the Spur, thereby reducing the space available for accessible recreation opportunities. iii. visual impact of the road, would detract from the amenity value of the Spur as viewed from surrounding communities. iv. road would divide the forest into two smaller blocks and detract from its ecological value. v. road can be expected to have a deleterious impact on a strip of forest up to 100m wide on either side of the road, or 200m wide in total. In the context of the Spur this would represent a serious reduction in its ecological potential, particularly its value to native wildlife. <i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|---|-----------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Submitter 47: Allan Sheppard | | | | |
| S47.1 | Mapping | Support | That the Silverstream Spur be rezoned to Natural Open Space. | <p>This submitter states that the Silverstream Spur be rezoned to Natural Open Space as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the land was originally acquired by the UHCC in 1990 for use as a public reserve and should continue to have this or similar status. ii. to conserve the natural character and associated ecological and landscape values of the site. <p>The indigenous vegetation should be further enhanced to encourage the movement of native animals and plants to form a bush corridor.</p> <p>The advantage at this location is the narrowing of the Hutt River 400m downstream of the road and rail bridges. This is the only suitable site in the 30km between Petone and Te Marua.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| Submitter 48: Donald Keith Skerman | | | | |
| S48.1 | Mapping | Support | Proceed with rezoning of the Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space. | <p>This submitter states that they fully support the rezoning of Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. this land forms a very prominent and noticeable landmark. ii. it forms one side of the narrowest section of the valley and compliments |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| | | | | <p>the forested Keith George Memorial Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. extensive planting of native species has been carried out on the banks of the river and along Hulls Creek by Forest and Bird groups and is becoming well established. iv. the Silverstream Spur continues this important corridor for birdlife across the valley and will become more effective as regeneration of native forest continues. v. regeneration could be accelerated by removal of some of the pine trees and replanting of appropriate native species. While sections of gorse on the Spur may not look attractive, they act as a nursery for native species which eventually grow up through it and shade it out. <p>They would also support Upper Hutt City Council further enhancing the protection for the land by taking action to gain reserve status. This land was purchased for the purposes of a reserve, not for a transportation corridor or residential development. The land should be preserved for future generations as a nature reserve.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| S48.2 | <p>Infrastructure including a transport corridor</p> <p>NOSZ-P6</p> <p>NOSZ-R15</p> <p>NOSZ-S4</p> | Oppose | <p>Ensure that the land is protected from the construction of any infrastructure on this land apart from walking and cycling tracks.</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>They are opposed to the building of any infrastructure on this land apart from walking and cycling tracks.</p> <p>The building of a road is not necessary for Upper Hutt residents to be able to enjoy this land for recreation and would greatly detract from the visual appeal of this prominent landmark and its ability to act as an important wildlife refuge and corridor.</p> <p>These provisions would be a major disruption to the amenity of the reserve as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the width of the road with footpath or shared path and parallel parking would effectively cut the land in two and prevent migration of smaller birds and invertebrates across it. ii. the large gap in the canopy would allow infiltration of weeds and would be an eyesore from a distance. iii. due to the elevation that must be gained and the gradient necessary for a road of this type it would also consume a significant portion of the area. iv. very few people enjoy walking or cycling along the side of a busy thoroughfare with its vegetation compromised by the wide gap in the canopy and the inevitable rubbish which builds up along roads. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> v. food scraps thrown from cars would attract predators which would also have an adverse effect on the native wildlife. vi. a sealed road of the proposed width would cause significant additional runoff which could adversely affect the watercourses on the land and those downstream. <p>Only walking and cycle paths should be permitted on any part of the land for the reasons stated above.</p> <p>There are other options for connecting the Southern Growth Area to the road network which don't require the compromising of this important publicly owned land.</p> <p>The concept of extensive development of houses sprawling over the top of the hills, far from the closest railway station, seems to be at odds with the need for reducing the greenhouse gas emissions from transport, building construction and services.</p> <p>Transmission lines need extensive clearance of vegetation and maintenance of a wide gap in the tree canopy and would also compromise the reserve.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| S48.3 | Significant Natural Areas NOSZ-P7 NOSZ-R22 | Support in part | That only walking and cycle paths should be permitted on any part of the land, not just areas that are judged to already be Significant Natural Areas. Support the removal of indigenous vegetation being disallowed on the land. | This submitter states that other reserves are popular places for people to walk, away from cars and buses, where they can hear the birds and enjoy the serene beauty of the forest. The tracks are only wide enough for people to walk so that there is still a closed canopy and wildlife can freely cross over. In other reserves, separate cycle paths are provided, ideally signed for one way traffic for safety and to minimise the width of track required. These can be constructed sustainably with little effect on the environment. <i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i> |
| Submitter 49: Rick Wheeler | | | | |
| S49.1 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | 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. | This submitter strongly opposes any provisions that may or may not lead to future land developments as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1630 970 2168 1145">i. the native bush in the residential conservation land adjacent to Sylvan Way has been heavily trapped for pests and is now home to many native birds and skinks. <li data-bbox="1630 1150 2168 1251">ii. this environment is too special to lose so must remain protected residential conservation land. <li data-bbox="1630 1256 2168 1394">iii. infrastructure access from Kiln Street will present a choke point for Silverstream, Pinehaven and Wallaceville Estate traffic. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. Silverstream Railway Station already forces commuters to park as far away as Kiln Street as parking capacity has overflowed into neighbouring streets. v. this southern end of the city already suffers from poor peak traffic flows as they link with State Highway 2 and Eastern Hutt Road. <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| Submitter 50: Abbie Spiers | | | | |
| S50.1 | Mapping | Support | <p>To support the UHCC proposal to rezone the Spur from its existing designation to Natural Open Space.</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>This submitter states that they support rezoning of the Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the Spur is our natural 'Green Gateway' to Upper Hutt and should be the 'Jewel in the Crown' of our local parks and reserves. ii. the Spur has excellent regenerative potential and will serve Upper Hutt well in the future as a native bush reserve as this was the original intention when purchasing the Spur with Reserve funds. iii. the Spur is also a vital noise/disturbance/fire buffer for the Silver Stream Railway, and any significant development could threaten this heritage organisation's existence. <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| S50.2 | Significant Natural Areas | 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'. | <p>This submitter generally supports, but seeks amendments, to the provisions regarding protection of identified Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) on the Silverstream Spur from development.</p> <p>They consider an infrastructure corridor and development to be incompatible with adequate protection of our valuable, Significant Natural Areas. The corridor would be a corridor for pests, weeds, erosion, habitat loss and other disturbance of the native species we want to protect in the first place.</p> <p>According to Reserve Management Theory, the Silverstream Spur is an excellent size (almost 50 hectares) and an excellent shape to comfortably protect the high value habitat of the SNAs, and in time provide a buffer of native habitat around these areas.</p> <p>The Spur is also in an excellent location, being a key linkage between native bush reserves on the western side of the Hutt Valley and existing reserves on the eastern hills, Orongorongo ranges and Wainuiomata area.</p> <p>This ecosystem continuity will in time further increase the value of the Spur SNAs, both to the Upper Hutt public and to our local/regional ecology and birdlife.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>Therefore, they wish UHCC to amend this component of the Proposal to better protect the SNAs, and then they can support it.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| S50.3 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | Urge UHCC to reject any such site-specific provisions. | <p>This submitter does not support these provisions.</p> <p>They want UHCC to reject this component of the Variation as they believe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. there are other viable options for access to the Southern Growth Area, should that development proposal ever go ahead. ii. roads and infrastructure have no place in reserves, or regenerating bush, or passing through the Spur's Significant Natural Areas as they are particularly destructive. iii. development-related infrastructure and roads will threaten the ecological integrity of the SNAs on the Spur and will act as corridors to bring 'edge effects'. iv. the ecological integrity of the Spur relies on maintaining the linkages with other reserves, we cannot do this if it is dissected by infrastructure/transport corridors. v. we do not need a road onto the Spur for recreational/educational activities - there is suitable road access and |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>parking at the base of the Spur already, from which recreational walking tracks can proceed.</p> <p>vi. the primary role of the Spur is as an aesthetic and ecological Green Gateway to Upper Hutt.</p> <p>Passive and low impact, 'eco' recreational activities such as walking, mountain biking, educational signage, tree planting and birdwatching are much better suited to a natural area such as the Silverstream Spur.</p> <p>In time, and with due process, they would like to see the Spur protected further as a reserve, so it can remain our natural 'Green Gateway' to Upper Hutt in perpetuity and for future generations.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| Submitter 51: Derek Reeves | | | | |
| S51.1 | Mapping and Significant Natural Areas | 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. | <p>This submitter states that they support the proposal to rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space as they consider that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the Silverstream Spur was purchased by the Council as a reserve, and it should be maintained as a reserve without infrastructure development. ii. it should be managed to allow native trees and bush to regenerate and |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| | | | | <p>become a sanctuary for native and endangered species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. this Spur reserve is an essential green zone in the Hutt Valley and forms an important linking green flight path and habitat for native birds moving through the valley. iv. at this time of global warming, it makes sense to preserve areas such as this for future generations as once gone, they are lost forever. v. as a protected native reserve, this area would bring significant recreational and ecological benefits to residents of Upper Hutt and the wider Hutt Valley. vi. in future it could be developed as a predator free zone and a green refuge to off-set the increasing high density development occurring on the Valley floor. vii. it would bring visitors to the area and boost Upper Hutt's appeal as a green city. viii. the Spur area has significant regenerating native bush and waterways and I understand that an earlier ecological report failed to correctly identify these. <p>They support the proposal to protect identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| S51.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To prohibit site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor. | This submitter strongly opposes these provisions as they consider that the site is steep, and any development would divide up the area into small patches greatly reducing the ability to support native birds and endangered species. |
| Submitter 52: Phil Hancock | | | | |
| S52.1 | Mapping and Significant Natural Areas | 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. | <p>This submitter states that they support the proposed zoning to have a continuous uninterrupted Natural Open Space covering the Spur.</p> <p>The Spur is an open space and clearly forms a significant linkage with the primary Hutt Valley vegetation corridor. In addition, it is the green view you receive every time you drive south along Ferguson Drive.</p> <p>The current paper road extending Kiln St and the adjoining area north of the Sylvan Way development should also be included in the Natural Open Space.</p> |
| S52.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To provide public access for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. | <p>This submitter opposes the draft proposal's wording to enable access to the Southern Growth Area through the Natural Open Space area as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. if the Southern Growth area is to be developed it needs to be developed in an environmentally sound manner and provisioning for a road is inconsistent |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>with the value proposed in creating a Natural Open Space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. the consideration of allowing the volume of earthworks required to build such a road and infrastructure is totally at odds with the purpose of creating this Natural Open Space. iii. there are numerous other access points to the Southern Growth Area. iv. the Southern Growth Area is inconsistent with the regionally stated intent that developments have good access to transport corridors. v. the minimum elevation change from Kiln St to the Guildford's block is approximately 150m which is significantly more than the elevation change along Ngauranga Gorge Road or going over the Wainuiomata Hill. <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| Submitter 53: Steven Robertson | | | | |
