
From: Michael McEnaney <Michael.McEnaney@greydc.govt.nz>
Sent: Thursday, November 10, 2022 10:52 PM
To: TTPP Info <info@tppp.nz>
Cc: GDC Paul Morris <Paul.morris@greydc.govt.nz>; Mayor Tania Gibson <mayor@greydc.govt.nz>
Subject: Submission: Grey District Council
Importance: High

This email is from an external sender. Please be careful with any links or attachments.

Evening

The Grey District Council thanks the Te Tai o Poutini Joint Committee (JC) for the opportunity to provide a formal submission on the proposed Te Tai o Poutini plan (pDP). We wish to acknowledge the extensive work that has been undertaken by the JC and TTPP staff in preparing the pDP.

This submission is split into a General Submission and an Operations Submission. The Operations Submission is from Councils Operations Department and it focuses on the parts of the plan that will affect infrastructure, 3 waters and the like.

The Grey District Council is very supportive of the District Plan review process that the JC has undertaken and the proposed provisions are generally consistent with the regional planning framework. In acknowledgement of this, the Grey District Council submission contains many points in support of the proposed provisions.

Our submission also contains a number of submission points that seek amendments to the proposed provisions. The submission points generally support the intent of the proposed provisions but are seeking amendments to better align with the West Coast Regional Policy Statement and to give effect to national policy statements. Additionally, some suggestions are made to improve consistency across the pDP. Where provisions are not identified, there is general support for those provisions.

Both the bulk submission spreadsheet and the Operation submission, in a table format, the order following the same structure as the pDP. This submission is included as a word version, if this format is more useful to the Hearing Officers, or to the Hearing Panel.

The documents attached are:

- Bulk submission spreadsheet – General Submission;
- Word Document – Operations Submission;
- Submission form as required.

Finally the submitter seeks any and all relief required to give effect to the matters raised in this submission, including as affected by introduced national environmental standards and national policy statements. Relief sought

specifically includes but is not limited to the relief detailed in the Bulk Submission Spreadsheet and word document attached.

In addition, the submitter specifically seeks any other relief as may be required to give effect to the matters raised in this submission, including alternative, further or consequential amendments to any provisions of the TPPP that address the matters raised by this submission.

It is requested that a reply to this email is sent acknowledging receipt.

Thank you again for this opportunity to provide a submission. For any clarification on the submission points please contact michael.mcenaney@greydc.govt.nz I would be more happy to assist the Hearings Officers.

Regards,



Michael McEnaney
Environmental Planning Manager

t: 03 744 7143
e: Michael.McEnaney@greydc.govt.nz
www.greydc.govt.nz



Grey District Residents Survey 2022

On behalf of the Grey District Council, please give us feedback about the services and facilities we provide. Our Council wants to know your views about your level of satisfaction with the Council's services, performance and facilities in your local area. Your response is valuable to help develop a clear view of our residents' satisfaction with our services and facilities. The information that you provide to Opinions Market Research will remain confidential as any reports based on the answers you give will not be able to be traced to any individual or household by the Council.

[You can click here to take part.](#)

Powered by:



Grey District Council Supports



**Have
your
say!**

Te Tai o Poutini Plan Proposed Plan

Submission form

We need your feedback. We want to hear from you on the proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan. What do you support and what would you like changed? And why? It is just as important to understand what you like in the Proposed Plan as what you don't. Understanding everyone's perspectives is essential for developing a balanced plan.

Your details:

First name: Michael Surname: McEnaney

Are you submitting as an individual, or on behalf of an organisation? Individual Organisation

Organisation (if applicable): Grey District Council

Would you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission? Yes No

If you **could** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission please complete the following:

I am /am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that (a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Postal address: PO Box 382, Greymouth 7840

Email: michael.mcenaney@greydc.govt.nz Phone: 037447143

Signature:  Date: 10/11/2022

Your submission:

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are:

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategic Direction | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Energy Infrastructure and Transport | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Risks |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Historical and Cultural Values | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Natural Environment Values | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subdivision |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General District Wide Matters | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Zones | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Schedules |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendices | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General feedback | |

All submitters have the opportunity to present their feedback to Commissioners during the hearings process. Hearings are anticipated to be held in the middle of 2023. Please indicate your preferred option below:

I wish to speak to my submission I do not wish to speak to my submission

If others make a similar submission, would you consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing?

Yes, I would consider presenting a joint case No, I would not consider presenting a joint case

Public information - all information contained in a submission under the Resource Management Act 1991, including names and addresses for service, becomes public information. The content provided in your submission form will be published to the Te Tai o Poutini Plan website and available to the public. It is your responsibility to ensure that your submission does not include any personal information that you do not want published.

Want to know more?
www.tppp.nz
0508 800 118



Te Tai o Poutini
PLAN
A combined district plan for the West Coast

My submission:

(Include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended, reasons for your views and the decision you seek from us).

See attached Bulk Submission spreadsheet for General Submission and attached word document for Operations Submission

Please attach more pages if required.

How to send in your submission form

▶ *Did you know you can complete this submission form online?*

 Online submission form:
www.tpp.nz

▶ *Or post this form back to us:*

 **TTPP Submissions, PO Box 66,
Greymouth 7840**

Submissions must be made by 5pm, Friday 11th November 2022

Want to know more?
www.tpp.nz
0508 800 118



Te Tai o Poutini
PLAN
A combined district plan for the West Coast

Instructions: This spreadsheet template has been made available to assist submitters wishing to make submissions on a significant number of provisions in the Proposed Plan.

If you are using this spreadsheet, please also complete a submission form with the details of the submitter. This can be done by either:

1. downloading and completing a submission form from the Council's website and lodging the form and this spreadsheet via email to info@tppp.nz; or
2. using the online submission tool accessible from the Council's website to upload this document as a supporting document. If you choose this method, please add one submission point to your online submission and select [General] as the Plan Section and [General] as the Provision.

To add your submission points to this spreadsheet, please scroll to the relevant Plan Section and click the '+' symbol to expand the group to show all of the provisions within that section. In the row containing the provision you wish to submit on, select one of the options from the Support/oppose column (click in the relevant cell and an arrow button will appear that presents a dropdown list). Add the reasons and the decision you seek in the next two columns. Please ensure you add both reasons and decision sought as these are an important part of your submission. If you are asking for a new provision to be added to a section, please include that in the row for the first provision in that section (the spreadsheet does not allow new rows to be added). Similarly, if you wish to make a submission that relates to a whole section of the Plan, please include that in row for the first provision in that section.

If you require any assistance with using this spreadsheet, please contact the District Plan team at info@tppp.nz.

| Plan section | Provision | Support Oppose | Reasons | Decision sought |
|----------------------------|--|-------------------|---|--|
| [General] | | | | |
| Whole Plan | | | | |
| Introduction Section | | | | |
| How The Plan Works Section | | | | |
| How The Plan Works | How The Plan Works | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Satutory Context | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Figure 1 RMA Plan relationships | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Figure 2 RMA responsibilities and where they have effect | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Te Tiriti o Wāitangi (Treaty of Waitangi) and the Resource Management Act | | | |
| How The Plan Works | General Approach | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Table 1: Classes of Activities | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Step 1 - Check the planning maps | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Step 2 - Locate the relevant zone rules | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Step 3 - Locate the relevant district-wide rules | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Step 4 - Check the relevant standards | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Step 5 - Apply for resource consent | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Table 2: National Environmental Standards and rules in Te Tai o Poutini Plan | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Notification | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Information to be submitted with resource consents | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Legal effect of Rules | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Cross Boundary Matters | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Management of Cross Boundary Matters | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Relationships between spatial layers | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Spatial layer name | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Zone | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Overlay | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Precinct | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Specific controls | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Development area | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Designation | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Heritage Order | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Residential Zone Discriptions | | | |
| How The Plan Works | General Residential Zone | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Large Lot Residential Zone | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Medium Density Residential Zone | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Residential Zones | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Rural Zone Descriptions | | | |
| How The Plan Works | General Rural Zone | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Rural Lifestyle Zone | Support in part | Description of Rural Lifestyle Zone incorrectly refers to Rural production zones. There is no Rural production zones in TTPP. | Remove reference to Rural productions zones. |
| How The Plan Works | Settlement Zone | | | |
| How The Plan Works | Rural Zones | | | |

How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works

Commercial and Mixed Use Zone Descriptions
Commercial Zone
Mixed Use Zone
Neighbourhood Centre Zone
Town Centre Zone
Commercial and Mixed Use Zones
Industrial Zone Descriptions
General Industrial Zone
Heavy Industrial Zone
Light Industrial Zone
Industrial Zones
Special Purpose Zone Descriptions
Airport Zone
Buller Coalfield Zone
Future Urban Zone
Hospital Zone
Mineral Extraction Zone
Māori Purpose Zone
Port Zone
Stadium Zone
Scenic Visitor Zone
Special Purpose Zones
Open Space and Recreation Zone Descriptions
Natural Open Space Zone
Open Space Zone
Sport and Active Recreation Zone
Open Space and Recreation Zones

Support in part The Highly Productive Land Precinct has not been included in this section of Add definition of "*Highly Productive Land*" precinct the plan. As it is mapped and referred to in the plan it should be included here as have all other precincts.

The precinct name "Highly Productive Land" may be incorrectly associated with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land given the shared name. However this is not the sole intent of the the Precinct. Areas of highly productive land that meet the defintiiton from the NPS have been included in the precinct but so has a large area of land that can be characterised as rural production land. To ensure the intended inturpretation, it is sought that the precinct is renamed the *Rural Production Land Precinct* . It is acknowledged that the term 'rural production' has been used in the National Planning Standards for a zone name. The description of this zone fits with the intent of the precinct in this plan and therefore it is considered the most appropriate name for the precinct.

Rename the *Highly Productive Land* Precinct the *Rural Production* Precinct.

How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works
How The Plan Works

Precincts
Greymouth Town Centre Precinct
Hokitika Town Centre Precinct
Reefton Town Centre Precinct
Westport Town Centre Precinct
Settlement Centre Precinct
Rural Residential Precinct
Coastal Settlement Precinct
Community Living Precinct
Overlays
Rifle Range Protection Areas
Airport Approach Paths
Airport Noise Contour Overlays
Electricity Transmission and Distribution Yard
Historic Heritage Items and Areas
Notable Trees

| | | | | |
|--|---|------------------------|--|--|
| <p>How The Plan Works How The Plan Works How The Plan Works How The Plan Works How The Plan Works How The Plan Works</p> | <p>Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Statutory Acknowledgement Areas Outstanding Natural Features Overlay Outstanding Natural Landscapes Overlay Outstanding Coastal Environment Area High Coastal Natural Character Area</p> | <p>Oppose</p> | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed. A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling. It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied. Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
| <p>How The Plan Works How The Plan Works How The Plan Works How The Plan Works How The Plan Works How The Plan Works How The Plan Works How The Plan Works How The Plan Works How The Plan Works</p> | <p>General Coastal Environment Area Lawfully Established Mineral Extraction and Processing Areas Previously Mined Locations in Rural and Open Space Zones Nohoanga Entitlements Natural Hazard Overlays Road Classification Specific Control Areas Jackson Bay Port Main Street Frontage Streets Facade Control Streets</p> | <p>Support in part</p> | <p>The area has been mapped and assessed and this conclusion reached. The overlay should reflect it.</p> | <p>Amend the <i>Coastal Environment</i> overlay to be consistent with this description by removing it from the urban areas of the Grey District</p> |
| <p>Interpretation Section</p> | <p>Interpretation Definitions Advice Note ACCESSORY BUILDING ACCESSWAY ACTIVITY ADDITION ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS ADJACENT ADJOINING AGRICULTURAL, PASTORAL AND HORTICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AIRPORT ACTIVITIES ALLOTMENT AMENITY VALUES ANCILLARY ACTIVITY APPROVED BUILDING PLATFORM ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE</p> | <p>Amend</p> | <p>Add definitions to enable better application/understanding of Rules which make reference to these activities/matters.</p> | <p>Add a definition of: - "hazardous facility" - "waste management area" - "outdoor service space" - "indoor storage space" - "outlook space" - "Primary Production" (use national planning standard definition)</p> |

Interpretation AREA OF SIGNIFICANT INDIGENOUS BIODIVERSITY
 Interpretation ARTIFICIAL LAKE OR POND
 Interpretation BED
 Interpretation BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT
 Interpretation BROWNFIELD
 Interpretation BUILDING
 Interpretation BUILDING FOOTPRINT
 Interpretation BUILDING PLATFORM
 Interpretation CAMPING GROUNDS
 Interpretation CEMETARIES
 Interpretation CLEANFILL
 Interpretation COASTAL ENVIRONMENT
 Interpretation COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY
 Interpretation COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS ACTIVITY
 Interpretation COMMUNITY FACILITIES, EDUCATION FACILITIES and HEALTH FACILITIES
 Interpretation COMMUNITY FACILITY
 Interpretation COMMUNITY SCALE
 Interpretation COMMUNITY SIGN
 Interpretation CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES
 Interpretation CONTAMINATED LAND
 Interpretation COUNCIL ENGINEERING STANDARDS

Oppose in part To give effect to the definition in the West Coast Regional Policy Statement. Amend by changing the name and definition to be consistent with the West Coast Regional Policy Statement.

Definition to read:

Regionally significant infrastructure means:

- a) The National Grid (as defined by the Electricity Industry Act 2010);*
- b) Other electricity distribution and transmission networks defined as the system of transmission lines, sub transmission and distribution feeders and all associated substations and other works to convey electricity;*
- c) Facilities for the generation of more than 1 MW of electricity and its supporting infrastructure where the electricity generated is supplied to the electricity distribution and transmission networks;*
- d) Pipelines and gas facilities used for the transmission and distribution of natural and manufactured gas;*
- e) The State Highway network, and road networks classified in the One Network Road Classification Sub-category as strategic;*
- f) The regional rail networks*
- g) The Westport, Greymouth, and Hokitika airports;*
- h) The Regional Council seawalls, stopbanks and erosion protection works;*
- i) Telecommunications and radio communications facilities;*
- j) Public or community sewage treatment plants and associated reticulation and disposal systems;*
- k) Public water supply intakes, treatment plants and distribution systems;*
- l) Public or community drainage systems, including stormwater systems;*
- m) The ports of Westport, Greymouth and Jackson Bay; and*
- n) Public or community solid waste storage and disposal facilities.*

Interpretation CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE
 Interpretation CRITICAL RESPONSE FACILITIES
 Interpretation CULTURAL LANDSCAPE
 Interpretation DUST
 Interpretation EARTHWORKS
 Interpretation EDUCATIONAL FACILITY
 Interpretation EMERGENCY SERVICE FACILITY
 Interpretation ENERGY ACTIVITY
 Interpretation ESPLANADE RESERVE
 Interpretation ESPLANADE STRIP
 Interpretation EXISTING BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES
 Interpretation EXISTING USE RIGHTS
 Interpretation FAÇADE CONTROL STREET
 Interpretation FARM QUARRY
 Interpretation FREEDOM CAMPING
 Interpretation FUNCTIONAL NEED
 Interpretation GREENFIELD

| | |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|
| Interpretation | GROSS FLOOR AREA |
| Interpretation | GROUND LEVEL |
| Interpretation | HABITABLE ROOM |
| Interpretation | HEALTHCARE AND MEDICAL ACTIVITIES |
| Interpretation | HEAVY VEHICLE |
| Interpretation | HEIGHT |
| Interpretation | HERITAGE FABRIC |
| Interpretation | HERITAGE PROFESSIONAL |
| Interpretation | HERITAGE RESOURCE |
| Interpretation | HISTORIC HERITAGE |
| Interpretation | HOME BUSINESS |
| Interpretation | HOMESTAY |
| Interpretation | INDIGENOUS VEGETATION CLEARANCE |
| Interpretation | INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITY |
| Interpretation | INFRASTRUCTURE |

Support in part To support the use of the definition of *Intensive Indoor Primary Production* which is used in a range of rules. Clarify that herd homes and wintering barns where the primary production activity principally occurs in an outdoor environment are not included within the definition.

