

#	Submission/address	Particulars	Reasons	Support/ Oppose
<b>OBJECTIVES</b>				
100, 102, 250, 251, 258, 327	Egon Guttke, Irene Guttke, Federated Farmers, Margaret Niven, Peter Adlam and Waa Rata	Revise definition of Dominant Ridgelines where if it is not looking down on other's it need not be considered dominant	Support a review of all dominant ridgelines as per our original submission	Support
263	Maypole Environmental Ltd	Amend objective 2.9 Landscapes so it reflects the requirements of section 6 (b) of the RMA	Ensure District Plan provisions relating to landscapes are consistent with Part II of the RMA	Support
280, 356, 358	Bryce Wilkinson, Christopher Ruthe and Salima Padamsey	Comments regarding ensuring an underlying principle that “resilient communities are those which rights are respected.” District Plan needs more balance in this respect.	The PDP lacks balance particularly in the rural environment.	Support
369, 408, 411, 492, 500	Anthony & Anne McEwan, USNZ Forestry Group Ltd, Land Matters Ltd, Kennott Trust Co. Ltd et al, and Ngatotara Farms Ltd	Proposed changes to objective 2.9.	Focus on statutory requirements to “ <u>protect</u> Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and <u>maintain and enhance</u> amenity landscapes	Support in part
30 & 32	Paul and Eppie Murton and Aaron Johnson	Comments regarding Council managing the weed species and pests on their own land	Council needs to lead by example	Support.
39, 77, 100, 102, 104, 231,	Df & AE Smith et al. Louise Trilloe, Egon Guttke, Irene Guttke, Declan Graves, Rick Swan, Hort New Zealand, Federated Farmers, Peter Adlam, Waa Rata	Comments regarding K017, Trimming Native Vegetation, Harvesting trees	As per our submissions	Support

219, 250, 258, 327				
443	Allan Smith	Comments particularly in respect of those areas where 20% of land is in indigenous vegetation & regarding weed and pest management	Consistent with the Draft NES	Support
202	Department of Conservation	Proposed inclusion of the word “development” to Policy 3.13.	I think it would be better to define what “significant development” means in the explanation	Oppose
<b>SIGNIFICANT NATURAL FEATURES</b>				
202	Department of Conservation	Include provisions to protect streams less than 3m in width when harvesting trees	This would be impractical given the number of small gullies affected.	Oppose
411, 416	Land Matters and Hamish and Leigh Wells	Comments regarding buildings adjacent to dominant ridgelines to allow buildings no higher than 4.5m above the dominant ridgeline	The current provisions in the PDP are too restrictive.	Support
492	Kennott Trust Co. et. Al.	Remove Significant Natural Feature notations from planning maps	This term is noted defined in the RMA and includes sites that are neither indigenous vegetation or outstanding natural landscapes.	Support
<b>#</b>	<b>Submission/address</b>	<b>Particulars</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>
<b>CHAPTER 7: RURAL ENVIRONMENT</b>				
100, 102,	Egon Guttke, Irene Guttke, Farm Forestry Association, DF and Ae	Comments in respect of sustainable logging so PDP is consistent with	District Plans need to be consistent with National Environmental	Support

188, 39,	Smith et. Al	draft NES on forestry	Standards	
250	Federated Farmers	Comments in respect of ONF	Where Council is looking to impose significant new restrictions on landowners they should ensure that the sites the subject of the restrictions have been accurately identified, quantified and qualified based on the criteria of the RMA, any National Environmental Standards and the Regional Policy Statement.	Support
<b>GENERAL: PROCESS</b>				
39, 54, 76, 100	DF & AE Smith, Levack Family Group, Alistair Mckenzie & Egon Guttke	Request for independent hearing commissioners	Technical elements of the PDP require expert advice in addition to elected councillors	Support
85, 205, 237 and 327	Gerald Rhys, Margaret Bilisland, Christopher Smith and Waa Rata	Concern about the lack of public participation and unfair treatment of submitters not affected by Chapter 4.  Ensure that provisions relating to ecological sites, ONF, SNFs, Priority Areas for Restoration are put on hold until individual landowners are consulted.	The PDP would enjoy more support and buy-in when landowners are properly consulted.	Support

Prepared by Anna Carter on behalf of the Carter's of Reikorangi.