| S53.1 | Mapping and Significant Natural Areas | Support | <p>To rezone the Spur to Open Space. Then as soon as the Spur is rezoned to Open Space an application should be made (and followed through on this time) to make it a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.</p> <p>To approve the SNA designation.</p> | <p>This submitter states that they agree with the rezoning to Open Space and the SNA provisions.</p> <p>This is green belt land that serves as a gateway to Upper Hutt and the land should be a reserve.</p> <p>The documentation shows that it was purchased in 1990 under the Reserve Fund Policy so legally that limits its use to public</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>reserve. Therefore, any attempt to do otherwise is illegal and any money spent on trying to do so is improper use of Council funds and ought to be highlighted to the Office of the Auditor General and those responsible censured.</p> |
| S53.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To remove the provision to allow a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur. | <p>This submitter states that they categorically oppose any attempt to enable a road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur as a road would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. destroy natural habitat as it would likely be wide and windy given the gradient of the slope. ii. create a blockage point for land based native fauna. iii. increase storm water runoff. iv. be within the high slope zone. v. only be for the purpose of allowing developers access to build significant housing. vi. be contrary to current climate change plans to build housing as it would not be near any public transport. <p>If the council passed the Scenic Amenity Landscape Plan Change as required any development would likely fall foul of that.</p> <p>Nothing about this road provision makes sense and the only obvious beneficiary of this proposal is the Guildford Timber Company. The</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>ratepayers of Upper Hutt don't benefit from the Council's proposed largesse.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| Submitter 54: Suilva Fay McIntyre | | | | |
| S54.1 | Mapping | Support | To retain the Natural Open Space in perpetuity. | <p>This submitter states that the entire Spur is a very important part of the ecological corridor linking birds and other wildlife across the valley.</p> <p>The area is a Natural Open Space zone, and the proposed development would set a precedent enabling similar development.</p> <p>We would lose forever the 1990 intention to set aside money for reserves as ecological corridors and greatly increase flooding risks.</p> |
| Submitter 55: Jason Durry | | | | |
| S55.1 | Mapping | Support | To rezone all of the Spur to Natural Open Space. | This submitter states that the Spur was purchased using funds held by Council for the purchase of reserve land. |
| S55.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To remove/disallow any provisions for the constructions or to enable construction of a road/infrastructure on any part of the Spur. | Numerous reports and memos confirm this and the intention to keep the land free from development to allow public access without any need for a road/infrastructure corridor. |
| S55.3 | Significant Natural Areas | Seek amendment | To correct the erroneous SNA maps and include all areas with native vegetation based on detailed site analysis. | Not stated. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Submitter 56: Quintin Towler | | | | |
| S56.1 | Mapping and Significant Natural Areas | Support | To zone the entire Spur as Natural Open Space and ensure protection of all SNAs. | This submitter supports zoning the Spur to Natural Open Space and protection of the SNAs. |
| S56.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To remove all provisions allowing a road/corridor anywhere on the Spur. | They oppose enabling a road/infrastructure corridor on any part of the Spur. |
| Submitter 57: Christian Woods | | | | |
| S57.1 | Mapping | Support | To rezone the entire Spur as Natural Open Space. | This submitter states that the Spur was purchased by UHCC using reserved funds, meaning that should be used only as Natural Open Space as Council documents show. |
| S57.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To remove provisions for a road or/and infrastructure corridor anywhere on the Silverstream Spur. | The wrecking of the Spur to allow access to the GTC land goes against these principles of a Natural Open Space. |
| Submitter 58: Marie Harris | | | | |
| S58.1 | Mapping | Support | To zone the entire Spur as Natural Open Space. | This submitter states that the Spur should be zoned entirely as Natural Open Space. |
| S58.2 | Significant Natural Areas | Support with amendment | To correct inadequate SNA areas. | The SNA areas shown on the PC49 website are inadequate and need to be corrected to include all native vegetation. |
| S58.3 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To remove provisions for building a road and utilities. | The building of a road and utilities on the Spur would be detrimental to the ecology of the area and the Spur which should be rezoned entirely as Natural Open Space. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| Submitter 59: Nadine Ebbett | | | | |
| S59.1 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | 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. | <p>This submitter states that a road/infrastructure corridor is not necessary to enable recreational access to the Spur.</p> <p>The ecology and SNAs on the Spur need protecting from the building/construction of a road.</p> |
| Submitter 60: Ben Jones | | | | |
| S60.1 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To disallow and provision for a road/infrastructure corridor on any part of the Silverstream Spur. | <p>This submitter states that the land was intended as a native reserve when purchased and in later discussions by UHCC.</p> <p>A road/infrastructure corridor would not be in keeping with the principles of the reserve and Natural Open Space zone.</p> |
| Submitter 61: Scott Fitzgerald | | | | |
| S61.1 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To remove any provisions for any road or infrastructure corridor on any part of the Silverstream Spur. | <p>This submitter states that the Spur is an important part of the ecological environment in the region allowing wildlife and birds to linking reserves.</p> <p>The construction of a road would be incredibly damaging to the wildlife and bird population. A road is not required to access this area.</p> |
| Submitter 62: Martin E McHue | | | | |
| S62.1 | Mapping and Significant Natural Areas | Support | To rezone the Spur as a Natural Open Space zone in full and protect all SNA areas on the Spur. | This submitter states that they support to rezone the Spur as a Natural Open Space zone in full and protect all SNA areas on the Spur. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| S62.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To disallow any provisions for road/infrastructure corridor on any part of the Spur land. | They strongly object to provision of rules to allow for access to the SGA on any part of the Spur. |
| Submitter 63: Trevor Richardson | | | | |
| S63.1 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | That the Silverstream Spur remains as is and not become a housing area with a road and associated utilities with housing and roading. | <p>This submitter states that the road/infrastructure corridor, with future housing on the Silverstream Spur, would threaten the Silver Stream Heritage Railway with the extra stormwater runoff and disturbance to the land.</p> <p>There would be less of the Natural Open Space for birds and other wildlife and native vegetation, which is needed in this time of climate change.</p> |
| Submitter 64: Elizabeth Maria Christensen | | | | |
| S64.1 | Mapping | Support | To rezone the Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space. | This submitter states that zoning the Spur Natural Open Space provides current and future potential for this area as a native eco system and ecological corridor across the valley linking Keith George Memorial Park. |
| S64.2 | Significant Natural Areas | Support | To protect identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development, but only development as native planting. | SNAs on the Silverstream Spur to be protected from development avoiding fragmentation, loss of buffering or connectivity within the SNAs and between other indigenous habitats. |
| S64.3 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To remove the site specific provisions for infrastructure including a transport corridor from the proposed variation. | A transport corridor through the Silverstream Spur will severely compromise the rezoning of it as Natural Open Space. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|--|------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Submitter 65: Janice Nancy Carey | | | | |
| S65.1 | Mapping | Support | To make the Silverstream Spur a Natural Open Space for always, for us all. | <p>This submitter states that we need to keep the Silverstream Spur as a Natural Open Space, safe for children and all others who have the chance to visit and enjoy that area, always. Once it's gone it's too late.</p> <p>That it would be lovely to develop with native trees and even water features. To keep it for the future - natural.</p> |
| Submitter 66: Anthony Carey | | | | |
| S66.1 | Mapping | Support | To rezone the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space for the entire Upper Hutt community. | <p>This submitter states that they would like to see the Spur kept as is for the future of Silverstream and children.</p> <p>To develop into a natural reserve that will last forever.</p> |
| Submitter 67: Lynette Elizabeth Smith | | | | |
| S67.1 | Entire Variation | Oppose | <p>To delete Variation 1, including a transport corridor, from PC49.</p> <p>To establish the Silverstream Spur as a reforestation project and across valley ecological link for our birdlife.</p> <p>To confirm the public ownership of the Silverstream Spur and class it as an ecological corridor.</p> | <p>This submitter states that they definitely oppose the construction of a road through the 47 hectares of the Silverstream Spur.</p> <p>This provision should be deleted from PC49 as a natural ecological corridor at the narrowest part of the gorge will be permanently destroyed forever.</p> <p>The wilding pines that the Council planted need removal and replanted with natives.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Submitter 68: Leo Parnell Smith | | | | |
| S68.1 | Entire Variation | Oppose | <p>To delete Variation 1, including a transport corridor, from PC49.</p> <p>To become actively involved in establishing the Silverstream Spur as a reforestation project and across valley ecological link for birdlife etc.</p> <p>To confirm the public ownership of the Silverstream Spur and establish it as an ecological corridor.</p> | <p>This submitter states that they absolutely oppose the construction of a road through the 47 hectares of the Silverstream Spur.</p> <p>This provision should be deleted from PC49 because a natural ecological corridor across the upper valley will be destroyed forever, and a large climate change mitigation forest will be lost.</p> <p>Council needs to be involved in encouraging and supporting the removal of the wilding pines that they planted on the Spur and replaced with native trees.</p> |
| Submitter 69: Heather Blissett | | | | |
| S69.1 | Mapping | Support | The protection of the Spur in favour of her ecological and recreational and healing value. | This submitter states quite simply and emphatically yes, to the Spur being rezoned a Natural Open Space. |
| S69.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | As above. | They state no, to a transport corridor or any major human disturbance on the Spur except to remove exotic trees in favour of indigenous trees. Definitely no to a transport corridor or similar. |
| Submitter 70: Katelin Hardgrave | | | | |
| S70.1 | Mapping | Support | The decision for the Silverstream Spur to remain as its original intention as a reserve without any roads or infrastructure. | This submitter states that the Silverstream Spur should be zoned Open Space without the construction of a road or any other infrastructure. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|---------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| S70.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | No road or infrastructure corridor through the Spur. | The Spur to be left without the construction of a road or any other infrastructure. |
| Submitter 71: Mary Beth Taylor | | | | |
| S71.1 | Mapping and Significant Natural Areas NOSZ-O1 NOSZ-O2 ECO-O1 | Support | That the Silverstream Spur be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. zoned Natural Open Space only in its entirety free of any roads, infrastructure corridors ii. free of any housing <p>I wish the following actions for the Silverstream Spur:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Protect and enhance the draft SNA areas. i. Protect and enhance the draft SAL areas (the entire Spur). ii. Add the Sylvan Way public reserve land to the Silverstream Spur. iii. Stop the Kiln Street paper road and add this land to the Silverstream Spur. | This submitter states that they do support these provisions. They wish to make it abundantly clear that they wish for the entirety of the Silverstream Spur to be permanently: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. zoned Natural Open Space only ii. free of any road's infrastructure corridors iii. free of any housing |