Add an explanatory note to definition as follows:

Definition to read:
means primary production activities that principally occur within buildings and involve growing fungi, or keeping or rearing livestock (excluding calf rearing for a specified time period) or poultry.

For the avoidance of doubt Intensive indoor primary production does not include herd homes and wintering barns where the primary production activity principally occurs in an outdoor environment

| | |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|
| Interpretation | INTENSIVE INDOOR PRIMARY PRODUCTION |
| Interpretation | IWI/PAPATIPU RŪNANGA MANAGEMENT PLAN |
| Interpretation | LAeq |
| Interpretation | LAF(max) |
| Interpretation | LAKE |
| Interpretation | LAND DISTURBANCE |
| Interpretation | LARGE SCALE |
| Interpretation | LAWFULLY ESTABLISHED |
| Interpretation | MAIN STREET FRONTAGE |
| Interpretation | MAINTENANCE |
| Interpretation | MĀORI LAND |
| Interpretation | MĀORI PURPOSE ACTIVITIES |
| Interpretation | MINERAL |
| Interpretation | MINERAL EXPLORATION |
| Interpretation | MINERAL EXTRACTION |
| Interpretation | MINERAL EXTRACTION MANAGEMENT PLAN |
| Interpretation | MINERAL PROSPECTING |
| Interpretation | MINIMUM LOT SIZE |
| Interpretation | MINOR RESIDENTIAL UNIT |
| Interpretation | NATIONAL GRID |
| Interpretation | NATIONAL GRID SUBDIVISION CORRIDOR |
| Interpretation | NATIONAL GRID YARD |
| Interpretation | NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION ACTIVITIES |
| Interpretation | NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION STRUCTURE |
| Interpretation | NET SITE AREA |
| Interpretation | NETWORK UTILITY OPERATOR |
| Interpretation | NOISE |
| Interpretation | NOTIONAL BOUNDARY |
| Interpretation | OFFICIAL SIGN |
| Interpretation | OPEN SPACE MANAGEMENT PLAN |
| Interpretation | OPERATIONAL NEED |
| Interpretation | OUTDOOR LIVING SPACE |
| Interpretation | OUTSTANDING COASTAL ENVIRONMENT |
| Interpretation | OVERLAY CHAPTER |
| Interpretation | PAPAKĀINGA |
| Interpretation | PAPATIPU RŪNANGA |
| Interpretation | PARKS FACILITIES |
| Interpretation | PARKS FURNITURE |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Interpretation | POINT STRIP |
| Interpretation | PORT ACTIVITIES |
| Interpretation | POUTINI NGĀI TAHU |
| Interpretation | POUTINI NGĀI TAHU ACTIVITIES |
| Interpretation | RECREATION ACTIVITY |
| Interpretation | RECONSTRUCTION |
| Interpretation | RELOCATED BUILDING |
| Interpretation | RELOCATION |
| Interpretation | RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY GENERATION |
| Interpretation | RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY GENERATION ACTIVITIES |
| Interpretation | REPOSITIONING |
| Interpretation | RESEARCH ACTIVITY |
| Interpretation | RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY |
| Interpretation | RESIDENTIAL BUILDING |
| Interpretation | RESIDENTIAL UNIT |
| Interpretation | RETAIL ACTIVITY |
| Interpretation | RETIREMENT VILLAGE |
| Interpretation | REVERSE SENSITIVITY |
| Interpretation | RIPARIAN MARGIN |
| Interpretation | RIVER |
| Interpretation | ROOT PROTECTION AREA |
| Interpretation | RURAL INDUSTRY |
| Interpretation | SENSITIVE ACTIVITY |
| Interpretation | SHARED PATHWAY |
| Interpretation | SIGN |
| Interpretation | SIGNIFICANT ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION LINE |
| Interpretation | SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREA |
| Interpretation | SITE |
| Interpretation | SMALL SCALE |
| Interpretation | STADIUM ACTIVITY |
| Interpretation | STORMWATER |
| Interpretation | STRUCTURE |
| Interpretation | STRUCTURE PLAN |
| Interpretation | SUBSTATION (DISTRIBUTION) |
| Interpretation | SUBSTATION (ZONE) |
| Interpretation | SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION |
| Interpretation | TEMPORARY ACTIVITY |
| Interpretation | TEMPORARY MILITARY TRAINING ACTIVITY |
| Interpretation | TRADE RETAIL AND TRADE SUPPLIERS |
| Interpretation | TRANSMISSION LINES |
| Interpretation | UNOCCUPIED BUILDING |
| Interpretation | UPGRADING |
| Interpretation | URBAN ZONE |
| Interpretation | VEHICLE CROSSING |
| Interpretation | VISITOR ACCOMMODATION |
| Interpretation | WATERBODY |
| Interpretation | WETLAND |

Glossary Section

Abbreviations Section

National Direction Instruments Section

Tangata Whenua Section

PART 2 - DISTRICT WIDE MATTERS Section

Strategic Direction Section

Energy Infrastructure and Transport Section

Energy Section

Infrastructure Section

| | |
|----------------|----------------|
| Infrastructure | INF |
| Infrastructure | Infrastructure |

| | | | |
|--------------------------|---|----------------|---|
| Infrastructure | Overview | | |
| Infrastructure | Other relevant Te Tai o Poutini Plan provisions | | |
| Infrastructure | Infrastructure Objectives | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - O1 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - O2 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - O3 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - O4 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - O5 | | |
| Infrastructure | Infrastructure Policies | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - P1 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - P2 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - P3 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - P4 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - P5 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - P6 | | |
| Infrastructure | Infrastructure Rules | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed |
| Infrastructure | Permitted Activities | | Remove reference to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" |
| Infrastructure | INF - R1 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R2 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R3 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R4 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R5 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R6 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R7 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R8 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R9 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R10 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R11 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R12 | | |
| Infrastructure | Controlled Activities | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R13 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R14 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R15 | | |
| Infrastructure | Restricted Discretionary Activities | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R16 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R17 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R18 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R19 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R20 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R21 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R22 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R23 | | |
| Infrastructure | Discretionary Activities | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R24 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R25 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R26 | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R27 | | |
| Infrastructure | Non-complying Activities | | |
| Infrastructure | INF - R28 | | |
| Transport Section | | | |
| Transport | TRN | | |
| Transport | Transport | | |
| Transport | Overview | | |
| Transport | Other relevant Te Tai o Poutini Plan provisions | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed |
| Transport | Transport Objectives | | Remove reference to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" |
| Transport | TRN - O1 | | |
| Transport | TRN - O2 | | |
| Transport | TRN - O3 | | |
| Transport | TRN - O4 | | |
| Transport | TRN - O5 | | |
| Transport | Transport Policies | | |

| | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|
| Transport | TRN - P1 |
| Transport | TRN - P2 |
| Transport | TRN - P3 |
| Transport | TRN - P4 |
| Transport | TRN - P5 |
| Transport | TRN - P6 |
| Transport | TRN - P7 |
| Transport | TRN - P8 |
| Transport | TRN - P9 |
| Transport | Transport Rules |
| Transport | Advice Notes: |
| Transport | Permitted Activities |
| Transport | TRN - R1 |
| Transport | TRN - R2 |
| Transport | TRN - R3 |
| Transport | TRN - R4 |
| Transport | TRN - R5 |
| Transport | TRN - R6 |
| Transport | Restricted Discretionary Activities |
| Transport | TRN - R7 |
| Transport | TRN - R8 |
| Transport | TRN - R9 |
| Transport | TRN - R10 |
| Transport | TRN - R11 |
| Transport | TRN - R12 |
| Transport | Discretionary Activities |
| Transport | TRN - R13 |
| Transport | TRN - R14 |

HAZ - Hazards and Risks Section

Contaminated Land Section

Hazardous Substances Section

HCV - Historical and Cultural Values Section

Historic Heritage Section

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Historic Heritage | HH |
| Historic Heritage | Historic Heritage |
| Historic Heritage | Overview |
| Historic Heritage | Other relevant Te Tai o Poutini Plan provisions |
| Historic Heritage | Other relevant Statutory Provisions |
| Historic Heritage | Historic Heritage Objectives |
| Historic Heritage | HH - O1 |
| Historic Heritage | HH - O2 |
| Historic Heritage | HH - O3 |
| Historic Heritage | HH - O4 |
| Historic Heritage | Historic Heritage Policies |
| Historic Heritage | HH - P1 |
| Historic Heritage | HH - P2 |
| Historic Heritage | HH - P3 |
| Historic Heritage | HH - P4 |
| Historic Heritage | HH - P5 |
| Historic Heritage | HH - P6 |
| Historic Heritage | HH - P7 |
| Historic Heritage | HH - P8 |
| Historic Heritage | HH - P9 |
| Historic Heritage | Historic Heritage Rules |
| Historic Heritage | HH - R1 |
| Historic Heritage | HH - R2 |
| Historic Heritage | HH - R3 |
| Historic Heritage | Controlled Activities |
| Historic Heritage | HH - R4 |

Oppose in part It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed Remove reference to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori"

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Historic Heritage | HH - R5 |
| Historic Heritage | Restricted Discretionary Activities |
| Historic Heritage | HH - R6 |
| Historic Heritage | HH - R7 |
| Historic Heritage | HH - R8 |
| Historic Heritage | Discretionary Activities |
| Historic Heritage | HH - R9 |
| Historic Heritage | HH - R10 |
| Historic Heritage | HH - R11 |
| Historic Heritage | Other Methods |
| Historic Heritage | HH - M1 |

Notable Trees Section

Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Section

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed. A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling. It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied. Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori SASM

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed. Council finds this externally troubling. It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied. Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Overview Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Objectives Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori SASM - O1

| | | |
|----------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Oppose in part | It is inappropriate to allow unfettered access where sites are in private ownership or are held in crown administration for the enjoyment by all. | Remove 'access' from Objective |
|----------------|---|--------------------------------|

Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori SASM - O2 Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori SASM - O3 Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Policies Cultural Landscapes

| | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|---|--|
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM - P1 Identification and access to significant sites and areas | Oppose in part | It is inappropriate to allow unfettered access where sites are in private ownership or are held in crown administration for the enjoyment by all. | Remove 'access' from Objective |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM - P2 SASM - P3 | Support | Council is supportive of iwi regaining kaitiakitanga and rangatiratanga over landscapes and areas of interest, especially wahi tupuna. | Retain as notified |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM - P4 Poutini Ngāi Tahu Roles SASM - P5 SASM - P6 Management of Activities on Identified Significant Sites and Areas | Support in part | The process of formal access arrangements must be via a shared process. Private ;andwomers must reserve the right to restrict access where desired. | Retain as notified |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM - P7 | Oppose in part | Use of "minimise" rather than "mitigate" changes the focus and possibly the intent of the policy which could result in more stringent and not as practical (cost/safety/risk) requirements. | Change 'minimise' to 'mitigate' |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM - P8 | Oppose in part | Use of "avoid" rather than "mitigate" changes the focus and possibly the intent of the policy which could result in more stringent and not as practical (cost/safety/risk) requirements. | Change 'avoid' to 'mitigate' |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM - P9 Inappropriate Activities SASM - P10 | Oppose in part | Use of "minimise" rather than "mitigate" changes the focus and possibly the intent of the policy which could result in more stringent and not as practical (cost/safety/risk) requirements. | Change 'minimise' to 'mitigate' |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM - P11 SASM - P12 Appropriate Activities | Oppose in part | Adverse effect should be on a case by case basis. | Delete all wording after "sites". Policy to read: <i>"Recognise the significance to Poutini Ngāi Tahu of the sites and areas of significance to Māori listed in Schedule Three and protect the identified values of these sites"</i> |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM - P13 | Oppose in part | Adverse effect should be on a case by case basis. | Delete all wording after "protected". Policy to read: <i>"Enable activities in sites and areas of significance to Poutini Ngāi Tahu included in Schedule Three where the cultural and spiritual values of the site or area are protected."</i> |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM - P14 SASM - P15 Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Rules Advice Notes: Permitted Activities | Oppose in part | It is inappropriate to allow unfettered access where sites are in private ownership or are held in crown administration for the enjoyment by all. | Delete part d |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM -R1 | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed, sites re-assessed/re-reviewed. Subsequently this Rule may require a re-write dependant on the outcome of the former | Remove Rule |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM -R2 | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed, sites re-assessed/re-reviewed. Subsequently this Rule may require a re-write dependant on the outcome of the former | Remove Rule |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM -R3 | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed, sites re-assessed/re-reviewed. Subsequently this Rule may require a re-write dependant on the outcome of the former | Remove Rule |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM -R4 | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed, sites re-assessed/re-reviewed. Subsequently this Rule may require a re-write dependant on the outcome of the former | Remove Rule |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM -R5 | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed, sites re-assessed/re-reviewed. Subsequently this Rule may require a re-write dependant on the outcome of the former | Remove Rule |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM -R6 | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed, sites re-assessed/re-reviewed. Subsequently this Rule may require a re-write dependant on the outcome of the former | Remove Rule |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM -R7 | Oppose in part | Unless Pounamu and Aotea is identified as being present on the subject site then the use of the land should remain un-restricted. | Remove "Condition 3" |

| | | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|---|
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM -R8 | | | |
| | | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed, sites re-assessed/re-reviewed. Subsequently this Rule may require a re-write dependant on the outcome of the former | Remove Rule |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM -R9 | | | |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | Controlled Activities | | | |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM - R10 | | | |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | Discretionary Activities | | | |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM - R11 | Oppose | Subsequent to the decision sought for Rules above | Remove rule. |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM - R12 | Oppose | Subsequent to the decision sought for Rules above | Remove rule. |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM - R13 | | | |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM - R14 | Oppose | Subsequent to the decision sought for Rules above | Remove rule. |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | Non-complying Activities | | | |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM - R15 | Oppose | Subsequent to the decision sought for Rules above | Remove rule. |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM - R16 | | | |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM - R17 | Oppose | Subsequent to the decision sought for Rules above | Remove rule. |
| | | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed, sites re-assessed/re-reviewed. Subsequently this Rule may require a re-write dependant on the outcome of the former | Remove Rule |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM - R18 | | | |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | Prohibited Activities | | | |
| Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM - R19 | | | |
| Natural Environment Values Section | | | | |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Section | | | | |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed | Remove all references to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" in the Chapter |
| | | Support | Over the past near twenty years the Grey District Council has been working towards the mapping of SNA. Identification has taken place (some time ago) however due to a sequence of unfortunate and un-controlable events the mapping (by Council initiated plan change) has yet to occur. Regardless the project was undertaken in terms of obligations in S.6(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991. The project had heavily involvement from Federated Farmers, Department of Conservation (DOC) and Forest and Bird. At times it was acrimonious but an SNA process was decided on which was in keeping with all parties philosophical approach to the protection of the Districts indigenous biodiversity. To summarise that process promulgated by Council; a stepped process which, generically speaking, involved Council, based on Ecologist input (desktop studies), developing a list of all property in the District with likely ecological features that had significance value; submitted this list to Department of Conservation who could add to the list or remove from it, and then agreeing on the list referred to as the potential SNA list. As a subsequent step, Council, based on formal Ecologist inspection and reports worked with DOC and its Ecologist to refine the list and the area of such SNAs. An important component of Council's process was the focus on landowners having direct access to Council's Ecologist in his determination of the S.6 values on the land and also in agreeing on ways and means to put measures in place to protect such features. | Retain SNA overlay as notified for the Grey District |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | | | |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | Overview | | | |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | Plantation Forestry | | | |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | Strategic Objectives | | | |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | Wetlands on the West Coast | | | |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Objectives | Support | Gives effect to Objectives of the West Coast RPS. | Retain as notified |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO- O1 | Support | Gives effect to Objectives of the West Coast RPS. | Retain as notified |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO- O2 | Support | Gives effect to Objectives of the West Coast RPS. | Retain as notified |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO- O3 | Support | Gives effect to Objectives of the West Coast RPS. | Retain as notified |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO- O4 | Support | Gives effect to Objectives of the West Coast RPS. | Retain as notified |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Policies | Support | | |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO - P1 | Support | Gives effect to Policies of the West Coast RPS. | Retain as notified |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO - P2 | Support | Gives effect to Policies of the West Coast RPS. | Retain as notified |

| | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|---|---|
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO - P3 | Support | Gives effect to Policies of the West Coast RPS. | Retain as notified |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO - P4 | Support | Gives effect to Policies of the West Coast RPS. | Retain as notified |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO - P5 | Support | Gives effect to Policies of the West Coast RPS. | Retain as notified |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO - P6 | Support | Gives effect to Policies of the West Coast RPS. | Retain as notified |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO - P7 | Support | Gives effect to Policies of the West Coast RPS. | Retain as notified |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO - P8 | Support | Gives effect to Policies of the West Coast RPS. | Retain as notified |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO - P9 | Support | Gives effect to Policies of the West Coast RPS. | Retain as notified |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO - P10 | Support | Gives effect to Policies of the West Coast RPS. | Retain as notified |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Rules | | | |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | Note: | | | |
| | | Support in part | Activities that have been lawfully established within an SNA or have an operational need to be within one and are deemed to have a less than minor effect | <p>Add a new Permitted Activity Rule for permitted clearance of indegious vegetaion clearance within an SNA.</p> <p>Rule to read: ECO - R3 Indigenous Vegetation Clearance within a Significant Natural Area Activity Status Permitted Where: 1. This is for: i. The maintenance, operation and repair of lawfully established tracks, fences, structures, buildings, critical infrastructure, network utilities, renewable electricity generation activities or natural hazard mitigation activities; ii. For the installation of temporary network activities following a regional or local state of emergency declaration; iii. To prevent a serious threat to people, property, structures or services; iv. To ensure the safe and efficient operation (including maintenance and repair) of any formed public road, rail corridor or access; v. For the construction of new fences and traplines associated with Conservation Activities or to exclude stock or pest animals; vii. To comply with section 43 of the Fire and Emergency Act 2017;</p> |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | Permitted Activities | Support in part | For clarification of the rule as intended to be applied | <p>Condition 1: add "and" to the end of Conditon 1. Rule will now read: <i>"It is outside of a scheduled Significant Natural Area as identified in Schedule Four; and"</i></p> <p>Conditon 3: add "In the....." Rule will now read: "In the Margins of Waterbodies it is necessary for one of the following purposes"</p> |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO - R1 | Support in part | Grey DC has identified areas of SNA within the Coastal Environment. Further restriction is therefore un-warranted. | <p>New Conditon 1: <i>"Within the Grey District it is outside of a scheduled Significant Natural Area as identified in Schedule Four;"</i></p> <p>Add between Condtion 1 and Condtion 2 <i>"Within the Buller and Westland Districts:"</i></p> <p>Relabel Conditons: 1 - 2 2 - 3 3 - 4</p> |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO - R2 | | | Remove Condtion 4 |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | Controlled Activities | | | Amend Condition 2 to remove <i>"and outside of the Coastal Environment"</i> |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO - R3 | Amend | Consequential amendment due to change sought to Rule 2 | Condition to read: <i>"The indigenous vegetation clearance is outside of any Significant Natural Area identified in Schedule Four "</i> |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO - R4/SUB - R7 | | | |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | Restricted Discretionary Activities | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|---|---|
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO - R5 | | | |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO - R6/SUB - R9 | | | |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | Discretionary Activities | | | |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO - R7 | | | |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO - R8/SUB - R15 | | | |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | Non-complying Activities | | | |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO - R9/SUB - R27 | | | |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO - R10 | | | |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO - R11 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes Section | | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed | Remove all references to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" in the Chapter |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | Natural Features and Landscapes Overview | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | Plantation Forestry | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | Other relevant Te Tai o Poutini Plan provisions | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | Natural Features and Landscapes Objective | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - O1 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | Natural Features and Landscapes Policies | | | |
| | | Amend | To give effect to Regional Policy Statement (Ch. 7B Policy 4). | Re-word Policy 1 as follows: <i>"Provide for activities within outstanding natural landscapes described in Schedule Five and outstanding natural features described in Schedule Six which have no more than minor effects"</i> |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - P1 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - P2 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - P3 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - P4 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - P5 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - P6 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - P7 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | Permitted Activities | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - R1 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - R2 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - R3 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - R4 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - R5 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - R6 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - R7 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - R8 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | Controlled Activities | | | |
| | | Support in part | Landowners should have the right to protect their own land from natural hazards. With the 'matters of Control' in place a controlled activity status is considered most appropriate | Amend Rule to remove Condition 1 |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - R9 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - R10 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | Restricted Discretionary Activities | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - R11 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - R12 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | Discretionary Activities | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - R13 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - R14 | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL - R15 | | | |
| Public Access Section | | | | |
| Public Access | PA | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed | Remove all references to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" in the Chapter |
| Public Access | Public Access | | | |
| Public Access | Overview | | | |
| Public Access | Public Access Objective | | | |
| Public Access | PA - O1 | | | |
| Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodies Section | | | | |
| Natural Character and Margins of Waterbody NC | | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed | Remove all references to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" in the Chapter |
| Natural Character and Margins of Waterbody | Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodies | | | |

Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodie Overview

Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodie Natural Character and the Margins of Waterbodies Objectives

Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodie NC - O1

Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodie NC - O2

Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodie NC - O3

Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodie Natural Character and the Margins of Waterbodies Policies

Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodie NC - P1

Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodie NC - P2

Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodie NC - P3

Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodie NC - P4

Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodie NC - P5

| | | |
|----------------|--|---|
| Oppose in part | The Objective seeks to provide for subdivision, use and development where adverse effects can be avoided or mitigated. This should be re-worded to give better effect to Objective 7A(2) and Policy 7A(4) of the West Coast RPS. | Amend Objective 1 to now read: <i>"To preserve the natural character of lakes, rivers and wetlands and their margins while providing for appropriate subdivision, use and development"</i> |
|----------------|--|---|

| | | |
|----------------|---|--|
| Oppose in part | Landowners should have the right to protect their own land from natural hazards. With the 'matters of Control' in place a controlled activity status is considered most appropriate | Add a Controlled Activity Rule for <i>"New Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures"</i> . |
|----------------|---|--|

Rule is to read:
NC - R4 New Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures
Activity Status Controlled
Where:
1. These are constructed by any party other than a Statutory Agency or their authorised contractor,
2. Earthworks and vegetation clearance are the minimum required to undertake the activity.
Discretion is restricted to:
a. Managing effects on public access;
b. Effects on the values that make up the degree of naturalness;
c. Extent and design of earthworks; and
d. Landscape measures.

As a result of the addition of this Rule, subsequent Rule numbering will need to be amended.

Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodie Natural Character and the Margins of Waterbodies Rules

Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodie Note:

Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodie Permitted Activities

Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodie NC - R1

| | | |
|----------------|---|--|
| Oppose in part | Landowners should have the right to protect their own land from natural hazards. With the 'matters of Control' in place a controlled activity status is considered most appropriate | Amend Condition E to remove <i>"constructed by a statutory agency or their nominated contractor"</i> |
|----------------|---|--|

| | | |
|----------------|---|--|
| Oppose in part | Landowners should have the right to protect their own land from natural hazards. With the 'matters of Control' in place a controlled activity status is considered most appropriate | Condition E to now read <i>"Natural hazard mitigation structures; or"</i> Add <i>"Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Controlled"</i> |
|----------------|---|--|

| | | |
|-------|--|--|
| Amend | It has been sought that a new Rule be added. Therefore the numbering of existing rules is required to be amended | Re-number in line with addition of new Rule. |
|-------|--|--|

| | | |
|-------|--|--|
| Amend | It has been sought that a new Rule be added. Therefore the numbering of existing rules is required to be amended | Re-number in line with addition of new Rule. |
|-------|--|--|

| | | |
|-------|--|--|
| Amend | It has been sought that a new Rule be added. Therefore the numbering of existing rules is required to be amended | Re-number in line with addition of new Rule. |
|-------|--|--|

| | | |
|----------------|---|---|
| Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed | Remove all references to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" in the Chapter |
|----------------|---|---|

Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodie NC - R2

Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodie NC - R3

Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodie Discretionary Activities

Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodie NC - R3

Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodie NC - R4

Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodie NC - R5

Financial Contributions Section

Subdivision Section

| | |
|-------------|------------------------|
| Subdivision | SUB |
| Subdivision | Subdivision |
| Subdivision | Overview |
| Subdivision | Subdivision Objectives |
| Subdivision | SUB - O1 |
| Subdivision | SUB - O2 |
| Subdivision | SUB - O3 |
| Subdivision | SUB - O4 |
| Subdivision | SUB - O5 |
| Subdivision | SUB - O6 |

| | | | | |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|---|---|
| Subdivision | Subdivision Policies | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - P1 | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - P2 | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - P3 | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - P4 | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - P5 | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - P6 | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - P7 | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - P8 | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - P9 | | | |
| Subdivision | Subdivision Rules | | | |
| Subdivision | Note: | | | |
| Subdivision | Permitted Activities | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - R1 | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - R2 | | | |
| Subdivision | Controlled Activities | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - R3 | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - R4 | Support | It has been sought that the "Flood Plain" overlay be removed. The reference in this rule is therefore irrelevant. | Amend Rule Condition 3(iv) title to remove reference to "Flood Plain" Rule to read: iv. Any Flood Susceptibility, Land Instability, Coastal Alert or Coastal Tsunami Hazard Overlay; Amend Rule Condition 3(iv) title to remove reference to "Flood Plain" |
| Subdivision | SUB - R5 | Support | It has been sought that the "Flood Plain" overlay be removed. The reference in this rule is therefore irrelevant. | Rule to read: iv. Any Flood Susceptibility, Land Instability, Coastal Alert or Coastal Tsunami Hazard Overlay; Amend Rule Condition 3(iv) title to remove reference to "Flood Plain" |
| Subdivision | SUB - R6 | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - R7/ECO - R4 | Support | It has been sought that the "Flood Plain" overlay be removed. The reference in this rule is therefore irrelevant. | Amend Rule Condition 3(v) title to remove reference to "Flood Plain" Rule to read: iv. Any Flood Susceptibility, Land Instability, Coastal Alert or Coastal Tsunami Hazard Overlay; |
| Subdivision | SUB - R8 | | | |
| Subdivision | Restricted Discretionary Activities | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - R9/ECO - R6 | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed | Remove reference to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" |
| Subdivision | SUB - R10 | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - R11 | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - R12 | Amend | It has been sought that the "Flood Plain" overlay be removed. The reference in this rule is therefore irrelevant. | Amend Rule title to remove reference to "Flood Plain" Rule to read: Subdivision to create allotment(s) in the Flood Susceptibility, Land Instability, Coastal Alert, Coastal Setback, Lake Tsunami and Coastal Tsunami Overlays |
| Subdivision | SUB - R13 | | | |
| Subdivision | Discretionary Activities | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - R14 | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - R15/ECO - R8 | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - R16 | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - R17 | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - R18 | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - R19 | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - R20 | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - R21 | | | |
| Subdivision | SUB - R22 | Amend | It has been sought that the "Flood Plain" overlay be removed. The reference in this rule is therefore irrelevant. | Amend Rule title to remove reference to "Flood Plain" Rule to read: Subdivision to create Allotments in the Flood Susceptibility, Land Instability, Coastal Alert, Coastal Setback, Lake Tsunami and Coastal Tsunami Overlays not meeting Restricted Discretionary Activity Standards |
| Subdivision | SUB - R23 | | | |

| | |
|-------------|--------------------------|
| Subdivision | Non-complying Activities |
| Subdivision | SUB - R24 |
| Subdivision | SUB - R25 |
| Subdivision | SUB - R26 |
| Subdivision | SUB - R27/ECO - R9 |
| Subdivision | Prohibited Activities |
| Subdivision | SUB - R28 |
| Subdivision | Subdivision Standards |
| Subdivision | SUB - S1 |
| Subdivision | SUB - S2 |
| Subdivision | SUB - S3 |
| Subdivision | SUB - S4 |
| Subdivision | SUB - S5 |
| Subdivision | SUB - S6 |
| Subdivision | SUB - S7 |
| Subdivision | SUB - S8 |
| Subdivision | SUB - S9 |
| Subdivision | SUB - S10 |
| Subdivision | SUB - S11 |

General District Wide Matters Section

Activities on the surface of water Section

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Activities on the surface of water | ASW |
| Activities on the surface of water | Activities on the surface of water |
| Activities on the surface of water | Overview |
| Activities on the surface of water | Activities on the Surface of Water Objective |
| Activities on the surface of water | ASW - O1 |
| Activities on the surface of water | Activities on the Surface of Water Policies |
| Activities on the surface of water | ASW - P1 |
| Activities on the surface of water | ASW - P2 |
| Activities on the surface of water | ASW - P3 |
| Activities on the surface of water | Activities on the Surface of Water Rules |
| Activities on the surface of water | Note: |
| Activities on the surface of water | Permitted Activities |
| Activities on the surface of water | ASW - R1 |
| Activities on the surface of water | ASW - R2 |
| Activities on the surface of water | ASW - R3 |
| Activities on the surface of water | ASW - R4 |
| Activities on the surface of water | Controlled Activities |
| Activities on the surface of water | ASW - R5 |
| Activities on the surface of water | Restricted Discretionary Activities |
| Activities on the surface of water | ASW - R6 |
| Activities on the surface of water | Discretionary Activities |
| Activities on the surface of water | ASW - R7 |