| S71.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor NOSZ-P6 NOSZ-P7 NOSZ-R15 NOSZ-R22 NOSZ-S4 | Oppose | That the Silverstream Spur to be free of any roads, infrastructure corridors. <p>I wish the following actions for the Silverstream Spur:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Create public access via Sylvan Way similar to Ecclesfield Reserve in Pinehaven. | They do not support these provisions for these reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Silverstream Spur was purchased as reserve for the community and this historical intention should be honoured. ii. A transport/infrastructure corridor as described is incompatible with the highly protective conditions around Natural Open Space Zone. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Create tracks designed for good accessibility for a range of ages and abilities. iii. Create basic amenities (toilets, water, benches). 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Contrary to what is stated in Section 32 Variation 1, Silverstream Spur is not critical to enable infrastructure including a transport corridor to access the SGA as there are several alternative access points. <p>Silverstream Spur has had no public access for so long because the land was caught up in closed door negotiations between Council and GTC which did not include the public voice.</p> <p>The community did not have the full benefit of this area as public land for that reason. This is the first time the community can participate in future plans for the Spur including public access and amenities.</p> <p>There is risk to Council in enabling a road/infrastructure corridor through the Silverstream Spur because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. to date Council have not received from GTC or any other developer a feasibility study for a road. ii. to date Council have not received from GTC or any other developer a proposal or application for subdivision. iii. the persistent uncertainty around the GTC plans spans many years and creates a risk to enabling access to a 'mythical' development that may never happen, eg 'road to nowhere'. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>There is risk to the environment in enabling a road/infrastructure corridor through the Silverstream Spur because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the Spur forms part of a very important ecological corridor for birds and other wildlife to connect with Wainuiomata and Akatarawa where substantial restoration work is also taking place. ii. a permanent road would destroy the continuity and integrity of the area and efforts to restore the indigenous biodiversity. <p>NOSZ-R22 (Discretionary activity) is likely to be triggered with development of infrastructure including a transport corridor from Kiln Street as recent mapping (see appendix 3 of s32 report) provided indicates areas of indigenous vegetation to cross the width of the Silverstream Spur in an East to West direction.</p> <p><i>'This suggests that it may be more appropriate to access the Silverstream Spur and SGA from Reynolds Bach Drive to avoid these areas of identified indigenous vegetation.'</i></p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| S71.3 | General | Neutral | <p>The following actions for the Silverstream Spur:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. To remain in community ownership. | <p>The best use of the Spur is to protect it and enhance its ecological values and beauty for the community to appreciate and enjoy as a reserve for future generations.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Protect and enhance the draft SAL areas (the entire Spur). 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. | <p>The Silverstream Spur has been recently signalled as a potential draft SAL (Special Amenity Landscape). The Spur forms part of the Upper Hutt Green Belt. A permanent road through the Spur would not be an appropriate development for this protected area.</p> <p>The Silverstream Spur is affected by PC47, Draft PC48, and PC49 the last two of which represent natural and logical barriers to inappropriate human development on this land.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| Submitter 72: Peter Ross | | | | |
| S72.1 | Entire Variation | Seek amendments | <p>To declare the Silverstream Spur, in its entirety, as a public open space.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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'.</p> | <p>This submitter states that the land was purchased with funds set aside for the purchase of reserves for the public of Upper Hutt City.</p> <p>Previous Councils agreed to the land being a reserve and have declared to the public that the land was to be a reserve for public use. They recognised the need for the land to be part of a green corridor, fought against any proposed development of the land.</p> <p>The Spur is needed to maintain a bird corridor across the valley. Any roading will create barriers to birds.</p> <p>Water courses and regenerating native bush will be permanently damaged.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>Many PC49 submissions asked for the Spur to be a reserve but just one organisation, Guildford Timber Company, asked for a road to be built across the Spur. To include one request against the wishes of many is not democratic and shows a strong bias by Council towards its dealings with the GTC.</p> <p>There has not been a public consultation about changing the status of part of the Spur land from Rural Hill to General Residential – the CEO is unable to provide any proof of public consultation for this change - which is a requirement of the RMA.</p> <p>A public plan change, paid for by ratepayers, should not be used to benefit any developer to access their land. If the developer(s) need a plan change then they should put up a private plan change request to UHCC.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| Submitter 73: Shayne Fairbrother | | | | |
| S73.1 | Mapping and Significant Natural Areas | 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. | <p>This submitter states that they support the Silverstream Spur being rezoned Natural Open Space with the future intention by Council to make this area a reserve, protecting it forever.</p> <p>Support for this same area to be protected as a Significant Natural Area and in the future reclassified as a reserve under appropriate legislation.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| S73.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | Opposition to the creation of a transport corridor being built through the Silverstream Spur area outlined in PC49. | <p>They state that they oppose these provisions for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Will take a large amount of time to construct causing disruption to surrounding living environment. ii. Will destroy natural habitats for a wide variety of native animals and plant life. iii. Create a huge nuisance factor with an isolated road that could be used for all sorts of illicit activities until population is established. iv. Would remove open space for recreational purposes. v. Environmentally unfriendly as will increase CO2 emissions and reduce ability for carbon credits. vi. Eliminate vital green space, which is an asset, to the character of the Upper Hutt region. vii. Would simply overwhelm the already congested Silverstream roundabout and shopping area. viii. With the intended development behind St Patrick's College, will cause unsurmountable problems to the infrastructure around Silverstream and excessive costs and rates increases for Upper Hutt ratepayers for decades to come. ix. There have been no factual/evidential estimates to forecast population growth to justify the construction of |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|--|-----------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>this transport corridor or a feasibility study showing the need to meet population growth with these excessive building developments.</p> <p>x. If a transport corridor is to be introduced, Council needs to look at a holistic solution/s which would future-proof the gateway to the Upper Hutt region as the southern entry point to the Upper Hutt region is already extremely congested.</p> <p>Rather than quick fix misguided solutions, time should be invested in proposed a 30 year plan to the ratepayers which protects our current green spaces, future proofs the infrastructure of the city and creates a welcoming experience to all that visit and live in Upper Hutt.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| Submitter 74: Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Amelia Geary | | | | |
| S74.1 | Mapping | Support | To retain the NOSZ zoning proposed by Variation 1 for Silverstream Spur. | <p>This submitter states that they welcome this Variation to include Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space and would ultimately like to see Silverstream Spur, and adjacent land owned by UHCC, further protected by applying for it to be gazetted as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.</p> <p>They support the zoning of Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space for the reasons set out in our original submission on proposed Plan Change 49 as:</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. it is appropriate to zone Silverstream Spur according to the natural values that occur on the land, including its value as a bird corridor. ii. the Spur was once habitat to the now At Risk¹ endemic forest ringlet butterfly². iii. the Spur has potential to be a very accessible Natural Open Space Zone for the benefit and enjoyment of residents of Pinehaven and Silverstream. iv. Natural Open Space Zone is appropriate for areas where people undertake predominantly passive recreational activities, or specialised active recreational activities which have a high degree of nature interaction. As such, using the Natural Open Space Zone allows for a rule framework which focuses on more passive recreation with a strong focus on nature interaction. Silverstream Spur not only ticks all the boxes, it also provides access to nature that is closer and more accessible than the regional parks in the district. <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| S74.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Seek amendment | Seek that either policy NOSZ-P6 is deleted, or, provided that the effects management hierarchy | The submitter seeks this amendment for the following reasons: |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | NOSZ-P6 | | <p>in policy 7 is amended in line with our submission, retain policy 6, with the below amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOSZ-P6 Silverstream Spur Infrastructure <u>Only consider enabling</u> 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 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Provide for a range of passive recreation opportunities; and Support for the development of the Southern Growth Area; <u>where the effects of such development are managed in accordance with NOSZ-P7</u> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Variation 1 policies and rules fail to align with PC49 and the purpose of the Natural Open Space Zone. They also fail to protect the biodiversity values of the site and therefore don't give effect to s6(c) of the RMA, and policies 24 and 47 of the Regional Policy Statement for Wellington. Roading to provide access for the Southern Growth Area beyond the zone is not an appropriate activity for the NOSZ as it will have a detrimental effect on the natural character of the Spur. There is no functional need for a transport corridor within Silverstream Spur because as there is already access to the Southern Growth Area via Avro Road. Further, such access would cut through and divide the Significant Natural Area within that zone. The s32 report options analysis fails to consider any alternative transport corridor scenarios available to the Southern Growth Area. In PC49, NOSZ – P2 specifically identifies appropriate development with the purpose to support informal sports and recreation activities, conservation, and customary activities. NOSZ – P3 sets out that inappropriate activities and development are those that are incompatible with the natural |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | <p>character and amenity values and that these are to be avoided.</p> <p>vii. Providing for a road is not an appropriate activity in terms of the NOSZ and given the scale of activity, loss of indigenous vegetation and division effects on the SNA would also be inappropriate from an effects basis when seeking to protect indigenous ecosystems, as per the direction of Policy 24 of the RPS. Variation 1 NOSZ – P6 would be inconsistent with Policy 24 and Policy 47 of the RPS.</p> <p>viii. Variation 1 as currently proposed would not maintain or enhance connections with the Significant Natural Area and may have adverse impacts on the functioning of the SNA as a corridor between significant natural area of Keith George Memorial Park to the north and reserves to the south and southeast of the site including Forest & Bird’s Ecclesfield Reserve.</p> <p>ix. Variation 1 does not provide adequate buffering as the road corridor would bisect the Significant Natural Area(s).</p> <p>x. The cumulative effects of loss of habitat from road construction and operation as well as impacts from pests and weeds would add to incremental loss of indigenous ecosystems and habitats in Upper Hutt.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| | | | | <p>xi. Providing for road access and water storage as a controlled activity precludes the application of a precautionary approach. Therefore, Variation 1 and specifically provision for a transport corridor would be deemed an inappropriate activity under Policy 47 of the RPS.</p> <p>In addition, there are a number of uncertainties with the approach set out to Variation 1. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. NOSZ-P6 is very broad regarding the infrastructure that is to be enabled. This could be any infrastructure that would support the Southern Growth Area. ii. NOSZ-P7 uses the terms ‘Silverstream Spur Natural Area’ and ‘Silverstream Spur Significant Natural Area’. The former is also used in R15, R22 and NOSZ-S4(5). This difference in terminology creates uncertainty. P7 also refers to the area as ‘identified’ however it is not clear where this is identified. iii. NOSZ-P7 sets out a specific effects management approach for the Silverstream Spur Natural Area. This is quite different to the PC49 NOSZ provisions and potentially pre-empts future provisions for Significant |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>Natural Areas. It is not clear how these provisions would be reconciled.</p> <p>iv. There are parts of the NOSZ which include regenerating native bush which will, if it is not already, provide important habitat and improving connectivity with Keith George Memorial Park and the wider Hutt Valley.</p> |
| S74.3 | Significant Natural Areas NOSZ-P7 | Seek amendment | <p>Amend policy NOSZ-P7 to clarify that this is an additional consideration not an alternative to other NOSZ policy. NOSZ-P7 Silverstream Spur Natural Area <u>Protect the biodiversity values of Silverstream Spur Significant Natural Areas identified on Map XX by requiring A</u>adverse effects from development <u>to: on the identified Silverstream Spur Significant Natural Areas shall be:</u></p> <p>(a) avoided where practicable; and <u>Avoid the following adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity:</u></p> <p><u>(i) Loss of ecosystem representation and extent;</u> <u>(ii) Disruption to sequences, mosaics or ecosystem function;</u> <u>(iii) Fragmentation or loss of buffering or connectivity within the SNAs and between other indigenous habitats and ecosystems; and</u> <u>(iv) A reduction in population size or occupancy of threatened species using the SNAs for any part of their life cycle.</u></p> <p>(b) where adverse effects cannot be demonstrably avoided, they are mitigated where practicable;</p> | <p>Amendments are sought for the following reasons:</p> <p>i. The submitter recognises that the 'effects management hierarchy' provided in Policy NOSZ-P7 reflects the latest evolution of the 'avoid-remedy-mitigate' approach enshrined in the RMA. However, this hierarchy does not protect biodiversity values. Rather, it allows for effects on SNAs from any activity so long as the hierarchy is worked through.</p> <p>ii. Avoidance of adverse effects will be the only way to protect the biodiversity values of Silverstream Spur Significant Natural Areas.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | <p>and Avoid other adverse effects as far as possible; and (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; (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.</p> | |