Coastal Environment Section

| | |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| Coastal Environment | CE |
| Coastal Environment | Coastal Environment |
| Coastal Environment | Overview |
| Coastal Environment | Coastal Environment Objectives |
| Coastal Environment | CE - O1 |
| Coastal Environment | CE - O2 |
| Coastal Environment | CE - O3 |
| Coastal Environment | Coastal Environment Policies |
| Coastal Environment | CE - P1 |
| Coastal Environment | CE - P2 |
| Coastal Environment | CE - P3 |
| Coastal Environment | CE - P4 |
| Coastal Environment | CE - P5 |
| Coastal Environment | CE - P6 |
| Coastal Environment | CE - P7 |

Oppose in part It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed Remove all references to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" in the Chapter

Support in part The area has been mapped and assessed and this conclusion reached. The overlay should reflect it. Amend the *Coastal Environment* overlay to be consistent with this description by removing it from the urban areas of the Grey District

Oppose in part It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed Remove all references to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" in the Chapter

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|-----------------|--|
| Coastal Environment | CE - P8 | | |
| Coastal Environment | Coastal Environment Rules | | |
| Coastal Environment | Note: | | |
| Coastal Environment | Permitted Activities | | |
| Coastal Environment | CE - R1 | | |
| Coastal Environment | CE - R2 | | |
| Coastal Environment | CE - R3 | | |
| Coastal Environment | CE - R4 | | |
| Coastal Environment | Permitted Activities within the High Coastal Natural Character Overlay | | |
| Coastal Environment | CE - R5 | | |
| Coastal Environment | CE - R6 | | |
| Coastal Environment | CE - R7 | | |
| Coastal Environment | Permitted Activities within the Outstanding Coastal Environment Area | | |
| Coastal Environment | CE - R8 | | |
| Coastal Environment | CE - R9 | | |
| Coastal Environment | CE - R10 | | |
| Coastal Environment | CE - R11 | | |
| Coastal Environment | Controlled Activities | | |
| Coastal Environment | CE - R12 | | |
| Coastal Environment | Restricted Discretionary Activities | | |
| Coastal Environment | CE - R13 | | |
| Coastal Environment | CE - R14 | | |
| Coastal Environment | CE - R15 | | |
| Coastal Environment | CE - R16 | | |
| Coastal Environment | CE - R17 | | |
| Coastal Environment | CE - R18 | | |
| Coastal Environment | Discretionary Activities | | |
| | | Support in part | The most appropriate process would be to allow an applicant to seek the written approval of an affected party. If the approval is not provided then a notified process could be undertaken. This is consistent with general resource consent processing. |
| | | | Change "Limited Notified" to "will require the written approval of the Geosciences Society of New Zealand" |
| | | | Rule to read: <i>"Applications to destroy any Outstanding Natural Feature or the Values which make it Outstanding will require the written approval of the Geosciences Society of New Zealand ."</i> |
| Coastal Environment | CE - R19 | | |
| Coastal Environment | CE - R20 | | |
| Coastal Environment | CE - R21 | | |
| Coastal Environment | Non-complying Activities | | |
| | | Support in part | The most appropriate process would be to allow an applicant to seek the written approval of an affected party. If the approval is not provided then a notified process could be undertaken. This is consistent with general resource consent processing. |
| | | | Change "Limited Notified" to "will require the written approval of the Geosciences Society of New Zealand" |
| | | | Rule to read: <i>"Applications to destroy any Outstanding Natural Feature or the Values which make it Outstanding will require the written approval of the Geosciences Society of New Zealand ."</i> |
| Coastal Environment | CE - R22 | | |
| Earthworks Section | | | |
| Earthworks | EW | | |
| Earthworks | Earthworks | | |
| Earthworks | Overview | | |
| Earthworks | Earthworks Objectives | | |
| | | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed |
| | | | Remove all references to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" in the Chapter |
| | | Oppose in part | Earthworks are an essential part of of many activities. The plan therefore needs to take an enabling approach to them. The drafted wording in the objective does not achieve this. It focuses on minimising the adverse effects of earthworks, and not enabling or recognising the positive effects. |
| | | | Amend wording by replacing "avoided" & "limited" with <i>"mitigated"</i> |
| | | | Rule to read: <i>"To provide for earthworks to facilitate subdivision, use and development of the West Coast/Te Tai o Poutini's land resource, while ensuring that their adverse effects on the surrounding environment are mitigated."</i> |
| Earthworks | EW - O1 | | |
| Earthworks | Earthworks Policies | | |
| Earthworks | EW - P1 | | |
| Earthworks | EW - P2 | | |
| Earthworks | EW - P3 | | |
| Earthworks | EW - P4 | | |
| Earthworks | Earthworks Rules | | |
| Earthworks | Note: | | |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| Earthworks | Permitted Activities | Support in part | Earthworks are an essential part of a building process. Building construction is subject to regulations under the Building Act and Building Code. Through these processes the majority are required to undergo geotechnical investigations which address and mitigate potential adverse effects. | Amend Condition 1 by adding - "or" " <i>Earthworks that are or will be subject to a building consent and occur within 2m of the outer edge of the exterior wall of the building</i> " <i>Condition 1 to read:</i> <i>1. Earthworks must not exceed a maximum depth or height above ground level of 1.5m measured vertically within 1.5m of a boundary except where these are undertaken by a network utility operator for the purpose of:</i> <i>a. Pole foundations;</i> <i>b. Backfilled trenches; or</i> <i>c. Installation of services by trenchless methods such as directional drilling;</i> <i>or</i> <u><i>Earthworks that are or will be subject to a building consent and occur within 2m of the outer edge of the exterior wall of the building</i></u> |
| Earthworks | EW - R1 | | | |
| Earthworks | EW - R2 | | | |
| Earthworks | EW - R3 | Support in part | Earthworks are an essential part of a building process. It is common to scrap off an entire site prior to the excavation and backfilling of a building pad. Given this it is considered most appropriate to allow 350m ² /site of land disturbance. | Amend Condition 4(a) changing 250m ² to 350m ² . Condition 4(a) to read: <i>"A maximum of 350m² /site of land is disturbed in any 12 month period"</i> |
| Earthworks | EW - R4 | | | |
| Earthworks | EW - R5 | | | |
| Earthworks | EW - R6 | | | |
| Earthworks | Restricted Discretionary Activities | | | |
| Earthworks | EW - R7 | | | |
| Earthworks | EW - R8 | | | |
| Light Section | | | | |
| Noise Section | | | | |
| Signs Section | | | | |
| Signs | SIGN | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed | Remove all references to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" in the Chapter |
| Signs | Signs | | | |
| Signs | Overview | | | |
| Signs | Signs Objective | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - O1 | | | |
| Signs | Signs Policies | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - P1 | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - P2 | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - P3 | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - P4 | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - P5 | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - P6 | | | |
| Signs | Signs Rules | | | |
| Signs | Note: | | | |
| Signs | Permitted Activities - All Zones | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - R1 | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - R2 | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - R3 | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - R4 | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - R5 | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - R6 | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - R7 | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - R8 | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - R9 | | | |
| Signs | Permitted Activities - Specific Zones | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - R10 | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - R11 | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - R12 | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| Signs | SIGN - R13 | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - R14 | Support in part | The most common sign size is consistent with a standard sheet of plywood. The dimension of a sheet is 2.4m by 1.2m, equaling 2.88m ² . It is considered appropriate to allow 3m ² as permitted in these zones. | Amend Condition 3 to increase size of sign to 3m ² . Condition to read: <i>"There is a maximum sign face of 3m²; and"</i> |
| Signs | SIGN - R15 | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - R16 | Support | This rule is supported however an amended wording is sought to allow better understanding | Amend Condition 3 to re-word as follows. Condition to read: <i>"Signs attached to the structure or face of the building must be no larger than a maximum of 10% of the area of the building facade or 3m², whichever is the lesser; and"</i> |
| Signs | SIGN - R17 | | | |
| Signs | Controlled Activities | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - R18 | | | |
| Signs | Restricted Discretionary Activities | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - R19 | | | |
| Signs | Discretionary Activities | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - R20 | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - R21 | | | |
| Signs | SIGN - R22 | | | |
| Temporary Activities Section | | | | |
| Temporary Activities | TEMP | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed | Remove all references to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" in the Chapter |
| Temporary Activities | Temporary Activities | | | |
| Temporary Activities | Temporary Activities Objective | | | |
| Temporary Activities | TEMP - O1 | | | |
| Temporary Activities | Temporary Activities Policies | | | |
| Temporary Activities | TEMP - P1 | | | |
| Temporary Activities | TEMP - P2 | | | |
| Temporary Activities | TEMP - P3 | | | |
| Temporary Activities | TEMP - P4 | | | |
| Temporary Activities | Temporary Activities Rules | | | |
| Temporary Activities | Note: | | | |
| Temporary Activities | Permitted Activities | | | |
| Temporary Activities | TEMP - R1 | | | |
| Temporary Activities | TEMP - R2 | Amend | Conditions 2 and 4 are identical. One should be removed. | Remove Condition 4. |
| | | Amend | It is not unusual for essential equipment to be stored in containers off site. The containers are then moved on site after the event. It is not unreasonable to permit this to occur. | Amend Rule 3.1 to allow structures on a temporary basis. Condition to read: <i>"Ancillary buildings or structures are allowed on a temporary basis. They can be moved on site no more than 3 days prior to the activity and must be removed from site within 24hrs after the completion of the activity. ;"</i> |
| Temporary Activities | TEMP - R3 | | | |
| Temporary Activities | TEMP - R4 | Oppose | Freedom camping is best left to the respective Councils bylaws or the agency in control/ownership of the site. | Remove rule |
| Temporary Activities | TEMP - R5 | | | |
| Temporary Activities | TEMP - R6 | | | |
| Temporary Activities | Controlled Activities | | | |
| Temporary Activities | TEMP - R7 | | | |
| Temporary Activities | Restricted Discretionary Activities | | | |
| Temporary Activities | TEMP - R8 | | | |
| Temporary Activities | TEMP - R9 | | | |
| PART 3 - AREA-SPECIFIC MATTERS Section | | | | |
| ZONES Section | | | | |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones Section | | | | |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | Open Space and Recreation Zones | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed | Remove all references to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" in the Chapter |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ | | | |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | Open Space and Recreation Zones | | | |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | Overview | | | |

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - Open Space and Recreation Zones Objectives |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - O1 |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - O2 |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - Open Space and Recreation Zones Policies |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - P1 |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - P2 |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - P3 |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - P4 |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - P5 |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - P6 |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - P7 |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - P8 |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - P9 |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - P10 |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | Open Space Zone |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - P11 |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - P12 |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - P13 |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - P14 |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | Sport and Active Recreation Zone |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - P15 |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - P16 |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - P17 |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | Natural Open Space Zone |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - P18 |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - P19 |
| Open Space and Recreation Zones | OSRZ - P20 |

Natural Open Space Zone Section

Open Space Zone Section

| | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Open Space Zone | OSZ |
| Open Space Zone | Open Space Zone |
| Open Space Zone | Overview |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - Open Space Zone Rules |
| Open Space Zone | Note: |
| Open Space Zone | Permitted Activities |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R1 |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R2 |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R3 |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R4 |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R5 |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R6 |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R7 |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R8 |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R9 |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R10 |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R11 |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R12 |
| Open Space Zone | Controlled Activities |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R13 |
| Open Space Zone | Restricted Discretionary Activities |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R14 |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R15 |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R16 |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R17 |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R18 |

| | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R19 |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R20 |
| Open Space Zone | Discretionary Activities |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R21 |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R22 |

Oppose in part It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed Remove all references to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" in the Chapter

Oppose in part It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed Remove reference to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori"

| | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R23 |
| Open Space Zone | Non-complying Activities |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R24 |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R25 |
| Open Space Zone | OSZ - R26 |

Sport and Active Recreation Zone Section

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | Sport and Active Recreation Zone |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | Overview |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone Rules |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | Note: |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | Permitted Activities |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ - R1 |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ - R2 |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ - R3 |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ - R4 |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ - R5 |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ - R6 |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ - R7 |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ - R8 |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ - R9 |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | Controlled Activities |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ - R10 |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | Restricted Discretionary Activities |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ - R11 |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ - R12 |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ - R13 |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ - R14 |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | Non-complying Activities |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ - R15 |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ - R16 |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ - R17 |
| Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ - R18 |

Oppose in part

It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed

Remove all references to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" in the Chapter

Commercial and Mixed Use Zones Section

Commercial Zone Section

| | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Commercial Zone | COMZ |
| Commercial Zone | Commercial Zone |
| Commercial Zone | Overview |
| Commercial Zone | Commercial Zone Rules |
| Commercial Zone | Note: |
| Commercial Zone | Permitted Activities |
| Commercial Zone | COMZ - R1 |
| Commercial Zone | COMZ - R2 |
| Commercial Zone | COMZ - R3 |
| Commercial Zone | COMZ - R4 |
| Commercial Zone | COMZ - R5 |
| Commercial Zone | Restricted Discretionary Activities |
| Commercial Zone | COMZ - R6 |
| Commercial Zone | COMZ - R7 |
| Commercial Zone | Discretionary Activities |
| Commercial Zone | COMZ - R8 |
| Commercial Zone | Non-complying Activities |
| Commercial Zone | COMZ - R9 |
| Commercial Zone | COMZ - R10 |
| Commercial Zone | COMZ - R11 |

Amend

Typo - wrong word in Conditon 4.v(3)

Change "species" to "spaces"

Mixed Use Zone Section

Neighbourhood Centre Zone Section

Town Centre Zone Section

| | |
|------------------|-----|
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ |
|------------------|-----|

| | | | | |
|------------------|---|-------|--|--|
| Town Centre Zone | Town Centre Zone | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | Overview | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | Other relevant Te Tai o Poutini Plan provisions | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | Town Centre Zone Rules | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | Note: | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | Permitted Activities | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ - R1 | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ - R2 | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ - R3 | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ - R4 | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ - R5 | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ - R6 | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ - R7 | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ - R8 | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ - R9 | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ - R10 | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ - R11 | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | Controlled Activities | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ - R12 | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | Restricted Discretionary Activities | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ - R13 | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | Discretionary Activities | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ - R14 | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ - R15 | Amend | typo - duplication of word "buildings" | Amend to insert correct word. Possibly "relocated" |
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ - R16 | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ - R17 | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | Non-complying Activities | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ - R18 | Amend | typo - missing word | Amend to add missing word. Possibly "relocated" |
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ - R19 | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ - R20 | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ - R21 | | | |
| Town Centre Zone | TCZ - R21 | | | |

Industrial Zones Section

| | | | | |
|------------------|--|----------------|---|---|
| Industrial Zones | Industrial Zones | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed | Remove all references to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" in the Chapter |
| Industrial Zones | INZ | | | |
| Industrial Zones | Industrial Zones - Objectives and Policies | | | |
| Industrial Zones | Overview | | | |
| Industrial Zones | Industrial Zone Objectives | | | |
| Industrial Zones | INZ - O1 | | | |
| Industrial Zones | INZ - O2 | | | |
| Industrial Zones | Industrial Zone Policies | | | |
| Industrial Zones | INZ - P1 | | | |
| Industrial Zones | INZ - P2 | | | |
| Industrial Zones | INZ - P3 | | | |
| Industrial Zones | INZ - P4 | | | |
| Industrial Zones | INZ - P5 | | | |
| Industrial Zones | INZ - P6 | | | |
| Industrial Zones | INZ - P7 | | | |
| Industrial Zones | INZ - P8 | | | |
| Industrial Zones | INZ - P9 | | | |
| Industrial Zones | INZ - P10 | | | |
| Industrial Zones | INZ - P11 | | | |

General Industrial Zone Section

Light Industrial Zone Rules Section

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------|--|-------------------|
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | LIZ | | | |
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | Light Industrial Zone Rules | Amend | Incorrect reference to a Heavy Industrial Zone. The zone is not included in this plan. | Remove reference. |
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | Overview | | | |
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | Light Industrial Zone Rules | | | |
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | Note: | | | |
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | Permitted Activities | | | |

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | LIZ - R1 |
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | LIZ - R2 |
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | LIZ - R3 |
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | LIZ - R4 |
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | LIZ - R5 |
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | LIZ - R6 |
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | LIZ - R7 |
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | LIZ - R8 |
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | Restricted Discretionary Activities |
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | LIZ - R9 |
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | LIZ - R10 |
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | LIZ - R11 |
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | Discretionary Activities |
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | LIZ - R12 |
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | LIZ - R13 |
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | LIZ - R14 |
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | Non-complying Activities |
| Light Industrial Zone Rules | LIZ - R15 |

Residential Zones Section

General Residential Zone Section

| | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| General Residential Zone | GRZ |
| General Residential Zone | General Residential Zone |
| General Residential Zone | Overview |
| General Residential Zone | General Residential Zone Rules |
| General Residential Zone | Note: |
| General Residential Zone | Permitted Activities |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R1 |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R2 |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R3 |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R4 |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R5 |

Oppose in part It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed Remove all references to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" in the Chapter

Support in part To ensure compliance is undertaken on this rule.

Rule is amended so that records of letting are to be provided to Council annually.
 Rule to read:
"Records of letting activity must be provided to the District Council annually; and"

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R6 |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R7 |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R8 |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R9 |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R10 |
| General Residential Zone | Controlled Activities |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R11 |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R12 |
| General Residential Zone | Restricted Discretionary Activities |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R13 |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R14 |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R15 |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R16 |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R17 |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R18 |
| General Residential Zone | Discretionary Activities |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R19 |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R20 |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R21 |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R22 |
| General Residential Zone | Non-complying Activities |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R23 |
| General Residential Zone | GRZ - R24 |

Large Lot Residential Zone Section

| | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Large Lot Residential Zone | LLRZ |
| Large Lot Residential Zone | Large Lot Residential Zone |

Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone

Overview
 Large Lot Residential Zone Rules
 Note:
 Permitted Activities
 LLRZ - R1
 LLRZ - R2
 LLRZ - R3
 LLRZ - R4
 LLRZ - R5

Amend To ensure compliance is undertaken on this rule.

Records of letting to be provided annually.
 Rule to read:
"Records of letting activity must be provided to the District Council annually; and"

Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone
 Large Lot Residential Zone

LLRZ - R6
 LLRZ - R7
 LLRZ - R8
 LLRZ - R9
 Controlled Activities
 LLRZ - R10
 LLRZ - R11
 Restricted Discretionary Activities
 LLRZ - R12
 LLRZ - R13
 LLRZ - R14
 Discretionary Activities
 LLRZ-R15
 LLRZ-R16
 LLRZ-R17
 LLRZ-R18
 Non-complying Activities
 LLRZ - R19
 LLRZ - R20
 LLRZ - R21
 LLRZ - R22

Medium Density Residential Zone Section

Rural Zones Section

Rural Zones
 Rural Zones
 Rural Zones
 Rural Zones
 Rural Zones

Rural Zones
 RURZ
 Rural Zones - Objectives and Policies
 Overview
 Note with Regard to Plantation Forestry

Oppose in part It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed Remove all references to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" in the Chapter

Support in part Primary production is the majority activity in the rural zone of the West Coast. The General Rural Zone has been drafted to accomadate a number of activites but at the forefront is primary production. Given this primary production needs protection from incompatable activites which may give rise to reverse sensitivity. Add an objective specific for the primary production activites that have a functional need to be in the general rural zone. Policy to read: *The General Rural Zone is managed to ensure its availability for primary production activities and its long-term protection from being comprimised by reserve sensitivity*

Rural Zones
 Rural Zones
 Rural Zones
 Rural Zones
 Rural Zones
 Rural Zones
 Rural Zones

Rural Zones Objectives
 RURZ - O1
 RURZ - O2
 RURZ - O3
 RURZ - O4
 RURZ - O5
 RURZ - O6

Support in part Primary production is the majority activity in the rural zone of the West Coast. The General Rural Zone has been drafted to accomadate a number of activites but at the forefront is primary production. Given this primary production needs protection from incompatable activites which may give rise to reverse sensitivity.

Add two policies specific to the primary production activites that have a functional need to be in the rural zone.

Policy to read:

Enable primary production activities, provided adverse effects are minimised, while recognising that typical adverse effects associated with primary production should be anticipated and accepted within the General Rural Zone.

Policy to read:

Ensure the General Rural Zone provides for activities that require a rural location by:

*a. enabling primary production activities as the predominant land use ;
b. enabling a range of compatible activities that support primary production activities, including ancillary activities, rural produce manufacturing, rural produce retail, visitor accommodation and home businesses.*

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Rural Zones | Rural Zones Policies |
| Rural Zones | Rural Amenity and Character |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P1 |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P2 |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P3 |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P4 |
| Rural Zones | Production Values |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P5 |
| Rural Zones | Non-Rural Activities |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P6 |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P7 |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P8 |
| Rural Zones | Visitor Economy |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P9 |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P10 |
| Rural Zones | Infrastructure in Rural Areas |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P11 |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P12 |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P13 |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P14 |
| Rural Zones | Reverse sensitivity |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P15 |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P16 |
| Rural Zones | Papakāinga housing |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P17 |
| Rural Zones | Mineral Extraction |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P18 |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P19 |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P20 |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P21 |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P22 |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P23 |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P24 |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P25 |
| Rural Zones | Airfields and Helipads |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P26 |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P27 |
| Rural Zones | RURZ - P28 |
| Rural Zones | GRUZ - PREC1 - Community Living Precinct Policy |
| Rural Zones | GRUZ - PREC1 - P1 |
| Rural Zones | SETZ - PREC2 - Settlement Centre Precinct Policy |
| Rural Zones | SETZ - PREC2 - P2 |
| Rural Zones | SETZ - PREC3 - Coastal Settlement Precinct Policy |
| Rural Zones | SETZ - PREC3- P3 |
| Rural Zones | SETZ - PREC4 - Rural Residential Precinct Policy |
| Rural Zones | SETZ - PREC4 - P4 |
| Rural Zones | GRUZ - PREC 5 - Highly Productive Land Precinct Policy |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Rural Zones | GRUZ - PREC5 - P5 | | |
| General Rural Zone Section | | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ | | |
| General Rural Zone | General Rural Zone - Rules | | |
| General Rural Zone | Overview | | |
| General Rural Zone | General Rural Zone Rules | | |
| General Rural Zone | Note: | | |
| General Rural Zone | Permitted Activities | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R1 | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R2 | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R3 | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R4 | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R5 | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R6 | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R7 | Support in part | To ensure compliance is undertaken on this rule. Records of letting to be provided annually. Rule to read: <i>"Records of letting activity must be provided to the District Council annually; and"</i> |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R8 | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R9 | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R10 | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R11 | Support in part | At the current level of disturbance(20,000)the rule is unlikely to be functional for the majority. An amount has been proposed that is more realistic. A 250m setback is excessive, 100m is a more realistic distance that will ensure adverse effects are mitigated. A 20m setback for stockpiles is excessive a more realistic distance is 3m. At this distance that effects are considered less than minor. Furthermore stockpiles can be used as a mitigation method by acting as screening and noise insulating. Increase annual allowance for disturbed material to 100,000m3. Rule to read: <i>1. Less than 100,000m3 of material is disturbed or removed within a 12 month period; or</i> Amend setback distance for General Rural Zone to 100m from residential building. Rule to read: <i>vi. 100m of a residential building on any RESZ - Residential Zone or RURZ - Rural Zone;</i> Reduce setback distance from boundary for stockpiles to 1m. Rule to read: <i>b. There are no stockpiles within 3m of the property boundary;</i> |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R12 | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R13 | Amend | Typo; incorrectly refers to condition 3 instead of condition 1. Amend rule to remove typo. Rule to read: <i>For circumstances other than outlined in 1. and 2. above, hours of operation are limited to:</i> |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R14 | | |
| General Rural Zone | Controlled Activities | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R15 | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R16 | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R17 | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed Remove reference to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R18 | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R19 | | |
| General Rural Zone | Restricted Discretionary Activities | Oppose in part | It is considered that most appropriate activity status for this activity in the general rural zone is Controlled. Amend activity status to Controlled Activity. Rule to Read: <i>Activity Status Controlled</i> |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R20 | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R21 | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R22 | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R23 | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R24 | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R25 | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R26 | | |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| General Rural Zone | Discretionary Activities | | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R27 | | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R28 | Amend | Amend rule title to reflect change in activity status for R20. | Rule to read: <i>Intensive Indoor Primary Production or Rural Industry not meeting Permitted or Controlled or Restricted Discretionary Activity Standards</i> |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R29 | | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R30 | | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R31 | | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R32 | | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R33 | | | |
| General Rural Zone | Non-complying Activities | | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R34 | | | |
| General Rural Zone | GRUZ - R35 | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone Section | | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | Rural Lifestyle Zone | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | Overview | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | Other relevant Te Tai o Poutini Plan provisions | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | Relationship with Other Plans | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | Note with Regard to Plantation Forestry | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | Rules | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | Note: | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | Permitted Activities | Amend | Typo; rule incorrectly states 2m setback when should be 20m | Amend 2m to 20m |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R1 | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R2 | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R3 | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R4 | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R5 | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R6 | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R7 | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R8 | Support in part | To ensure compliance is undertaken on this rule. | Records of letting to be provided annually. Rule to read: <i>6 "Records of letting activity must be provided to the District Council annually; and"</i> |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R9 | Oppose in part | Given the extremally important function emergency services provide to their communities an imposition on hours of operation is inappropriate. Emergency services are required to operate day and night. | Insert exclusion for Emergency Service Facilities for hours of operation. Rule to read: 2. Hours of operation are limited to: i. 7am-10pm weekdays; and ii. 8am - 8pm weekends and public holidays; except iii. For community halls lawfully established at the time of notification of the Plan; iiii. There are no hours of operation for emergency service facilities; |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R10 | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R11 | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | Controlled Activities | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R12 | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R13 | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | Restricted Discretionary Activities | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R14 | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM ovelay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed | Remove reference to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R15 | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | Discretionary Activities | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R16 | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R17 | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R18 | | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R19 | | | |

| | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|--|
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R20 | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R21 | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R22 | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | Non-complying Activities | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R23 | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R24 | | |
| Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ - R25 | | |
| Settlement Zone Section | | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ | | |
| Settlement Zone | Settlement Zone | | |
| Settlement Zone | Overview | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - PREC2 - Settlement Centre Precinct | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - PREC3 - Coastal Settlement Precinct | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - PREC 4 - Rural Residential Precinct | | |
| Settlement Zone | Other relevant Te Tai o Poutini Plan provisions | | |
| Settlement Zone | Note with Regard to Plantation Forestry | | |
| Settlement Zone | Rules | | |
| Settlement Zone | Note: | | |
| Settlement Zone | Permitted Activities | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R1 | Support in part | The current rule wording is not clear. The term "non-residential buildings" could be interpreted in multiple ways which could materially affect the applicaiton fo the rule. |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R2 | | Define what is meant by "non-residenital" buildings i.e. is it a building where a commerical or industrial activity occurs or is it accessory buildings? |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R3 | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R4 | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R5 | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R6 | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R7 | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R8 | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R9 | Support in part | To ensure compliance is undertaken on this rule. |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R10 | | Amend rule 10.5 to change records of letting to be provided annually. |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R11 | | Rule to read: 5 "Records of letting activity must be be provided to the District Council annually;" |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R12 | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R13 | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R14 | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R15 | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R16 | | |
| Settlement Zone | Controlled Activities | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R17 | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R18 | | |
| Settlement Zone | Restricted Discretionary Activities | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R19 | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R20 | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R21 | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R22 | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R23 | | |
| Settlement Zone | Discretionary Activities | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R24 | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R25 | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R26 | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R27 | | |
| Settlement Zone | Non-complying Activities | | |
| Settlement Zone | SETZ - R28 | | |
| SPZ - Special Purpose Zones Section | | | |
| SPZ - Special Purpose Zones | SPZ - Special Purpose Zones | | |
| Airport Zone Section | | | |
| Airport Zone | AIRPZ | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed Remove all references to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" in the Chapter |

| | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|---|---|
| Airport Zone Airport Zone | Airport Zone Overview | Support in part | The greymouth aerodrome has had infrastructure built to allow its use as an outdoor entertainment facility. Greymouth lacks any other location for this type of use so the ability to use the aerodrome is both important financially for bussinesses in the district but also for the wellbeing of the wider regions communities | Insert Temporary activity policy to support Greymouths aerodrome as an outdoor entertainment facility |
| Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone | Airport Zone Objectives AIRPZ - O1 AIRPZ - O2 AIRPZ - O3 AIRPZ - O4 | Support in part | The greymouth aerodrome has had infrastructure built to allow its use as an outdoor entertainment facility. Greymouth lacks any other location for this type of use so the ability to use the aerodrome is both important financially for bussinesses in the district but also for the wellbeing of the wider regions communities | Insert Temporary activity policy to support Greymouths aerodrome as an outdoor entertainment facility |
| Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone | Airport Zone Policies AIRPZ - P1 AIRPZ - P2 AIRPZ - P3 AIRPZ - P4 AIRPZ - P5 AIRPZ - P6 AIRPZ - P7 AIRPZ - P8 AIRPZ - P9 AIRPZ - P10 AIRPZ - P11 | Support in part | The greymouth aerodrome has had infrastructure built to allow its use as an outdoor entertainment facility. Greymouth lacks any other location for this type of use so the ability to use the aerodrome is both important financially for bussinesses in the district but also for the wellbeing of the wider regions communities | Insert Temporary activity policy to support Greymouths aerodrome as an outdoor entertainment facility |
| Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone Airport Zone | Airport Zone Rules Note: Permitted Activities AIRPZ - R1 AIRPZ - R2 AIRPZ - R3 AIRPZ - R4 AIRPZ - R5 Restricted Discretionary Activities AIRPZ - R6 AIRPZ - R7 AIRPZ - R8 AIRPZ - R9 Discretionary Activities AIRPZ - R10 Non-complying Activities AIRPZ - R11 | | | |
| Buller Coalfield Zone Section | | | | |
| Future Urban Zone Section | | | | |
| Future Urban Zone Future Urban Zone Future Urban Zone Future Urban Zone Future Urban Zone Future Urban Zone Future Urban Zone Future Urban Zone Future Urban Zone Future Urban Zone Future Urban Zone | FUZ Future Urban Zone Overview Future Urban Zone Objectives FUZ -O1 FUZ -O2 FUZ -O3 FUZ -O4 Future Urban Zone Policies FUZ - P1 FUZ - P2 | Oppose in part | It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed | Remove all references to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" in the Chapter |

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - P3 |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - P4 |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - P5 |
| Future Urban Zone | Future Urban Zone Rules |
| Future Urban Zone | Note: |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R1 |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R2 |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R3 |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R4 |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R5 |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R6 |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R7 |

Support in part To ensure compliance is undertaken on this rule.