| S74.4 | Definition | Seek amendment | The Variation needs to include a definition of biodiversity offsetting, which includes a requirement that an offset proposed meets the principles of offsetting. These should be included in an appendix to the Plan and should be mandatory (rather than guidance). | This submitter considers it is particularly important to include limits to offsetting, otherwise, offsetting risks being used as a management approach without any rigour, or certainty that it will appropriately deal with adverse effects on significant biodiversity. Without a clear framework for offsetting, including offsetting as an option in policy NOSZ-P7 risks allowing for adverse effects that will not be adequately managed. |
| S74.5 | Controlled Activity Rule R15 | Oppose | Seek deletion of Controlled Activity Rule R15. | Deletion sought for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1621 1222 2130 1394">i. There are parts of the NOSZ which include regenerating native bush which will, if it is not already, provide important habitat and improving connectivity with Keith George |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>Memorial Park and the wider Hutt Valley. However, NOSZ-R15 in Variation 1 would enable roading and other development over the natural values and ecological benefits, including carbon sequestration, that regenerating vegetation would provide. The provisions in PC49 and amendments sought in the submitter's original submission on PC49 are appropriate in this case and NOSZ-R15 should be deleted.</p> <p>ii. If the road is a controlled activity, then consent must be granted. This could mean that the controlled activity status indicated the appropriateness of the activity to the NOSZ, effectively making the discretionary status for vegetation removal in the SNA to provide for the road connection a token gesture with a presumption that consent will be granted. In the alternative it could mean that upon bundling consents the overall activity status is discretionary in which case the controlled activity status has little relevance. The meaning of a controlled activity in this context is confusing and should be deleted.</p> |
| S74.6 | NOSZ-R22 | Support | Retain NOSZ-R22. | |
| S74.7 | NOSZ-S4 | Seek amendment | As a consequence of deleting NOSZ-R15, delete NOSZ- S4. | NOSZ-S4 does not provide any certainty as to the total scale of works or width or earthworks |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | and vegetation clearance that could occur. It sets out lane width but does not limit the number of lanes or the width of works. Nor is there any indication of the location to which works would be confined. The standard does not address storage tanks or reservoirs and it remains unclear what the purpose, scale or location of these would be. |
| S74.8 | Mapping | 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. | The submitter states it is not clear where this is identified. |
| Submitter 75: Polly Forrest | | | | |
| S75.1 | Mapping | Support | To declare the Silverstream Spur a Natural Open Space and become a protected reserve. | <p>This submitter states that they fully support the Silverstream Spur becoming a Natural Open Space and in the future being a reserve and the guardianship that we have of this area is so important.</p> <p>This will provide a range of recreation activities and more importantly conservation of the land and protect the native birds and diversity of this area in both the bird and ecological corridors to connect the green belt land on both sides of the river.</p> |
| S75.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | No road or residential development. The road must not happen. | They oppose any move by Council, or interested parties, to enable these provisions as the Council must protect this area for future generations to come and must not put profit before people. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| Submitter 76: Kate Hunter | | | | |
| S76.1 | Mapping NOSZ-O1 NOSZ-O2 | Support with amendment | That Silverstream Spur is rezoned as Natural Open Space. That the ecological values of the Spur are investigated as part of the larger conservation mosaic of the lower North Island and is given sufficient protection. | This submitter states that they strongly support the re-zoning of Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space (NOSZ-O1) and strongly support protection of identification of the ecological value of the Spur in order to have a benchmark for protection of its values (NOSZ-O2). Beyond Significant Natural Areas already identified they encourage understanding the Spur's ecological values in the context of the lower North Island conservation network from Zealandia and Wainuiomata Mainland Island in the south to Mt Bruce and Tararua Forest Park in the north. <i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i> |
| S76.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor OSRZ-O1 OSRZ-O2 | Oppose | That a transport corridor is not approved, rather a decision is made to explore alternative access mechanisms. | In order to protect the Spur's ecological value this submitter opposes provision for a transport corridor through the Spur (OSRZ-O1) for the following reasons: i. A road is not the only way to make the Spur accessible to recreational users and indeed would be detrimental to its ecology and indeed could be considered contrary to OSRZ-O2. ii. Studies show that ' <i>reserves adjacent to roads had significantly higher weed richness than reserves further from roads</i> ' and roads create suitable environments for noxious weeds |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|--------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>contributing to the spread of noxious weeds and 'edge effects' that exacerbate the invasive potential of weeds.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| Submitter 77: Tony Chad | | | | |
| S77.1 | <p>Mapping and Significant Natural Areas</p> <p>NOSZ-O1 NOSZ-O2 ECO-O1</p> | Support | <p>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.</p> <p>They wish to make it absolutely clear, yet again, that they seek for the entire of the Silverstream Spur to be permanently:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Zoned Natural Open Space only. ii. Free of any roads, infrastructure corridors. iii. Free of any housing. iv. Remain in community ownership. <p>Seek the following actions for the Silverstream Spur:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Protect and enhance the draft SNA areas. ii. Protect and enhance the draft SAL areas on the entire Spur. iii. Add the Sylvan Way public reserve land to the Silverstream Spur. iv. Stop the Kiln Street paper road. Add this land to the Silverstream Spur. v. Create public access via Sylvan Way similar to Ecclesfield Reserve in | <p>This submitter states that they do support these provisions.</p> <p>In supporting these three provisions they wish to reiterate the content of their previous submissions to Plan Change 49 in November 2021 and to the Annual Plan in May 2022.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | <p>Pinehaven, Wi Tako Ngatata Scenic Reserve, Keith George Memorial Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> vi. Create tracks designed for good accessibility for a range of ages and abilities. vii. Create basic amenities (toilets, water, benches). 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. | |
| S77.2 | <p>Infrastructure including a transport corridor</p> <p>NOSZ-P6 NOSZ-P7 NOSZ-R15, R22 NOSZ-S4</p> | Oppose | As above | <p>This submitter does not support these provisions for these reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Silverstream Spur was purchased as reserve for the community and this historical intention should be honoured. ii. A transport/infrastructure corridor as described is incompatible with the highly protective conditions around a Natural Open Space Zone. iii. Contrary to what is stated in Section 32 Variation 1, Silverstream Spur is not critical to enable infrastructure including a transport corridor to access the SGA. There are several alternative access points. <p>In response to various statements in Section 32, they submit that:</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1615 213 2152 421">i. The proposed infrastructure corridor is completely excessive for providing access to the Spur. It is clearly proposed for the sole purpose of accessing the land belonging to a private developer. <li data-bbox="1615 427 2152 746">ii. This developer has not made public any plan for how they want to develop their land, how they would access their development, what scale of “infrastructure corridor” would be required and exactly how much of the Spur would be destroyed by establishing such a road with a gradient not exceeding 1:8 (NOSZ-S4). <li data-bbox="1615 753 2152 1002">iii. In the absence of any such public plan the UHCC should not be trying to read their minds and leave their options open. GTC have no options in relation to the Silverstream Spur - it is public, not private land. They have other access points to their property. <li data-bbox="1615 1008 2152 1321">iv. Silverstream Spur has had no public access for so long because the land was caught up in closed door negotiations between Council and GTC which did not include the public voice. This is the first time the community can participate in future plans for the Spur which of course includes public access and amenities. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | <p>There is risk to Council in enabling a road/infrastructure corridor through the Silverstream Spur because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Council have not received from GTC or any other developer a feasibility study for a road. ii. Council have not received from GTC or any other developer a proposal or application for subdivision. iii. The persistent uncertainty around the GTC plans creates a risk to enabling access to a 'mythical' development that may never happen, e.g., 'road to nowhere'. iv. There is risk to the environment in enabling a road/infrastructure corridor because the Spur forms part of a very important ecological corridor for birds and other wildlife. v. A permanent road would destroy the continuity and integrity of the area and efforts to restore the indigenous biodiversity. <p>The best use of the Spur is to turn it back to the environment, protect it and enhance its ecological values for the community to appreciate and enjoy as a reserve for future generations.</p> <p>The Silverstream Spur has been recently signalled as a potential draft SAL (Special Amenity Landscape). The Spur forms part of</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>the Upper Hutt Green Belt. A permanent road through the Spur would not be an appropriate development for this protected area. The Silverstream Spur is affected by PC47, Draft PC48, and PC49.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| Submitter 78: Caleb Scott | | | | |
| S78.1 | Mapping and Significant Natural Areas | 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. | <p>This submitter fully supports the rezoning of the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space.</p> <p>They support protecting identified Significant Natural Areas on the Spur from development, but this must include that no area of the Spur is used for other things such as utilities (power and water infrastructure etc).</p> |
| S78.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To disallow any provisions allowing construction of a road/infrastructure corridor. | They oppose these provisions. |
| Submitter 79: Upper Hutt Branch of Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc (Forest and Bird) - Barry Wards | | | | |
| S79.1 | Mapping | Support | To rezone the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space as proposed in Variation 1. | <p>This submitter supports the proposal to rezone the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. While the Spur has been planted in exotic pine trees, it contains extensive tracts of native regenerating forest. These regenerating areas form the basis of a fully regenerating natural area, especially if the pines are eventually removed and additional |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| | | | | <p>native planting is done over a period of years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. As the city grows and its population expands, the need for open space is even more important. As noted in the strategic goals of the Upper Hutt Open Space Strategy 2018-2028. iii. As Natural Open Space, the Silverstream Spur is important to wellbeing and the interdependence of people, and their surroundings as noted in the Upper Hutt Open Space Strategy 2018-2028. iv. Legacy and the connection to what we have lost, especially in terms of biodiversity and thriving natural habitat, is critical to communities and people’s sense of ‘place’. The presence and closeness of open space, reinforces that legacy component and helps connect people with it. v. The Silverstream Spur forms a critical ecological link between the Eastern and Western Hills of the Hutt Valley, contributing to the rebuilding of the ecological corridor network that once encompassed the entire Wellington region. vi. Upper Hutt has few Natural Open Spaces that exist primarily for their intrinsic environmental and biodiversity values, and which provide opportunities to be further valued as such. The Silverstream Spur has the |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>potential to be such a space, especially through combined community effort to restore and enhance it.</p> <p>This is further supported through recognition of the significant biodiversity protection and restoration work undertaken by the submitter and other organisations over decades within Wellington and the Hutt Valley, resulting in reduction in mammalian predators and the concomitant increase in native birdlife.</p> <p>Rezoning the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space would add weight to future proposals to seek classification of the land as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| S79.2 | <p>Infrastructure including a transport corridor</p> <p>NOSZ-P6</p> | Seek amendment | <p>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:</p> <p><u>NOSZ-P6 – Silverstream Spur Natural Open Space 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></p> <p><u>1. Allow optimum ecological functioning;</u> <u>2. Enable appropriate activities to support achieving those values and opportunities.</u></p> | <p>The submitter does not support the proposal to enable site specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor, for the following reasons:</p> <p>i. Such infrastructure would significantly compromise the values of the Silverstream Spur, and the associated proposed Significant Natural Areas, the opportunities these provide for environmental, conservation and biodiversity sustainability and protection, and recreation, through future provision of walking, cycling and other passive activities.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1608 177 2152 456">ii. The value of SNAs would be compromised by the presence of infrastructure, especially a transport corridor. Such areas are ‘significant’ for good reason – let’s not even attempt to compromise that by allowing for further destructive human-attributed activities to take place. <li data-bbox="1608 464 2152 671">iii. While the Silverstream Spur is 35 ha, the larger the size of protected areas and the less those areas are broken up (e.g., by putting a road through them), the more effective they are as areas for conserving avian diversity. <li data-bbox="1608 679 2152 1318">iv. Kiwi have recently been heard in Wi Tako Ngatata Scenic Reserve and the Blue Mountains. The submitter has received two reports of kiwi being heard in Oct/Nov 2022. In addition, a juvenile make kiwi was killed by a dog in the Blue Mountains ~5 years ago. It is most likely that such reports are the result of kiwi overflowing from the Mainland Island Restoration Operation (MIRO) site in Eastbourne. If this is the case, the inclusion of a transport corridor on the Silverstream Spur, plus the prospect of extensive residential development in the SGA, would further jeopardise the possibility that we would once again see kiwi living in the upper valley. <li data-bbox="1608 1326 2152 1391">v. The ability of Natural Open Spaces, to optimally function to achieve |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| | | | | <p>biodiversity and environmental outcomes is highly dependent on spatial attributes, such as size and connectivity². Disruption of these adversely affects this function, a phenomenon frequently referred to as 'habitat fragmentation'. The core area shrinks by a much greater area than the actual land taken by the corridor. In addition, the microclimate is changed and disturbance more likely; the connectivity of animal life is compromised. The Section 32 Report notes that 'There may be some small effect to the environment based on activities occurring and potential development.' The submitter considers that these effects will not be small at all.</p> <p>vi. The inclusion of a transport corridor on the Silverstream Spur will adversely impact the ability to achieve the goals of the Land Use Strategy Upper Hutt 2016 – 2043. Such goals include, <i>'Preserve and enhance the quality of our natural environment'</i> and <i>'Maintain and enhance our open space network.'</i> Enhancing the quality of open space should include robust analysis of options to avoid/mitigate adverse effects. As that Strategy notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>We want to make sure there is appropriate protection for the qualities of the environment that contribute to</i> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | <p><i>the city's image, identity and biodiversity.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>We also want to make sure that connections between areas that have environmental value are identified and improved.</i> <p>vii. The installation of infrastructure, including a transport corridor, on the Silverstream Spur will create extensive disruption beyond the corridor itself. This will include the extensive excavation of earthworks, laying of pipes, concrete and sealing, removal of indigenous vegetation, and the destructive impacts of numerous large vehicles.</p> <p>viii. In acquiring the Silverstream Spur, historical Upper Hutt City Council documents³ support the intention of purchase for reserve purposes.</p> <p>ix. While a transport corridor 'would allow accessibility to the Silverstream Spur for passive recreation, conservation, and customary activities, as well as opening access to potential development in the Southern Growth Area,⁴ it is not essential or critical to do so.</p> <p>x. The likely consequential impacts of a transport corridor will significantly affect the opportunities provided by the Silverstream Spur being rezoned as Natural Open Space.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | <p data-bbox="1608 177 2157 312">xi. The purpose of the proposed transport corridor is for vehicular access to the SGA, the submitter’s position related to this is outlined below:</p> <p data-bbox="1608 357 2069 456">The provision of a transport corridor is inconsistent with proposals in PC49. The submitter maintains that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1608 501 2130 995">i. A transport corridor would not be considered a ‘low scale and level of development’. The Section 32 Report and proposed policy NOSZ-S4 notes that approximately 10% of the Spur would be required, equating to approximately 3.5ha. Neither the Report or NOSZ-S4 place certainty on the scale of a transport corridor, including the extent of vegetation clearance and earthworks, how many lanes can be built or how the scale of earthworks is to be managed to limit adverse effects. <li data-bbox="1608 1007 2152 1321">ii. A transport corridor is not needed to support ‘appropriate activities’. The Silverstream Spur is within walking and cycling distance of residential areas in Upper Hutt and can easily be accessed by future walking and cycling tracks from the end of Kiln St. This is supported by the Council’s Sustainability Strategy – 2020 <li data-bbox="1608 1332 2152 1390">iii. Infrastructure, particularly including a transport corridor, to provide access to |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>the SGA is not an appropriate activity for the NOSZ.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| S79.3 | Significant Natural Areas NOSZ-P7 | Seek amendment | <p>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:</p> <p>NOSZ-P7 – Silverstream Spur Natural Open Space – Management of Effects</p> <p>Adverse effects from activities within the Silverstream Spur Natural Open Space shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be avoided where practicable. 2. Avoid the following adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity values: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Loss of ecosystem representation and extent; ii. Loss or disturbance to ecosystem functioning; iii. Habitat fragmentation or loss of connectivity within the open space and between other indigenous habitats and ecosystems; iv. The potential for indigenous species recovery or establishment, especially through the functioning of ecological corridors; and | <p>They support the proposal to protect significant natural areas on the Silverstream Spur from development for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sections 6(c)⁵ and 7(c)(d) and (d)⁶ of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the RMA) require these areas to be protected. ii. Silverstream Spur is a prominent part of the Upper Hutt landscape, considered to be distinctive, widely recognised and highly valued, especially as part of the welcoming entrance to Upper Hutt. The presence of SNAs within the Spur and the potential opportunities to enhance their natural value needs to be retained. iii. Development and the inclusion of infrastructure, including a transport corridor, through the identified SNAs is inconsistent with the legal requirement and Upper Hutt City Council strategies to protect them. iv. Any development within the SNAs will compromise the values which merit that designation. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | <p>v. Reduction in population size of indigenous flora and fauna.</p> <p>3. Avoid other adverse effects as far as possible, including those that may compromise all values that characterise the open space through the zoning designation.</p> <p>4. If unable to be avoided, minimise adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity values and values identified in 3 above.</p> <p>5. If biodiversity offsetting is not appropriate, the activities shall be avoided.</p> | <p>v. Development of the SNAs is likely to adversely affect ecological functioning and biodiversity values of the wider Silverstream Spur and environs. The identified SNAs cannot be considered as isolated units in themselves and naturally connect to neighbouring forest, waterways, and ecological units. Any development will likely disrupt these connections, not only adversely impacting the SNAs themselves but the surrounding areas.</p> <p>vi. Development of the SNAs, especially through residential development, will increase the presence, spread and impacts of exotic plants and animals, including animal predators. This will compromise the biodiversity values of the SNAs, the Silverstream Spur, and the wider environs, particularly the ability of these areas to effectively function as part of an ecological corridor network.</p> <p>vii. The identified SNAs form a substantial part of the Silverstream Spur and are likely to increase in size through further enhancement of biodiversity values. The submitter notes that there is considerable uncertainty about where SNAs are in relation to the Silverstream Spur itself and the size of them. The map of the current and proposed zoning of the Silverstream Spur, included in the Section 32</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | <p>Report, showing the identified SNAs, is inconsistent with the identified SNAs on the Spur shown on the web map on the Upper Hutt City Council website. This uncertainty impacts on the proposed provision for infrastructure, including a transport corridor, because it raises considerable uncertainty about where that transport corridor may go and how extensive it may be. While it is not satisfactory to submit on the knowledge that this uncertainty exists, in-principle and for the reasons above, the submitter does not support any development in SNAs.</p> <p>viii. The submitter also maintains that the proposed provisions in NOSZ-P7 do not adequately protect biodiversity values of SNAs. While NOSZ-PZ is titled to address the management of adverse effects on the proposed Silverstream Spur Natural Area as a whole, the management of adverse effects only addresses those pertaining to the 'identified Silverstream Spur Significant Natural Areas'. Furthermore, this management is insufficient when applied to the biodiversity values of SNAs. The submitter states the only way to adequately protect these values is to avoid them. Necessarily, because of their proximity in and to the Silverstream Spur and wider environs. Avoidance should be</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | extended to the whole Silverstream Natural Area, not just the SNAs. In addition, NOSZ policies need to provide for the management of effects in the Silverstream Spur Natural Area, as well as the SNAs. |
| S79.4 | Definition | Seek amendment | Include a definition for 'biodiversity offsetting' in the operative Upper Hutt District Plan. | |
| S79.5 | NOSZ-R15 | Oppose | Delete NOSZ-R15. | |
| S79.6 | NOSZ-R22 | Seek amendment | Retain NOSZ-R22 but amend 'Silverstream Spur Natural Area' to 'Silverstream Spur Natural Open Space'. | |
| S79.7 | NOSZ-S4 | Oppose | Delete NOSZ-S4. | |
| S79.8 | Mapping | 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. | |
| Submitter 80: John Campbell | | | | |
| S80.1 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | That Variation 1 be rejected, and that no road be allowed to cut through the Silverstream Reserve. | <p>This submitter states that if a road were to be cut through the forest of the Silverstream Spur the fire risk would increase due to gorse and Pinus Radiata and environmental conditions adjacent to the road corridor. The submitter states that intense fires have been a feature of the Spur.</p> <p>The road would permanently cut the reserve into two separate segments thus negating any benefit of making the Spur a reserve. Sun</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>would penetrate far into forest on the eastern side of the road and thus encourage gorse, broom, blackberry, and other weeds.</p> <p>Road access to the ridge should be from Reynold's Bach Drive to avoid these problems.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| Submitter 81: Ros Connelly | | | | |
| S81.1 | <p>Infrastructure including a transport corridor</p> <p>NOSZ-P6 NOSZ-S4</p> | Oppose | To remove the provision of the transport corridor. | <p>This submitter states that a transport corridor would break up the bush, thus creating a barrier and a hazard for birds, insects, and lizards. The bush in Upper Hutt city is already fragmented and this exacerbates the problem.</p> <p>They question the concept of the Southern Growth Area. Any new subdivisions must be within 15 minute walk of frequent public transport, and they do not see how this development could meet the target - a concept that is now considered to be good urban design.</p> <p>There is potential to provide for multi-modal or low zero transport options, although they would have to see details of this before they could support.</p> <p>Given the climate crisis, they cannot support any subdivisions that are going to further lock in car use. Given few details of the Southern Growth Area are available it appears prima</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>facie that the Southern Growth Area will not meet the low carbon imperative.</p> <p>For these reasons they support the whole area being zoned Natural Open Space and state there is no need to provision for a transport corridor.</p> |
| Submitter 82: The Guildford Timber Company Limited | | | | |