Amend rule 8.5 to change records of letting to be provided annually.

Rule to read:

5 "Records of letting activity must be provided to the District Council annually;"

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R8 |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R9 |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R10 |
| Future Urban Zone | Controlled Activities |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R11 |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R12 |
| Future Urban Zone | Restricted Discretionary Activities |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R13 |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R14 |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R15 |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R16 |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R17 |
| Future Urban Zone | Discretionary Activities |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R18 |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R19 |
| Future Urban Zone | Non Complying Activities |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R20 |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R21 |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R22 |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R23 |
| Future Urban Zone | FUZ - R24 |

Hospital Zone Section

Mineral Extraction Zone Section

Māori Purpose Zone Section

| | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ |
| Māori Purpose Zone | Māori Purpose Zone |
| Māori Purpose Zone | Overview |
| Māori Purpose Zone | Māori Purpose Zone Objectives |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - O1 |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - O2 |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - O3 |
| Māori Purpose Zone | Māori Purpose Zone Policies |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - P1 |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - P2 |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - P3 |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - P4 |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - P5 |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - P6 |
| Māori Purpose Zone | Māori Purpose Zone Rules |
| Māori Purpose Zone | Note: |
| Māori Purpose Zone | Permitted Activities |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R1 |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R2 |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R3 |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R4 |

| | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R5 | | |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R6 | | |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R7 | Support in part | To ensure compliance is undertaken on this rule. |
| | | | Amend rule 8.5 to change records of letting to be provided annually. |
| | | | Rule to read: <i>5 "Records of letting activity must be provided to the District Council annually;"</i> |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R8 | | |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R9 | | |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R10 | | |
| Māori Purpose Zone | Restricted Discretionary Activities | | |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R11 | | |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R12 | | |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R13 | | |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R14 | | |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R15 | | |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R16 | | |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R17 | | |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R18 | | |
| Māori Purpose Zone | Discretionary Activities | | |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R19 | | |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R20 | | |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R21 | | |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R22 | | |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R23 | | |
| Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ - R24 | | |
| Port Zone Section | | | |
| Port Zone | PORTZ | | |
| Port Zone | Port Zone | Support in part | To give effect to the West Coast Regional Policy Statement |
| | | | The regions ports are deemed "regionally significant infrastructure" by the RPS and as such this chapter should reflect this. Of particular importance is the objectives and polices for the zone reflecting this. |
| Port Zone | Overview | Support in part | The regions ports are deemed regionally significant infrastructure (RSI) by the West Coast Regional Policy Statement. This fact should therefore be acknowledged and recognised in this plan. Futhermore the contribution ports have on the social and economic wellbeing of the region should also be recognised. |
| | | | Add additional objectives |
| | | | Objective to read: <i>"Recognise and provide for the importance of the regions Port's as regionally significant infrastructure and the contribution they make to the economic and social wellbeing of the Region"</i> |
| | | | Objective to read: <i>Regional Ports are protected from incompatible land use, subdivision and development that may result in reverse sensitivity effects to ensure their effective operation, maintenance and upgrading</i> |
| Port Zone | Port Zone Objectives | | |
| Port Zone | PORTZ - O1 | | |
| Port Zone | PORTZ - O2 | Support in part | Add a policy that reflects the presence of and ability to set up non-port activities in the port zone. |
| | | | Add a policy: |
| | | | Policy to read: <i>Provide for other industrial activities within the Port Zone, where such activities do not adversely affect port activities.</i> |
| Port Zone | Port Zone Policies | Support in part | To align with the propsoed two new Objectives, Policy 1 is propsoed to be re-wrtten. Splitting the policy in two will capure the importance of the policy. |
| | | | Policy to be rewritten. Split into two separate policies: |
| | | | Policies to read: <i>- Enable the efficient operation, use and development of West Coast/Te Tai o Poutini ports</i> <i>- Avoid incompatible activities or developments locating within the zone that would adversely effect the efficient operation of port activities, including those likely to result in reverse sensitivity effects.</i> |
| Port Zone | PORTZ - P1 | | |
| Port Zone | PORTZ - P2 | | |
| Port Zone | PORTZ - P3 | | |
| Port Zone | PORTZ - P4 | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|---|
| Port Zone | PORTZ - P5 | | | |
| Port Zone | PORTZ - P6 | | | |
| Port Zone | Port Zone Rules | Oppose in part | These activities are an essential part of an operating port. The plan therefore needs to take an enabling approach to them. Rules that are overly restrictive will impinge on the operation and development of the port. | Amend rule to remove condtions 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 |
| Port Zone | PORTZ - R1 | | | |
| Port Zone | PORTZ - R2 | Oppose | Given the zoning it seems excessive to have a rule of this nature. | Remove rule |
| Port Zone | PORTZ - R3 | Oppose | Given the zoning it seems excessive to have a rule of this nature. | Remove rule |
| Port Zone | PORTZ - R4 | Support | The West Coast Wilderness Trail is within the Greymouth Port Zone. Given the economic and wellbeing values both activites bring to the town and wider region it is important that the two co-exist. It is however acknowledged that it is a working port and that there are safety considerations. As such any extension of the cycleway should be in accordance with a management plan. | Reatain rule as notified. |
| Port Zone | PORTZ - R5 | | | |
| Port Zone | Controlled Activities | | | |
| Port Zone | PORTZ - R6 | | | |
| Port Zone | Restricted Discretionary Activities | | | |
| Port Zone | PORTZ - R7 | | | |
| Port Zone | PORTZ - R8 | Oppose | Given the zoning it seems excessive to have a rule of this nature. | Remove rule |
| Port Zone | PORTZ - R9 | Oppose | Given the zoning it seems excessive to have a rule of this nature. | Remove rule |
| Port Zone | Discretionary Activities | | | |
| Port Zone | PORTZ - R10 | | | |
| Port Zone | PORTZ - R11 | Oppose | Given the zoning it seems excessive to have a rule of this nature. | Remove rule |
| Port Zone | Non-complying Activities | | | |
| Port Zone | PORTZ - R12 | | | |
| Stadium Zone Section | | | | |
| Scenic Visitor Zone Section | | | | |
| Development Areas Section | | | | |
| Designations Section | | | | |
| PART 4 - APPENDICES Section | | | | |
| Schedules Section | | | | |
| SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE ITEMS AND AREAS Section | | | | |
| SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE ITEMS AND AREAS | Support | Gives effect to the West Coast RPS | Retain as notified |
| SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | HH1 | | | |
| SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | HH2 | | | |
| SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | HH3 | | | |
| SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | HH4 | | | |
| SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | HH5 | | | |
| SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | HH6 | | | |
| SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | HH7 | | | |
| SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | HH8 | | | |
| SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | HH9 | | | |
| SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | HH10 | | | |
| SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | HH11 | | | |
| SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | HH12 | | | |
| SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | HH13 | | | |
| SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | HH14 | | | |
| SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | HH15 | | | |
| SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | HH16 | | | |
| SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | HH17 | | | |
| SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | HH18 | | | |
| SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | HH19 | | | |

SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH83
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH84
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH85
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH86
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH87
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH88
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH89
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH90
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH91
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH92
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH93
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH94
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH95
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH96
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH97
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH98
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH99
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH100
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH101
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH102
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH103
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH104
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH105
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH106
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH107
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH108
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH109
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH110
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH111
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH112
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH113
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH114
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH115
SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE HH116

SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SITES Section

SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SITES
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH1
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH2
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH3
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH4
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH5
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH6
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH7
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH8
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH9
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH10
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH11
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH12
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH13
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH14
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH15
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH16
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH17
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH18
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH19
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH20
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH21
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH22
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH23
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH24
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH25
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH26
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH27

Support

Gives effect to the West Coast RPS

Retain as notified

SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH28
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH29
SCHED1B - SCHEDULE OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIT ARCH30

SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES Section

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | Support | Gives effect to the West Coast RPS | Retain as notified |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE1 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE2 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE3 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE4 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE5 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE6 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE7 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE8 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE9 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE10 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE11 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE12 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE13 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE14 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE15 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE16 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE17 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE18 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE19 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE20 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE21 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE22 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE23 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE24 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE25 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE26 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE27 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE28 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE29 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE30 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE31 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE32 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE33 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE34 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE35 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE36 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE37 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE38 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE39 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE40 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE41 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE42 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE43 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE44 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE45 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE46 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE47 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE48 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE49 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE50 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE51 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE52 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE53 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE54 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE55 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE56 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE57 | | | |
| SCHED2 - SCHEDULE OF NOTABLE TREES | TREE58 | | | |

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI Section

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI

Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed. A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling. It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied. Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.

Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 2

Oppose

Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed. A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling. It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied. Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.

Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 3

Oppose

Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed. A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling. It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied. Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.

Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE SASM 4

Oppose

Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed. A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling. It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied. Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.

Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE SASM 5

Oppose

Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed. A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling. It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied. Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.

Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 6

Oppose

Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed. A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling. It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied. Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.

Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 7

Oppose

Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed. A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling. It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied. Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.

Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE SASM 8

Oppose

Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed. A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling. It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied. Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.

Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE SASM 9

Oppose

Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed. A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling. It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied. Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.

Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE SASM 10

Oppose
Oppose

Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed. A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling. It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied. Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.

Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE SASM 11

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 12

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 13

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 14

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 15

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 16

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 17

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 18

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 19

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 20

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 21

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 22

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 23

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 24

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 25

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 26

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 27

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 28

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 29

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 30

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 31

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 32

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 33

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 34

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 35

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 36

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 37

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 38

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 39

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 40

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 41

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 42

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 43

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 44

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 45

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 46

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 47

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 48

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 49

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 50

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 51

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 52

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 53

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 54

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 55

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 56

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 57

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 58

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 59

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 60

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 61

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 62

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 63

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 64

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 65

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 66

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 67

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 68

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 69

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 70

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 71

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 72

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 73

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 74

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 75

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 76

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 77

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 78

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 79

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 80

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 81

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 82

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 83

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 84

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 85

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 86

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 87

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 88

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 89

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 90

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 91

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 92

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 93

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 94

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 95

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 96

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 97

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 98

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 99

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 100

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 101

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 102

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 103

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 104

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 105

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 106

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 107

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 108

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 109

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 110

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 111

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 112

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 113

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 114

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 115

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 116

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 117

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 118

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 119

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 120

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 121

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 122

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 123

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 124

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 125

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 126

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 127

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 128

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 129

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 130

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 131

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 132

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 133

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 134

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 135

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 136

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 137

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 138

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 139

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 140

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 141

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 142

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 143

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 144

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 145

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 146

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 147

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 148

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 149

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 150

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 151

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 152

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 153

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 154

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 155

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 156

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 157

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 158

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 159

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 160

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 161

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 162

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 163

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 164

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 165

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 166

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 167

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 168

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 169

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 170

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 171

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 172

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 173

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 174

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 175

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 176

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 177

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 178

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 179

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 180

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 181

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 182

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 183

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 184

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 185

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 186

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 187

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 188

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 189

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 190

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 191

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 192

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 193

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 194

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 195

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 196

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 197

Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed. A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling. It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied. Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.

Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 198

Oppose
Oppose

Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed. A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling. It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied. Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.

Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 199

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 200

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 201

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 202

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mistrust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|--|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 203

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 204

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 205

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 206

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 207

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 208

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 209

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 210

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 211

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 212

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 213

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 214

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE - SASM 215

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| Oppose | <p>Council opposes the cultural landscape approach taken in this plan. The sites are extensive, covering vast amounts of private and crown land within almost all zones in the district. The sites are to the point of excessiveness and appear to have been designated by a 'spray and hope' method. The source of information is singular with little ability to be subjectively peer reviewed.</p> <p>A review of specific land designated as SASM by this process shows it quoted as having "little economic or cultural value". Given the contradiction, Council finds itself in a position of mis-trust, this is externally troubling.</p> <p>It is unclear as to exactly how the sites have been identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the rule framework will be applied.</p> <p>Furthermore the overlay will impose significant costs and constraints on the majority of the public. The public will also have to have an 'open door policy' for access to their land. The presence of sites will often result in the requirement for authorisation for activities that are deemed 'day to day' for a zone. All of this is not practical.</p> | <p>Remove the Overlay so that they can be further reviewed and reassessed. A framework is sought that will not impinge on the use of private property. Insert a statutory process for identification, agreement with landowner, management incentives, and insertion of new mapped areas into plan by way of Schedule 1 process. No SASM can be formalised except by way of plan change.</p> |
|--------|---|--|

SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE SASM 216

SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS Section

| | | |
|---------|---|---|
| Support | <p>Over the past near twenty years the Grey District Council has been working towards the mapping of SNA. Identification has taken place (some time ago) however due to a sequence of unfortunate and un-controlable events the mapping (by Council initiated plan change) has yet to occur. Regardless the project was undertaken in terms of obligations in S.6(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991. The project had heavily involvement from Federated Farmers, Department of Conservation (DOC) and Forest and Bird. At times it was acrimonious but an SNA process was decided on which was in keeping with all parties philosophical approach to the protection of the Districts indigenous biodiversity.</p> <p>To summarise that process promulgated by Council; a stepped process which, generically speaking, involved Council, based on Ecologist input (desktop studies), developing a list of all property in the District with likely ecological features that had significance value; submitted this list to Department of Conservation who could add to the list or remove from it, and then agreeing on the list referred to as the potential SNA list. As a subsequent step, Council, based on formal Ecologist inspection and reports worked with DOC and its Ecologist to refine the list and the area of such SNAs.</p> <p>An important component of Council's process was the focus on landowners having direct access to Council's Ecologist in his determination of the S.6 values on the land and also in agreeing on ways and means to put measures in place to protect such features.</p> | <p>Retain SNA overlay as notified for the Grey District</p> |
|---------|---|---|

SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS

SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS PUN - W033

SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS PUN - W034

SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS PUN - 123

SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS PUN - 124

SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS PUN - 044

SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS PUN - 049

SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS DOC - 004

SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS HOC - 083

SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS HOC - 087

SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS HOC - 089

SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS HOC - 091

SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS HOC - 093

SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS HOC - 094

SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS HOC - 095

Council considers its obligations under s6 of the Act meet and any

SCHED9 - LAWFULLY ESTABLISHED MINERAL E Strongman Mine, Access and infrastructure

SCHED9 - LAWFULLY ESTABLISHED MINERAL E Strongman East Mine

SCHED9 - LAWFULLY ESTABLISHED MINERAL E Rapahoe Coal Yard

SCHED9 - LAWFULLY ESTABLISHED MINERAL E Rocky Creek Coal Washery

SCHED9 - LAWFULLY ESTABLISHED MINERAL E Kaiata Yard

SCHED9 - LAWFULLY ESTABLISHED MINERAL E Kiwi Quarry

SCHED9 - LAWFULLY ESTABLISHED MINERAL E Karamea Quarry

SCHED9 - LAWFULLY ESTABLISHED MINERAL E Blackball Quarry

SCHED9 - LAWFULLY ESTABLISHED MINERAL E Okuru Quarry

SCHED9 - LAWFULLY ESTABLISHED MINERAL E BRM Developments Ianthe Forest Mine

SCHED9 - LAWFULLY ESTABLISHED MINERAL E Birchfields Ross Mine

SCHED9 - LAWFULLY ESTABLISHED MINERAL E R&M Mining Mine Ross Township

SCHED9 - LAWFULLY ESTABLISHED MINERAL E Reefton Restoration Project/ Globe Progress Mine

SCHED9 - LAWFULLY ESTABLISHED MINERAL E Snowy River Gold Mine

SCHED9 - LAWFULLY ESTABLISHED MINERAL E Westland Schist Quarry

SCHED9 - LAWFULLY ESTABLISHED MINERAL E Karamea Lime Quarry

SCHED10 - PREVIOUSLY MINED LOCATIONS IN THE RURAL AND OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION ZONES Section

SCHED10 - PREVIOUSLY MINED LOCATIONS IN SCHED 10

Support

Council supports the inclusion of this schedule

Retain as notified

SCHED10 - PREVIOUSLY MINED LOCATIONS IN Schedule Ten: Previously Mined Locations in the Rural and Open Space and Recreati

Support

Council supports the inclusion of this schedule

Retain as notified

Appendices Section

Appendices

Appendices

Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards Section

Appendix Two: Recession Planes Section

Appendix Three: Design Guidelines Section

Appendix Three: Design Guidelines

Appendix Three: Design Guidelines

Support in part

It is most important to encourage development within the Greymouth CBD. Remove all references to control of colors to be used. Imposing guidelines around colors for buildings may be construed as regulation, or a step towards regulation. This is not ideal for future development.

Appendix Three: Design Guidelines

Greymouth/Māwhera Town Centre and Mixed Use Zone Urban Design Guidelines

Appendix Three: Design Guidelines

Hokitika Town Centre Urban Design Guidelines

Appendix Three: Design Guidelines

Medium Density Housing Design Guidelines

Appendix Three: Design Guidelines

Reefton Heritage Town Design Guidelines

Appendix Three: Design Guidelines

Westport/Kawatiri Town Centre and Mixed Use Zone Urban Design Guidelines

Appendix Four: Accidental Discovery Protocols Section

Appendix Five: Statutory Acknowledgements Section

Appendix Six: Nohoanga Entitlements Section

Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements Section

Appendix Eight: Community Living Precinct Concept Plans Section

Appendix Nine: Airport Approach Path Overlay Section

Appendix Ten: New Zealand Archaeological Association Sites of Māori Origin Section