| S82.1 | Entire Variation and s32 Report | Seek amendment | <p>In summary, GTC seeks that either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The variation be withdrawn/rejected and PC49 continues through the schedule 1 RMA process without affecting the Silverstream Spur; or 2. The variation is subject to a comprehensive redrafting to address the matters outlined in the 'overall position' section of this submission and 3. Any alternative or consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in this submission be adopted. | <p>This submitter states that while there are aspects of the proposal that they support, overall, they oppose the variation for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The proposed provisions are not enabling of a roading connection and associated servicing between Kiln Street and Silverstream Forest. ii. The provisions are not sufficiently clear as to how competing policy aims are to be collectively achieved – for example proposed Policies NOSZ-P6 and NOSZ-P7. iii. The provisions contain rules that are not efficient or effective for the purposes of implementing the operative objectives and policies of the District Plan, or of the proposed policies in the variation – in particular proposed Rule NOSZ-R15. iv. The provisions duplicate, or conflict with, other chapters in the operative District Plan – for example in the earthworks chapter, the ecosystems |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | <p>and biodiversity chapter, and the transport and parking chapter.</p> <p>v. The proposed standards relating to road design matters – including clauses 1, 2, 3 and 4 under Standards NOSZ-S4 – are neither necessary, nor justified.</p> <p>vi. By zoning the entirety of the Spur for open space purposes, the efficiency of providing a major collector road through the Spur is not optimised – 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.</p> <p>In addition to the above, opposition is based on fundamental concerns regarding the references in the variation provisions to ‘natural areas’. They consider that the variation is void of certainty in this regard for the following reasons:</p> <p>i. There is a mixture of terminology used in relation to the concept of natural areas that make the provisions (as a whole) very difficult to understand – for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy NOSZ-P7 refers to (multiple) “identified Silverstream Spur Significant Natural Areas”; |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rules NOSZ-R15 and NOSZ-R22 refer to (a single) “Silverstream Spur Natural Area (Pt Sec 1 SO 34755, Parcel ID: 3875189)” without using the terms “identified” or “significant”; and • Standard NOSZ-S4 uses the term “Silverstream Spur Natural Area”, without reference to the legal description, parcel ID, or the terms “identified” or “significant”. <p>ii. On plain reading of the above, it is unclear whether the entire Silverstream Spur is “identified” as a Significant Natural Area where its legal description is referred to and no other identifier is provided, whether there are multiple natural areas that serve different purposes under the proposed variation, or whether some other construct is meant to apply.</p> <p>iii. There is no plan, figure or wording included in the variation provisions that otherwise identifies any area as “Significant Natural Area” in the context of the Spur to assist with interpretation in the above respect.</p> <p>iv. While the right-hand image on the maps attached to the variation entitled “Current and Proposed Zoning of the Silverstream Spur” indicates two</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | <p>colours, it does not expressly identify any Significant Natural Area in name.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> v. Appendix 1 to the section 32 report accompanying the variation assists with the notation stating “[t]he proposed zoning of Natural Open Space also shows the extent of the area on the Silverstream Spur identified as a Significant Natural Area”, but this notation does not indicate the part of the site that comprises a Significant Natural Area, nor is the notation included on the zone map attached to the variation provisions. vi. while Appendix 3 to the section 32 report discusses the term “SNA”, it does not label any area as Significant Natural Area. vii. if the area labelled ‘Combined extent of SNA...’ under Figure 5 in Appendix 3 to the section 32 report is intended to be the basis for the ‘identified’ natural area, and the lighter toned area on the right-hand image of the zoning map is intended to represent that identified area in the proposed variation itself, it is noted that the spatial extent of these two areas is not equivalent and there is no explanation as to why there is variation between the two. <p>They also note the lack of rigour as to the methodology, policy basis, analysis and</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>justification regarding the proposed natural areas set out in section 32 Report Appendix 3. This submitter is concerned to see the proposed inclusion of Significant Natural Area(s) on the Silverstream Spur as a standalone feature, in the knowledge that Council has prepared a draft plan change to address such areas across the city as a whole. Good practice would promote that the areas be advanced as a single proposal, with a consistent approach applied across the plan, and supporting analysis commensurate with the scale and significance of the proposed subject matter of the provisions.</p> <p>Related to the above, the submitter commissioned its own independent ecological advice following the release of the aforementioned draft plan change. The conclusions and recommendations of that review do not support the inclusion of a Significant Natural Area within the Spur as proposed.</p> |
| S82.2 | Mapping | Seek amendment | <p>Amend the proposed zoning of the Silverstream Spur as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Retain the General Residential Zone over that portion of the land subject to that zoning in the Operative Plan. 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 | <p>This submitter states that the proposed variation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Is not sufficiently enabling of a roading connection and associated servicing between Kiln Street and the Southern Growth Area. ii. Does not provide for the efficient integration of infrastructure with land use development. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | <p>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. NB - Alternative zoning options may also be appropriate.</p> <p>3. Consequentially delete the spatial notation labelled UH070 as shown on the proposed rezoning map.</p> | <p>iii. Reduces the efficacy of the District Plan as relates to Council’s statutory obligations to provide sufficient development capacity under the National Policy Statement for Urban Development.</p> |
| S82.3 | <p>Infrastructure including a transport corridor</p> <p>NOSZ-P6</p> | Support in part | <p>Amend proposed Policy NOSZ-P6 as follows (or similar):</p> <p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. provide for a range of passive recreation opportunities; and 2. support for the development of the Southern Growth Area, including <u>the construction and operation of new community water infrastructure;</u> <u>3. service residential development within the Spur;</u> <u>4. facilitate the revegetation of retired plantation forestry with appropriate native species.</u> | <p>They support the intent of proposed Policy P6 to enable a new transport corridor and other infrastructure within the Spur; however, these proposed facilities would have wider functions and benefits that should be reflected in the policy. Namely, a new collector road would enable the construction of substantial new community water supply assets to the overall benefit of the City’s resilience and service levels.</p> <p>A new roading connection will also facilitate enhancements to the safe, efficient function of the transport network. In particular, it will afford a safer route for the transport of materials from retiring forestry plantations, away from more constrained parts of the network. Facilitating the retirement of plantation forestry in the Southern Growth Area and removal of pines on the Spur will also enable native bush regeneration programmes</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | to be advanced more expeditiously and extensively. |
| S82.4 | Significant Natural Areas NOSZ-P7 | Oppose | To delete proposed Policy NOSZ-P7 | <p>As discussed in the general summary of the submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. This policy is more appropriate to be introduced by way of comprehensive plan change relating to Significant Natural Areas across the city; ii. Council’s evidence base does not support the Spur (or part of the Spur) being identified as a Significant Natural Area, nor has such an area been accurately identified in the variation document; and iii. The policy does not clarify how it is intended to be applied in conjunction with the policy direction in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter in the operative District Plan, or indeed justify its necessity given that existing direction in the Plan. |
| S82.5 | NOSZ-R15 | 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: | This submitter supports – in principle – the use of a controlled activity rule to implement the enabling direction of proposed Policy NOSZ-P6, the drafting of rule NOSZ-R15 as notified lacks sufficient clarity and efficacy. The submitter considers that amendments are required to address the following: |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | <p>1. Amend the wording of the rule description as follows (or similar):</p> <p>Road and associated network utility infrastructure, including <u>any associated earthworks and vegetation clearance</u> storage tanks or reservoirs on the Silverstream Spur Natural Area (PT Sect 1 SO 34755, Parcel ID: 3875189)</p> <p>2. Delete clause a) requiring compliance with proposed standard NOSZ-S4.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>4. Delete clauses f), g) and h).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>NB – alternative drafting solutions may be</i></p> | <p>i. subject to Council confirming the area comprising the ‘Identified’ Significant Natural Area on the Spur, it is understood from the section 32 report that the area spans the width of the land – if that is the case, compliance with the controlled activity standards under proposed NOSZ-S4 is not possible and the enabling direction of NOSZ-P6 will not be implemented, let alone in an efficient or effective manner;</p> <p>ii. matter of control c) relating to road alignment, location and design duplicates matters that would otherwise be considered within Council’s discretion under Rule TP-R3 in the operative District Plan – the submitter supports the controlled activity pathway under the proposed rule, but a corresponding cross reference is required within the Transport Chapter to avoid duplication and enhance the efficient implementation of proposed Policy NOSZ-P6;</p> <p>iii. similar to the point above, matter of control d) duplicates the role of rules for network utility infrastructure under the Network Utility Chapter, and exclusionary clauses are required to remove this duplication;</p> <p>iv. matter of control e) relating to “earthworks” similarly duplicates the</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | <p><i>appropriate for the purposes of affecting this relief.</i></p> | <p>regulatory function of corresponding rules in the Earthworks Chapter, which should be avoided for the sake of efficiency and clarity;</p> <p>v. matter of control f) refers to ‘any special amenity feature’ – it is unclear what this matter refers to as no such features have been identified, and in the absence of sufficient clarity in that regard, the efficacy of the controlled activity rule is compromised;</p> <p>vi. pursuant to s108(10) of the RMA, the inclusion of matter of control g) is not authorised under the financial contribution’s provisions set out under the Development Contributions Chapter of the Operative Plan unless the new services are vested in association with a subdivision proposal – Rule DC-2 does not require financial contributions for the creation of new network utilities or services themselves, but to provide for such facilities where associated with subdivision and other development;</p> <p>vii. matter h) should be deleted in light of the submitters submission regarding the Council’s identification of Significant Natural Areas on the Spur; and</p> <p>viii. there is general lack of specificity in the drafting of matters of control – efficient use of the controlled activity</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| | | | | status will be enhanced by providing clearer matters. |
| S82.6 | NOSZ-R22 | Oppose | Delete proposed Rule NOSZ-R22 | <p>As discussed in the general summary of the submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Council’s evidence base does not support the Spur (or part of the Spur) being identified as a Significant Natural Area, nor has such an area been accurately identified in the variation document; and ii. the rule does not clarify how it is intended to be applied in conjunction with the rules in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter in the operative District Plan, or indeed justify its necessity given that existing regulatory approach in the Plan. |
| S82.7 | NOSZ-S4 | Oppose | Delete proposed standard NOSZ-S4 | <p>As discussed in the general summary of the submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the proposed road design clauses (1-4) are unnecessary, and unjustified in the Council’s Section 32 Report – such matters can be addressed through matters of control on the new road ii. Council’s evidence base does not support the Spur (or part of the Spur) being identified as a natural area, nor has such an area been accurately identified in the variation document |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | iii. clause 5 under the standard is untenable – that roading and earthworks are subject to this control and no other network utility infrastructure enabled under proposed Rule R15. |
| Submitter 83: Pam Hurly | | | | |
| S83.1 | Mapping and Significant Natural Areas | Support | To rezone the Spur to Natural Open Space and protecting the Significant Natural Areas on the Spur from development. | This submitter supports rezoning the Spur to Natural Open Space and protecting the Significant Natural Areas from development. |
| S83.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To withdraw any intention to establish a transport corridor. | They do not support site-specific provisions including a transport corridor. |
| Submitter 84: Wayne Dolden | | | | |
| S84.1 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To remove the provision of a road on any part of the Silverstream Spur. | This submitter states that the Spur should have no roads, development or infrastructure introduced to this area of land. |
| S84.2 | Mapping | Support | For the Silverstream Spur to remain as previously intended as a reserve and zoned as Natural Open Space. | That the Silverstream Spur should remain as a reserve as decided by previous Council members. It should remain as a reserve and natural habitat for wildlife. |
| Submitter 85: D Garland | | | | |
| S85.1 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | 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. | This submitter states that the intent for the acquisition of the Silverstream Spur by the Council in the beginning, was for the Spur to be left as a natural space reserve, an intent which has yet to be formally followed through with by the Council. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | <p>The Council is to be applauded for finally making further steps towards achieving the original vision by zoning as Natural Open Space.</p> <p>The proposed provisions are in contradiction to the original aims and vision for the Spur, and they oppose this provision fully as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. there is no evidence that a transport corridor through the Spur is necessary, and the developers who hold land which potentially might be developed adjacent to the Spur have other, potentially better, access options to their land than across the Spur. ii. the Spur itself is of importance as is, both in ecological terms and in terms of being a reserve for public enjoyment. iii. public access to the Spur is not necessary via this road, nor via a road at all - walking tracks are sufficient. iv. logging of trees has occurred so far successfully without a road. v. a transport corridor devalues the Spur as a public reserve for no reason that can be justified in the interest of the public. vi. the transport corridor has potential ecological impacts that would affect the Spur and surrounding area, with no mitigation able to fully overcome these impacts. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>They oppose these provisions and urge the Council to delete this provision while proceeding to protect the Silverstream Spur as a wholly intact reserve, in line with the original vision of the Upper Hutt City Council and the public who supported the purchase of the land in the first place.</p> |
| Submitter 86: Simon Edmonds | | | | |
| S86.1 | Mapping | Support | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>This submitter states that they agree with the Plan Change 49 Variation 1 proposal to rezone the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space.</p> <p>This part of the proposed changes is important and is supported by the submitter and on behalf of SSR who seeks to change the zoning of the entire Spur to Natural Open Space.</p> <p>This could be a first step of a later separate designation as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. Historic documents show UHCC's intention for the land when purchased using reserve fund money, and in later moves to rezone and designate the land as a reserve.</p> <p>The retention of the Spur in a natural state would provide the buffer for an operating heritage railway. It also minimises the fire risk from the operation of steam locomotives and avoids reverse sensitivity effects from smoke and noise.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>The retention of the Spur in a natural state will not alter the stream flow intensity and volume that crosses the railway alignment.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| 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. | <p>The submitter does not agree with the unnecessary and unilateral proposals by UHCC to include specific provisions within the Open Space designation for the Spur for infrastructure including a transport corridor.</p> <p>This part of the proposal seeks to allow a road/infrastructure corridor to be constructed anywhere on the Spur, with no restriction on the area it takes up, only restricting the width and gradient of the road.</p> <p>Such destruction of the Spur does not fit with the underlying Natural Open Space Zoning and would result in severely limiting the ecological function of the Spur, as well as storm water and land disturbance issues for SSR at the bottom of the Spur.</p> <p>While the road may require a resource consent if it were to pass through the SNA areas on the Spur, it may be possible for the road to go ahead on the Spur with no further consultation.</p> <p>The construction of this road/infrastructure corridor is not 'critical' to the development of the Southern Growth Area, the developers</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>have several other feasible options for this corridor.</p> <p>Neither is it critical for the road to be constructed to allow for recreational access to the Spur, other local reserves do not have roads through the middle to allow public access.</p> <p>Although some additional protection may be offered to the areas identified in the proposed Plan Change as Significant Natural Areas from development, it is important to note that ‘transport corridor’ and ‘infrastructure’ are not included in the definition of ‘development’ and could therefore be carried out within the SNA areas if the provisions for the road/infrastructure are included in the approved plan change.</p> <p>They support the protection of these SNA areas, but don’t consider that ‘protection from development’ adequate if it does not preclude works in these areas carried out as infrastructure or transport corridors.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| 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 most recent ecological assessment of the Spur commissioned by UHCC has confirmed the anecdotal evidence put forward by various conservation interest groups that there are areas of regenerating native bush on the Spur |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|---|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | <p>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.</p> | <p>that can be classed as Significant Natural Areas.</p> <p>These are not small areas of high value regrowth, and the advice received from conservation professionals is that the entirety of the Spur land as a single undivided parcel with a favourable plan shape and minimum area meets the definition of a successful conservation area likely to support a growing population of flora and fauna.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| S86.4 | General | Seek amendment | <p>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.</p> | |
| Submitter 87: David Grant-Taylor | | | | |
| S87.1 | Significant Natural Areas | Seek amendment | <p>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.</p> | <p>This submitter states that the initial purchase of the area was from the reserve fund and proposals to use the area for housing have temporarily abated but the proposal is now to take the area out of reserve and rezone as Natural Open Space with two separate portions identified as Significant Natural Areas.</p> <p>The Significant Natural Areas should be continuous to maintain integrity of the flow of natural biota. Reports previously provided to the Council are in error in their detail on the</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>biota across the Spur and indicate that at the very least the Significant Natural Areas should be continuous and much larger.</p> <p>It would be better to define the area as a reserve with only walking access. All of the area is significant.</p> <p>The Spur forms a natural break between Lower and Upper Hutt, and a portion of the corridor between western and eastern sides of the valley and beyond in both ways.</p> |
| S87.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To remove provision for roading and provision for access to the Southern Growth Area. | <p>They state that site specific infrastructure is not specific at all. It is completely unspecified, and fulfilment of this clause allows anything at all. Whatever happens this must be defined before it is an acceptable component of the proposal.</p> <p>Access for a range of recreation as well as access to the Southern Growth Area appears to be an attempt to provide a road to a yet unspecified development.</p> <p>Most developers have to pay for their own roading access, and to provide a route across one of the last possibilities for provision of green space seems to run contrary to the conduct of most developments.</p> |
| Submitter 88: Silver Stream Railway Incorporated (petition attached) | | | | |
| S88.1 | Mapping | Support | To zone the entire Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space. | This submitter states that the rezoning to Natural Open Space and protection of |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>identified SNAs on the Spur fit with UHCC's published sustainability strategy goals being:</p> <p><i>1: Council will be a carbon neutral organisation by 2035</i> <i>2: We will prioritise protecting and enhancing our natural environment,</i> <i>4: Our community will be resilient, adaptable, and inclusive</i> <i>5: Upper Hutt City Council will be a leader in the community on sustainability issues,</i> <i>7: Our community will be engaged and informed on sustainability issues</i> <i>8: We will encourage low carbon transport</i></p> <p>However, the provisions to allow for the construction of a road infrastructure corridor on the Spur for the proposed Southern Growth Area are in direct contravention to these same sustainability objectives. Attempting in PC49 V1 to justify the construction of a road to allow for recreational access is particularly removed from the principals of this strategy on carbon neutrality, protecting and enhancing our natural environment and encouraging low carbon transport.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details and attached petition.</i></p> |
| S88.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To remove any and all provisions for a road/transport and/or network utility infrastructure corridor on any part of the Silverstream Spur. | This submitter considers that the proposed site specific provisions would lead to enablement of residential development in the future on the Spur and in turn undermine the ability to |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | <p>continue to operate Silver Stream Railway and would therefore lead to the demise of the facility.</p> <p>The major issues for the submitter arising from development of the Spur for a road/infrastructure corridor, residential development, even in part are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The loss of the iconic landscape backdrop of the Spur as a green space that is part of the Heritage Railway character of SSR and the entrance of Upper Hutt. ii. The reverse sensitivity effects of prodigious amounts of wood, coal and oil smoke from steam locomotives and the noise of steam whistles and trains on the amenity of any future residential areas. iii. The enhanced risk profile for the consequences of any fire on the Spur caused by the railway operation or associated activities by SSR and the issues with obtaining insurance for this risk. iv. The influence of changes to the storm water catchments from the Spur that discharge across the railway alignment. <p>This submitter considers that the construction of a road/infrastructure corridor on the UHCC owned Spur would result in preferential</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | <p>environmental, recreational, and financial benefits for GTC, at the expense of and the loss of existing similar environmental, recreational and community benefits currently enjoyed by other residents of Upper Hutt and by the submitter and their collaboration partners on land adjacent the Spur.</p> <p>It is inevitable that any future residential development on areas that have been defined as suitable by both UHCC and GTC enabled by the construction of a road/infrastructure corridor would result in complaints from new residents about smoke discharge. The submitter considers it a realistic concern that complaints would force UHCC to take action that would result in a restriction of their activities. Complaints and consequential restrictions could occur regardless of any existing use rights and having in place reverse sensitivity covenants removing rights of owners to complain as UHCC has statutory responsibilities to respond to such complaints.</p> <p>Insurability – the submitter relies on their own Public Liability Insurance policy cover that is required to allow operation of the railway with the ever present risk of fire and other risks associated with the operation of a railway. As with most insurance, the ongoing ability to first obtain any kind of cover and then at what premium cost requires frequent assessments and changes of insurer. Any material changes to the risk profile of a heritage railway, such as</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | <p>Silver Stream Railway, such as would result from adjacent residential development or the location of infrastructure in close proximity to the railways activities will place more pressure on the insurability of operating the railway.</p> <p>The nature of the Silver Stream Railway activities is such that there is an ongoing fire risk for the vegetation along the northern flanks of the Spur. The most recent fire in 2012 demonstrated the spread of fire up the slopes that can occur almost reaching the ridge line in this case. Development on the Spur would be at risk from fires and instead of the insurance risk being for vacant land it would be property and future enabled development of residential property.</p> <p>The submitter considers 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. The present construction of the railway formation still reflects the type of construction used when it was built 140 years ago with an economical narrow formation cut into the face of the Spur</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| | | | | <p>and end tipped into Hulls Creek. Culvert pipes cross the formation to discharge concentrated water flows from gullies on the Spur below the railway to Hulls Creek. The formation the railway is built on is prone to slope instability when it becomes saturated. This could be materially affected by any increase in total flow volumes from the catchments occurring over longer periods. The instability of the weathered greywacke rock faces above the railway are also prone to increased instability with greater amounts of saturation occurring. All these effects on storm water discharges are likely to occur with development of any type. Therefore, the submitter considers that any development within any of the catchments discharging across the railway premises along the flanks of the Spur should not be permitted.</p> <p>The provisions of PC49 V1 to allow the construction of a road infrastructure corridor on land that is otherwise being set aside as Natural Open Space are without precedent in NZ district planning documents. This would set a very concerning precedent example for other open space land held on behalf of the citizens of any town or city in New Zealand.</p> <p>No attempt has been made in PC49 V1 to explore alternatives for accessing the proposed SGA/GTC land other than via the Spur. Defining alternative access routes and evaluating these alternatives would be standard practice to establish a preferred option for an issue such</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | <p>as this. GTC have and are continuing to explore possibilities for access to their land through further land acquisitions and have stated the SGA development is able to go ahead without the use of the Spur for access.</p> <p>The submitters opinion is that they are not reassured that the proposed site-specific provisions of PC49 V1 to enable construction of a road infrastructure corridor will mean that the areas of the Spur not included in the corridor will remain as a Natural Open Space in perpetuity. History has shown that despite the protection of the Spur being a recurring key Council policy, this can just as quickly be forgotten and all memory of it hidden from view if it does not suit the agenda of the current council administration.</p> <p>Public access to the Spur is not limited by the lack of a road/infrastructure corridor. Public access has been encouraged onto the land previously by Council, and since then access opportunities to the site have not changed. An appropriate enhancement of the current access for recreation use could be a loop walking track or similar with minimal loss or degradation of the natural habitat. The attempt to justify the construction of a road to a neighbouring property as being required for recreational access is misleading. The recent pine tree removal on an area of the Spur by forestry contractors has shown once again that</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>permanent road access is not required for the removal of this pest species.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details and attached petition.</i></p> |
| S88.3 | General | Seek amendment | <p>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.</p> | <p>This submitter has researched and identified significant evidence from Council’s own records that shows the Spur was purchased using Reserve Fund finance. They consider that the proposed use of the Spur land purchased using reserve funds for the provision of a road/infrastructure corridor for a potential future private housing development is inconsistent with the intent that the land was purchased for, and the source of funding used for the purchase.</p> <p>There have been specific events since 1990, documented in Council records, where UHCC decided against either selling or importantly “developing” the land as the current administration at each time were reminded that the original intent of purchasing was to protect the Spur for the future on behalf of the citizens of Upper Hutt. These decisions were made at a time when climate change threats and the prevention of habitat destruction were not considered as critical to society as they are in 2022.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details and attached petition.</i></p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| S88.4 | Significant Natural Areas | 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. | <p>UHCC commissioned Boffa Miskell ecological assessment of the Spur land has neglected the contribution of the current Spur vegetation cover to provide a habitat for native birds and other fauna. The location of the Spur and its connection to more significant areas of native vegetation within the area mean means native birds and fauna utilise the Spur as part of a common habitat. Consideration of ecological values for the combined land area should be the basis of any ecological assessment rather than considering them as separate areas as was done in the assessment. In addition, this assessment is basic and is now out of date by quite a significant margin and cannot be relied upon to paint an accurate picture of the state of the ecology of the Spur in 2022.</p> <p>The one positive outcome for the Spur from the past decade of wrangling over its future through various proposals and consultation periods has been time and nature quietly getting on with regenerating the Spur into an important ecological and visual amenity for the community. The recognition of SNAs and streams on the Spur and the commencement of the removal of pine trees and the replanting in natives of areas along the Spur boundary provide a clear indication of the right future for this land.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details and attached petition.</i></p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| S88.5 | General | Seek amendment | To introduce a Special Amenity Landscape overlay on the entire site as the Spur meets the definition by being distinctive, widely recognised and highly valued where part of the site is dominated by natural components and part is an exceptional landscape area that has been modified by human activity. The Spur also has several shared and recognised values. | <i>Note: see full submission for further details and attached petition.</i> |
| S88.6 | General | 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. | <p>Since 2007 several proposals to purchase, sell, swap, or utilise the Spur have been made by UHCC with no opportunity provided to the community to submit to the Council on these matters, which have often been done in secret, or public excluded portions of Council meetings. This is not a good example of how local government should engage with the citizens it represents and has destroyed trust of the public in UHCC.</p> <p>Any objections raised by submitters during this period to proposals to sell, swap or utilise the Spur for development have been dismissed by UHCC as being not relevant, or rebutted as there being no proposals for the Spur being considered by Council. Their findings indicate this is factually inaccurate and the Spur and its use to access the SGA/GTC land have been allowed to become entwined in Council policy with no opportunity prior to this variation for the public to have its say on this policy decision and direction.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>UHCC's own reporting and research into the history of their ownership of the Spur as documented in PC49 V1 could be described as "woefully inadequate". What has been clear is the strongly biased proposals put forward by UHCC toward sacrificing a community asset for future development and/or meeting the needs of a neighbouring private landowner rather than that of the community that it owns and manages the land on behalf of. This is reinforced by the minute amount of information that is shown on the UHCC website.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details and attached petition.</i></p> |
| Submitter 89: Lisa Marshall | | | | |
| S89.1 | Mapping | Support | To rezone the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space, leading towards the Reserves Act process. | This submitter states that they support rezoning of the Silverstream Spur to Natural Open Space, phasing out the existing pine trees, encouraging and enhancing the regenerating indigenous vegetation. Protecting indigenous biodiversity for future generations. |
| S89.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To investigate alternative opportunities for transport corridor access to the Southern Growth Area. | <p>They oppose these provisions as this would need to traverse land already identified as Significant Natural Area which is orientated east to west across the Silverstream Spur.</p> <p>This is supported by Upper Hutt City Council Section 32 report (page 28)10.4.4 that states: <i>'This suggests that it may be more appropriate to access Silverstream Spur and SGA from</i></p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <i>Reynolds Bach Drive to avoid these areas identified indigenous vegetation'.</i> |
| Submitter 90: Rhys Lloyd | | | | |
| S90.1 | Mapping | Support | To rezone the Spur as Natural Open Space. | This submitter states that the Spur was always intended to be a reserve, being purchased with reserve funds for the creation of a reserve. |
| S90.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | To remove the provisions seeking to allow a road/infrastructure corridor to be constructed on any part of the Spur. | That allowing these provisions is incompatible with Natural Open Space land and would ruin the ecological value of the Spur and it is not required for recreational access. |
| S90.3 | Significant Natural Areas | Seek amendment | To undertake a detailed assessment of native vegetation on the Spur to include all areas appropriate in the SNA. | That further assessment is required of the SNAs to ensure complete protection of the areas with native vegetation. |
| S90.4 | Special Amenity Landscape | Seek amendment | Introduce a Special Amenity Landscape overlay on the entire Spur. | Not stated. |
| Submitter 91: Save our Hills (Upper Hutt) Incorporated (SOH) | | | | |
| S91.1 | Mapping | 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. | <p>This submitter states that they support this proposal.</p> <p>The Silverstream Spur has illegitimately been shown on Council planning maps for the last 30 years as 'Residential Conservation' zone. The Spur was originally a recognised part of Upper Hutt City's greenbelt and was intended to be officially made a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. The lapse of 30 years does not make the Residential Conservation zoning legitimate.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>It is appropriate for Council to take the opportunity now to rezone the entire Spur as Natural Open Space.</p> <p>The submitter requests that further to this, Council also carry out now its original stated intention of making the entire 35.14ha of Silverstream Spur a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977 and provide walking and cycling access through the Spur for recreational and conservation purposes for the public.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| S91.2 | Significant Natural Areas | Support with amendment | To protect the identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development and protect the remainder of the entire 35ha of Silverstream Spur from development. Regenerate the entire Spur with native plants and bush. | <p>The submitter supports this proposal, and requests that it be extended to include the entire 35ha of the Spur, i.e., that the entire 35ha of the Spur be protected from development, meaning no transport corridor and no infrastructure on the Spur.</p> <p>The submitter would like to see the entire Spur cleared of pines and replanted in native plants and trees, as an important corridor for birds linking both sides of the Hutt Valley, as commented by forest ecologist, John Campbell.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| S91.3 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | Do not enable site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor, through the Silverstream Spur. | The submitter opposes this proposal. The proposed transport corridor and infrastructure through the Spur is for the benefit of a private developer (Guildford Timber Company) and as |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | <p>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.</p> | <p>such should not be paid for out of the public purse in this public PC49 Variation 1, but rather it should be paid for by the developer via a Private Plan Change.</p> <p>The submitter opposes the proposal to include in this public Plan Change access by way of a transport corridor and infrastructure through the Silverstream Spur to Guildford Timber Company's proposed private development along the Silverstream, Pinehaven and Blue Mountains ridge lines.</p> <p>Any access and infrastructure for Guildford's private development (Council's so-called 'Southern Growth Area') should be by way of a Private Plan Change. The majority of the public has strongly opposed Guildford's proposed development on the Pinehaven hills.</p> <p>Access to such a large-scale private development by Guildford Timber Company should be provided by the developer via a Private Plan Change, not via a Public Plan Change, and certainly not via PC49 variation 1, a Public Plan Change for making the Silverstream Spur 'Natural Open Space'.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is a no information whatsoever in PC49 Variation 1 about the location, route or size of the proposed transport corridor and infrastructure through the Spur.</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>Supporting such access would be like writing a blank cheque from the public purse for the benefit of a private developer, Guildford Timber Company.</p> <p>This submitter strongly opposes the proposed access through the Spur for opening up the GTC/SGA development.</p> <p><i>Note: see full submission for further details.</i></p> |
| S91.4 | General | Seek amendment | Do provide pedestrian and cycling access to and through the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes. | <p>The Submitter supports the proposal to open up the Spur for a range of recreation, conservation and customary purposes, and all this requires are walking and cycling tracks (like in Ecclesfield and Witako Reserves, and the native bush areas in Trentham Memorial Park) – it does not require a transport corridor or infrastructure.</p> <p>They would oppose any proposal to put a transport corridor or infrastructure through the native bush areas in Trentham Memorial Park, and similarly we oppose a transport corridor or infrastructure through the Spur.</p> |
| Submitter 92: Rachel Stuart | | | | |
| S92.1 | Mapping | Support | <p>That the Silverstream Spur be rezoned as Natural Open Space.</p> <p>To designate the Spur as a reserve (Reserves Act 1977).</p> | <p>This submitter states that they agree with the provisions to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. rezone the Silverstream Spur from a mix of Rural Hill Zone and Residential Conservation Zone to Natural Open Space. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|--------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. protect identified Significant Natural Areas on the Silverstream Spur from development. iii. to enable site-specific provisions to provide access to the Silverstream Spur for a range of recreation, conservation, and customary purposes (only). |
| S92.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | That the Silverstream Spur remains exclusively Natural Open Space, with no transport corridor (now or in the future). | <p>They disagree with the following provisions, and want them to be removed from the proposed plan change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Enable site-specific provisions for infrastructure, including a transport corridor. ii. The proposed site-specific provisions would provide access to the Silverstream Spur for potential future access to the Southern Growth Area. |
| Submitter 93: Ngāti Toa | | | | |
| S93.1 | Mapping | 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. | <p>This submitter states that in addition to its cultural significance and providing cultural activities to be performed, rezoning will provide protection and conservation of natural character, indigenous vegetation, and ecological and landscape values the Spur has.</p> <p>These are important matters to Tangata Whenua. It is important that cultural, ecological, and environmental values are protected from development in the District Plan and inappropriate subdivision and land</p> |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | development is prevented through rezoning and provisions. |
| S93.2 | Significant Natural Areas | 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. | They are aware that current operative District Plan does not have a legal sites and areas significant to Māori schedule and an associated Chapter providing protection and maintenance of these sites and areas. |
| S93.3 | NOSZ-R22 | Seek amendment | Request the addition of NOSZ-R22 which makes the removal of indigenous vegetation a discretionary activity. | They consider that discretionary activity status is more appropriate if specific conditions or standards are not met while considering proposals for this zone. |
| S93.4 | New provisions for customary activities | Seek amendment | The plan variation mentions enabling access for customary activities however, there are not any meaningful provisions for customary activities. | They are more than happy to work with you and with our Tangata Whenua partners in the rohe to come up with a solution that focuses on producing such provisions with your kaimahi. |
| S93.5 | Open Space Strategy Objectives | 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. | They would be more than happy to have a kōrero with you and improve how all Council documents can align strategically and should support the District Plan provisions suggested above, and finally how they could help implementing it. |
| Submitter 94: Jennifer Ann Dolton | | | | |
| S94.1 | Mapping and Significant Natural Areas | Support | The Council to rezone and protect the Silverstream Spur as Natural Open Space and to protect any identified Significant Natural Areas. | This submitter states that the Silverstream Spur should be zoned Natural Open Space to enhance and preserve it for future generations and wildlife corridors. |

| Submission Point | Provision | Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|-----------|
| S94.2 | Infrastructure including a transport corridor | Oppose | The Council to delete all reference to roads, infrastructure, and anything else that may damage the Natural Open Space. | As above. |