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| General Comments | In Relief Sought section red means deletion and blue means addition. | | | |
| Overlays | It is recommended that all overlays be removed, reviewed and reassessed with new overlays created. Grey District Council acknowledges the benefit of overlays; however, they must be correct to be effective and beneficial to users. There are a number of overlays that extend over road boundaries and / or are noted as being incorrect. | | | |
| Regional Council Matters | The plan seems to cover both District and Regional Council matters. This could put Council in a position where resource consent is needed from both the District and Regional Council for the same activity, whereas the current operational plans would normally only require resource consent from the Regional Council. This could impact on costs and timing for Council to undertake its statutory functions but is also relevant to private property owners. It is recommended that further investigation be given to whether the objectives, policies and rules are appropriate as District Council matters. For example, the Natural Character and the Margins of Waterbodies chapter (see further comments below). | | | |
| Part 1 – Introduction and General Provisions | | | | |
| Definitions | New: Statutory Agency | NEW Definition | It is recommended that a definition of Statutory Agency is included in the plan. This will provide clarity on what agency the rules are applicable to. | Include new definition |
| | | | | |
| Part 2 – District Wide Matters | | | | |
| | | | | |
| INF – Infrastructure | | | | |
| Overview | Overview | Support in part | Some spelling errors in the definition for Reverse Sensitivity (perceived) as well as the bullet point for Transport (in an around) in the overview section. Recommend these be fixed. | Fix grammar errors as per comment |
| Infrastructure Objectives | INF - O1 | Support | Support without alteration. | N/A |
| | INF - O2 | Support in part | There is no definition of incompatible in terms of the protection of utilities and infrastructure from the adverse effects of incompatible subdivision, land use or development. What subdivision, land use or development does this objective refer to? | Clearly define incompatible in terms of the protection of utilities and infrastructure from the adverse effects of incompatible subdivision, land use or development. |
| | INF – O3 | Support in part | Recommend it is more clearly defined in this section as to where the onus is put, i.e. on the developers when subdividing. | |
| | INF – O4 | Support | Support without alteration. | N/A |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|--------------------------------|----------|---|--|--|
| | INF - O5 | Support | Support without alteration. | N/A |
| Infrastructure Policies | INF – P1 | Support in part | While INF – O1 is to enable development, operation, maintenance and upgrading of utilities and infrastructure, INF – P1 does not specify maintenance as being recognised and provided for. The maintenance of infrastructure should be provided for within this policy | Reword to the following “Recognise and provide for the positive social, economic, cultural and environmental benefits from the development, continued operation, <u>maintenance</u> and upgrading of utilities and infrastructure.” |
| | INF – P2 | Support in part | The definition of wastewater should allow for the separate generation of greywater and blackwater to be considered as wastewater. | Alter the definition of wastewater to allow for it to include the generation of greywater or blackwater as follows: “means any combination of two <u>one</u> or more <u>of</u> the following wastes: sewage, greywater or industrial and trade waste.” |
| | INF – P3 | Support | Support without alteration. | N/A |
| | INF – P4 | Support in part | The definition of wastewater should allow for the separate generation of greywater and blackwater to be considered as wastewater. | Alter the definition of wastewater to allow for it to include the generation of greywater or blackwater as follows: “means any combination of two <u>one</u> or more <u>of</u> the following wastes: sewage, greywater or industrial and trade waste.” |
| | INF – P5 | Support | Support without alteration. | N/A |
| | INF – P6 | Support | Support without alteration. | N/A |
| Infrastructure Rules | | | | |
| | INF – R2 | Support in part | Clarification is requested as to whether any building such as those that do not generate human wastewater are required to connect to water, wastewater or stormwater networks, i.e. a carport. | Reword the permitted activity standard to clarify what buildings are required to connect to reticulated services as follows: “A building <u>or structure in which human wastewater is generated</u> is serviced by, and capacity exists within the reticulated water supply, wastewater <u>and</u> stormwater network.” An advice note is required as connection are only of right for residential zoned land. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-----------------------|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | The definition of wastewater should allow for the separate generation of greywater and blackwater to be considered as wastewater. | <p>Approval is required from Network Utility Operator.</p> <p>Alter the definition of wastewater to allow for it to include the generation of greywater or blackwater as follows: “means any combination of two <u>one</u> or more <u>of</u> the following wastes: sewage, greywater or industrial and trade waste.”</p> |
| | INF – R4 | Support | Support without alteration. | N/A |
| | INF – R5 | Support in part | The definition of height refers to a specified reference point which is not clear as to what it is. It is requested that this be made clear in the definition or in the provision, i.e. existing ground level. | <p>Alter the definition of Height or specific provision to include the specified reference point, i.e.:</p> <p>“means the vertical distance between <u>existing ground level</u> and the highest part of any feature, structure or building above that point.”</p> |
| | INF – R7 | Support in part | <p>The definition of Relocation in point 3. is as follows: “means, in relation to historic heritage items, moving an item to a new area or site.” This needs to be altered to refer to INF – R7 which is the provision for the “Installation, extension, maintenance, operation, upgrade and repair of lines, underground pipelines and ancillary vehicle access tracks erected by a Network Utility Operator”. It is unclear from the definition of Relocation how it refers to the provisions of this permitted activity standard.</p> <p>Provision 7. of INF – R7 refers to the pi pole structure provided for in provision 4., however</p> | <p>Alter the definition of Relocation to refer to the provisions of this permitted activity standard as follows:</p> <p>“means, in relation to historic heritage items, moving an item to a new area or site.”</p> <p>Alter provision 7. as follows:</p> <p>“The building footprint or the footprint of the structure does not increase by more than 30</p> |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-----------------------|-----------|---|---|--|
| | | | provision 5. is the provision for pi poles. Recommend provision 7. is altered to refer to provision 5. | percent of the existing building or structure, excluding any pole or pi pole structure provided for in 4 5 above;” |
| | INF – R11 | Support in part | Include definition of Small Cell Utility. | Include definition of Small Cell Utility. |
| | INF – R12 | Support in part | Include definition of Land Transport Corridor. The definition of height refers to a specified reference point which is not clear as to what it is. It is requested that this be made clear in the definition, i.e. existing ground level. | Include definition of Land Transport Corridor. Alter the definition of Height to include the specified reference point, i.e.: “means the vertical distance between <u>existing ground level</u> a specified reference point and the highest part of any feature, structure or building above that point.” |
| | INF – R13 | Support in part | Remove provision 4. of INF – R13, as it refers to the requirements for dish antennae in zoned land (INF – R13 is specifically for road reserve). OR include a separate sub-provision under provision 4. for dish antennae in unzoned road reserve. Various grammatical errors. | Delete provision 4. 4. A dish antenna does not exceed a diameter of: a. —0.6m in a RESZ – Residential Zone or SETZ – Settlement Zone; b. —0.9m in all other zones. Edit provisions to grammatically correct standard, i.e. “notional envelope <u>is</u> exceeded” |
| | INF – R14 | Support in part | Provision 2. refers to excluding panel antenna in a RESZ or SETZ zone. Clarity is required on what the requirements are in these two zones if they are excluded from this provision. | Specify the requirements for width of panel antenna in the RESZ or SETZ if the limit is not 0.8m. |
| | INF – R16 | Support in part | The definition of wastewater should allow for the separate substances of greywater and blackwater to be considered as wastewater. | Alter the definition of wastewater to allow for it to include the substance of greywater or blackwater as follows: “means any combination of two <u>one</u> or more <u>of</u> the following wastes: sewage, greywater or industrial and trade waste.” |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-----------------------|-----------|---|---|---|
| | INF – R18 | Support in part | Insert new provision for Lighthouses, navigational aids and beacons as a permitted activity standard. | <p>Insert new permitted activity standard for the installation of Lighthouses, navigational aids and beacons:</p> <p><u>INF – R13 New lighthouses, navigational aids and beacons</u> <u>Activity Status Permitted</u> Where: 1. <u>This meets the performance standards in Rule INF – R1.</u> Activity status where compliance not achieved: Restricted Discretionary.</p> |
| | INF – R21 | Support in part | <p>Alter the definition of wastewater to allow for the separate substances of greywater and blackwater to be considered as wastewater.</p> <p>Comment: the definition of land here refers to land that is covered by water and the airspace above land. Recommend that this is altered to clarify that this is only for land not covered by water or in the air above land as this provision is for the disposal of treated effluent to land, not water or air.</p> | <p>Alter the definition of wastewater to allow for it to include the substance of greywater or blackwater as follows: “means any combination of two <u>one</u> or more <u>of</u> the following wastes: sewage, greywater or industrial and trade waste.”</p> <p>Alter the definition of land</p> |
| | INF – R24 | Support in part | <p>Alter the definition of wastewater to allow for the separate substances of greywater and blackwater to be considered as wastewater.</p> <p>Alter the definition of Water to include the water within the Water Treatment Plant, as the</p> | <p>Alter the definition of wastewater to allow for it to include the substance of greywater or blackwater as follows: “means any combination of two <u>one</u> or more <u>of</u> the following wastes: sewage, greywater or industrial and trade waste.”</p> <p>Alter the definition of Water to include the water within the Water Treatment Plant, as</p> |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-----------------------------|-----------|---|--|---|
| | | | definition excludes water in any form while in any pipe, tank or cistern. OR Remove the hyperlink of Water from the Water Treatment Plant for clarity. | the definition excludes water in any form while in any pipe, tank or cistern. OR Remove the hyperlink of Water from the Water Treatment Plant for clarity. |
| | INF – R26 | Support in part | Remove reference to “minor upgrade” from provision, as there is no other allowance for the upgrade of these structures. | Alter provision to the following: “Installation, extension, maintenance, operation, minor upgrade and repair of lines, poles and towers erected by a Network Utility Operator not meeting Permitted Activity standards” |
| TRN – Transport | | | | |
| Transport Objectives | TRN-O1 | Support | Recognises the importance of infrastructure. | Important to note that this needs to be supported also by appropriate rules and practical conditions to allow implementation. See notes below. |
| | TRN-O2 | Support in part. | Use of “minimise” rather than “mitigate” changes the focus and possibly the intent of the objective which could result in more stringent and not as practical (cost/safety/risk) requirements (i.e., more difficult and costly for Council to provide emergency and core infrastructure services). | Re-word to include “mitigate” rather than “minimise”. |
| | TRN-O3 | Support | Encourages discussions between developers and Council to ensure that potential impacts on Council infrastructure are taken into account. | |
| | TRN-O4 | Support | Extreme events are more common and having this recognised when it comes to providing emergency and core infrastructure services is important. | |
| | TRN-O5 | Support | Encourages discussions between developers and Council to ensure that potential impacts on Council infrastructure are taken into account. | |
| Transport Policies | TRN-P1 | Support in part. | Use of “minimise” rather than “mitigate” changes the focus and possibly the intent of the | Re-word to include “mitigate” rather than “minimise”. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|------------------------|--------------|---|--|--|
| | | | policy which could result in more stringent and not as practical (cost/safety/risk) requirements (i.e., more difficult and costly for Council to provide emergency and core infrastructure services). | |
| | TRN-P2 | Support | Encourages discussions between developers and Council to ensure that potential impacts on Council infrastructure are taken into account. | |
| | TRN-P3 | Support | Encourages discussions between developers and Council to ensure that potential impacts on Council infrastructure are taken into account. | |
| | TRN-P4 | Support | Encourages discussions between Council and KiwiRail to maintain relationships. Intersecting transport infrastructure should be a collaborative process. | |
| | TRN-P5 | Support | Encourages discussions between developers and Council to ensure that potential impacts on Council infrastructure are taken into account. | |
| | TRN-P7 | Support | Encourages discussions between developers and Council to ensure that potential impacts on Council infrastructure are taken into account. | |
| | TRN-P8 | Support | Encourages discussions between developers and Council to ensure that potential impacts on Council infrastructure are taken into account. | |
| | TRN-P9 | Support | Encourages discussions between developers and Council to ensure that potential impacts on Council infrastructure are taken into account. | |
| Transport Rules | Introduction | Support in part | <p>While the identification of potentially multiple relevant rules to an activity is important, the wording implies that all rules must be complied with rather than the most applicable rule.</p> <p>Having a PA rule that cannot be met due to the general rule conditions makes little sense.</p> | <p>Clarification on how this wording corresponds to standard best practice in the planning sector.</p> <p>This is found in all the intro sections for each chapter and the same query applies.</p> |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-----------------------|--------------|---|--|---|
| | Advice Notes | Support in part | <p>1. Assume that any non-Council Utility Provider must still consult with Council prior to any works being undertaken.</p> <p>2. Assume works undertaken in the road reserve or designation by the roading authority may not have the same requirements as works undertaken by other parties.</p> <p>This advice note refers to requiring a road opening approval to undertake work in the road reserve / transport corridor – amend wording to require a “ road works permit” to be applied for and approved prior to works being undertaken.</p> <p>4. and 5. Encourages good relationship and communication between Council and WK/KR.</p> <p>5. Is this appropriate for local situations?</p> | <p>Clarify or add words as necessary to ensure no ambiguity.</p> <p>Amend wording to: a “road works permit” is required prior to works being undertaken....</p> <p>Ensure that these standards do not put unrealistic or unsuitable requirements in place.</p> |
| | Designations | Support in part | Unclear whether all road / transport corridors are designated in this plan. The Designation chapter for GDC does not mention roads | <p>Confirmation or clarity on whether all roads are automatically designated.</p> <p>Additional/specific details on the purpose of the designation could offer up an opportunity to include more common activities and thereby limit the need for authorisations through a RC when fully within the road reserve.</p> |
| | TRN-R1 | Support in part | Confirmation of the suitability of the Auckland design guide for stormwater in relation to local environment conditions and site constraints. | Ensure that these standards do not put unrealistic or unsuitable requirements in place. |
| | TRN-R2 | Support in part | Assuming all roads are designated, land use activities within the designation should not require further authorisation as long as they are | Amend accordingly so appropriate rules and conditions can be applied to standard Council activities. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-----------------------|--------|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>in accordance with the purpose of the designation.</p> <p>The definition of 'maintenance' excludes "upgrades" however this is very general and does put significant and possibly unnecessary limits on the activities that can be undertaken within the road corridor.</p> <p>What is the intent of this rule? i.e., what activities does it intend to capture?</p> | |
| | TRN-R3 | Support in part | Assuming all roads are designated, land use activities within the designation should not require further authorisation as long as they are in accordance with the purpose of the designation. | Amend accordingly so appropriate rules and conditions can be applied to standard Council activities. |
| | TRN-R4 | Support in part | <p>Would a new transport corridor automatically be designated? Unsure what the point of this rule is and why a consent would be required for it?</p> <p>Does this refer to only the physical creation of the road or the creation of the road corridor boundaries?</p> | Clarification required to ensure all parties are aware of relevant rules and responsibilities. |
| | TRN-R6 | Support in part | Inconsistent use of language when referring to roading authorities, etc. | Amend throughout TTPP as required to be clear and consistent. A definition could possibly be added. |
| | TRN-R7 | Support in part | Impact on the road controlling authority and existing infrastructure is not clear as a matter to consider. It is implied. | More explicit wording. |
| | TRN-R8 | Support in part | What sort of activities are expected to fall within this rule? As above, it is not clear on the purpose of the PA rule and why more activities are not considered 'maintenance'. | |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|----------------------------------|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | Matters of discretion are appropriate. | |
| | TRN-R9 | Support in part | <p>Impact on the road controlling authority and existing infrastructure is not clear as a matter to consider. It is implied.</p> <p>Is the intention of this rule for developers etc to open and form unformed legal road?</p> <p>Matters of discretion are considered lite. c. Add cyclists Consider adding design, suitability to the matters of discretion</p> | <p>More explicit wording.</p> <p>Reword and add to as required.</p> |
| | TRN-R10 | Support | Matters of discretion are appropriate. | |
| | TRN-R11 | Support | Matters of discretion are appropriate. | |
| | TRN-R12 | Support in part | <p>This is the first mention of “high trip activities”. Also, this term is not included as a definition.</p> <p>Use “mitigate” rather than “minimise” to allow less opportunity for interpretation.</p> | <p>Having something earlier, whether a rule or policy would ensure it doesn’t go unnoticed as part of an application.</p> <p>Include as a definition.</p> <p>Re-word as required.</p> |
| | TRN-R13 | Support in part | Given TRN-R4, which is not clear, it is not obvious what activity will be captured by this DA rule? | Clarification on the requirements for Council when considering the creation of a new road and formed vs unformed roads. |
| | TRN-R14 | Support in part | As for TRN-R12. | |
| NH - Natural Hazards | | | | |
| Overview | Overview | Support in part | Remove hyperlink of Land use activity definition after the reference to “geothermal activity” as it creates confusion and is not part of the original RMA definition. | Remove hyperlink from “geothermal activity” in the second paragraph of the overview. |
| Natural Hazard Objectives | NH – O1 | Support | Support without alteration. | N/A |
| | NH – O2 | Support | Support without alteration. | N/A |
| | NH - O3 | Support | Support without alteration. | N/A |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|--------------------------------|----------|---|--|--|
| | NH – O4 | Support in part | Could use rewording to ensure clarity. | Reword objective to ensure intention is clear. |
| | NH – O5 | Support | Support without alteration. | N/A |
| | NH – O6 | Support | Support without alteration. | N/A |
| Natural Hazard Policies | NH - P1 | Support in part | Reword this provision for clarity to the following: “Identify with natural hazard overlays the areas at significant risk from natural hazards.” | Alter the provision to provide clarity. |
| | NH - P2 | Support in part | It is unclear as to how natural hazards are being identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the policy will be applied. | Alter the policy to provide clarity on how natural hazards are being identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant. |
| | NH - P3 | Support | Support without alteration. | N/A |
| | NH - P6 | Support | Provided the Earthquake Hazard Overlay is accurately located this policy is supported. | N/A |
| | NH - P7 | Support | Provided the Earthquake Hazard Overlay is accurately located this policy is supported. | N/A |
| | NH - P8 | Support | Provided the Coastal Tsunami Hazard Overlay is accurately located this policy is supported. | N/A |
| | NH - P9 | Support in part | For consistency recommend revising the use of Restrict to Avoid. Otherwise support this policy provided the Lake Tsunami Hazard overlay is accurately located. | Reword policy to use the word Avoid instead of Restrict. |
| | NH - P10 | Support | Provided the Coastal Severe and Flood Severe Hazard Overlays are accurately located this policy is supported. | N/A |
| | NH - P11 | Support in part | Remove hyperlink from the Land part of Land Instability Alert overlay for clarity. There is concern with the word ‘minimise’ within this policy, how do you quantify minimise? There is a risk that onerous requirements could be introduced. | Alter the policy to remove the hyperlink from Land. Reword a) of this policy to remove ‘minimise’ |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|------------------------------------|--------------|---|---|--|
| | | | Otherwise support this policy provided the Land Instability Alert, Coastal Alert and Flood Susceptibility overlays are accurately located. | |
| | NH - P12 | Support in part | <p>Clarify what effects this policy is requiring be considered (adverse, potential, actual?).</p> <p>Clarify whether provision b. is existing mitigation measures, potential measures or proposed ones.</p> <p>Include a definition of natural hazard risk that is referred to in this provision.</p> | <p>Clarify in the policy which effects are being assessed and whether provision b. of the policy is for existing or proposed mitigation (if any is proposed).</p> <p>Include a definition of natural hazard risk.</p> |
| Natural Hazard Advice notes | Advice Notes | Support in part | <p>Advice note 2 refers to the diversion of water, with the word water being a hyperlink. The definition of water brings up that water within a pipe is not included in the definition.</p> <p>Recommend removing the hyperlink from the word water in this instance.</p> | Remove hyperlink from the word Water in the second advice note. |
| Natural Hazard Rules | NH – R1 | Support in part | <p>When compliance is not achieved the reader is directed to specific Natural Hazard Overlays Rules. Clarity is required as to where these can be found.</p> <p>Provision 2. of the rule refers to an Act of God and natural disaster. Clarity is required on what an Act of God is vs. a natural disaster.</p> | <p>Clarity on which Natural Hazard Overlay rules apply if compliance of the rule is not achieved, and what activity status is if provision NH – R1 is not complied with.</p> <p>Clarity on what an Act of God is vs. a natural disaster.</p> |
| | NH – R2 | Support in part | <p>It seems unduly onerous to require resource consent for the continued operation of any existing natural hazard mitigation structure.</p> <p>Provision 3. requires that there is no change to the design, texture or form of the structure, however this would prevent the permitted activity of maintenance or repair from being undertaken.</p> | <p>Remove the reference to operation from the title of NH – R2.</p> <p>Reword provision 3. to the following: “3. There is no significant change to the design, texture, or form of the structure;” OR align with NH – R3: “3. There is no change to more than 10% of the overall dimensions, orientation or</p> |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-----------------------|---------|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>Provision 2. of NH – R2 is made redundant if the required earthworks or land disturbance is restricted by a rule in another overlay chapter as referred to by the advice note. The restrictions make this permitted activity standard unduly trying to use.</p> <p>R2 requires the ‘minimum’ earthworks and land disturbance to undertake the activity. The term ‘minimum’ is open to interpretation and is not measurable or quantifiable which will lead to multiple interpretations of the rule. It is therefore recommended that the word ‘minimum’ be replaced.</p> | <p>outline the design, texture, or form of the structure;</p> <p>Specify that the provisions in this permitted activity standard are isolated from the provisions for earthworks in the other overlay chapters to prevent this being unduly onerous.</p> <p>Replace the word ‘minimum’ with a measurable or quantifiable wording to provide clarity</p> |
| | NH – R3 | Support in part | <p>Remove the reference to “originally consented structure” from provision 4. as not all lawfully established structures are lawfully established with consent.</p> <p>Provision 2. of NH – R2 is made redundant if the required earthworks or land disturbance is restricted by a rule in another overlay chapter as referred to by the advice note. The restrictions make this permitted activity standard unduly trying to use.</p> <p>R2 requires the ‘minimum’ earthworks and land disturbance to undertake the activity. The term ‘minimum’ is open to interpretation and is not</p> | <p>Reword provision 4. of NH – R3 to the following: “4. There is no change to more than 10% to the overall dimensions, orientation or outline of structure from the that originally <u>lawfully established</u> consented structure; and”</p> <p>Specify that the provisions in this permitted activity standard are isolated from the provisions for earthworks in the other overlay chapters to prevent this being unduly onerous.</p> <p>Replace the word ‘minimum’ with a measurable or quantifiable wording to provide clarity</p> |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-----------------------|---------|---|---|--|
| | | | measurable or quantifiable which will lead to multiple interpretations of the rule. It is therefore recommended that the word 'minimum' be replaced. | |
| | NH – R4 | Support in part | <p>Appears unduly convoluted to require any new natural hazard mitigation structure to be subject to all provisions of the Overlay Chapters when the intention of the Natural Hazard chapter is to provide for this (NH – O2).</p> <p>Replace the word 'minimum' with a measurable or quantifiable wording to provide clarity</p> | <p>Request that the provisions to create new natural hazard mitigation structures simplified to reduce confusion and undue convolution.</p> <p>Replace the word 'minimum' with a measurable or quantifiable wording to provide clarity</p> |
| | NH – R5 | Oppose in part | Appears unduly convoluted to require any repairs, maintenance, operation or upgrade of any existing or new natural hazard mitigation structure to be subject to all provisions of the Overlay Chapters when the intention of the Natural Hazard chapter is to provide for this (NH – O2). | Request that the provisions to create new natural hazard mitigation structures simplified to reduce confusion and undue convolution. |
| | NH – R6 | Support in part | <p>The definition of maintenance in the title only appears to refer to historic heritage and infrastructure not buildings.</p> <p>It is implied in this standard that the repair/maintenance of existing buildings in the Flood Susceptibility Overlay or Flood Severe Overlay when the building is unoccupied is permitted, however it is not clear. It is considered that this should be permitted given NH – R7 allows for the construction of new unoccupied buildings in these overlays as a permitted activity.</p> | <p>Amend the definition of maintenance in the title to refer to buildings as this is what the rule is providing for.</p> <p>Clarify whether NH – R6 provides for the repair/maintenance of existing buildings when the buildings are unoccupied.</p> |
| | NH – R7 | Support | Support without alteration. | N/A |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-----------------------|----------|---|--|---|
| | NH – R8 | Support in part | Change the wording of NH – R8 provision 1. to clarify that it is any building used for sensitive activities, not a specific building. | Reword NH – R8 provision 1. to the following: “1. There is are no increases in <u>the</u> net floor area of <u>any the</u> building used for sensitive activities; and |
| | NH – R9 | Support in part | Change the wording of NH – R9 provision 1. to clarify it is net floor area of buildings and for consistency with NH – R8. | Reword NH – R9 provision 1. to the following: “1. There is no increase in <u>the</u> net floor area <u>of any building</u> used for sensitive activities.” |
| | NH – R11 | Support | Support without alteration. | N/A |
| | NH – R15 | Support in part | The definition of maintenance in the title only appears to refer to historic heritage and infrastructure not buildings. | Amend the definition of maintenance in the title to refer to buildings. |
| | NH – R16 | Support | Provided the Earthquake Hazard Overlays are accurately located this policy is supported. | N/A |
| | NH – R18 | Support in part | The definition of maintenance in the title only appears to refer to historic heritage and infrastructure not buildings. | Amend the definition of maintenance in the title to refer to buildings. |
| | NH – R20 | Support in part | The definition of maintenance in the title only appears to refer to historic heritage and infrastructure not buildings. | Amend the definition of maintenance in the title to refer to buildings. |
| | NH – R24 | Support in part | The definition of maintenance in the title only appears to refer to historic heritage and infrastructure not buildings. Change the wording of NH – R24 provision 1. to clarify it is the net floor area of buildings. | Amend the definition of maintenance in the title to refer to buildings. Reword NH – R24 provision 1. to the following: “1. There is no increase in <u>the</u> net floor area <u>of any building</u> used for Critical Response Facility.” |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-----------------------|----------|---|---|---|
| | NH – R27 | Support in part | <p>The definition of maintenance in the title only appears to refer to historic heritage and infrastructure not general buildings.</p> <p>Change the wording of NH – R27 provision 1. to clarify it is the net floor area of buildings.</p> | <p>Amend the definition of maintenance in the title to refer to buildings.</p> <p>Reword NH – R27 provision 1. to the following:</p> <p>“1. There is no increase in the net floor area of any building used for Critical Response Facility purposes.”</p> |
| | NH – R29 | Support in part | Reword the title to clarify whether this is for additions and alterations to existing facilities and for new facilities, or whether this is for additions and alterations to new or existing facilities. | Reword the title to clarify whether the provision is for additions and alterations to existing facilities and for new facilities, or whether this is for additions and alterations to new or existing facilities. |
| | NH – R30 | Support in part | | <p>Amend the definition of maintenance in the title to refer to buildings.</p> <p>Reword NH – R30 provision 1. to the following:</p> <p>“1. There is no increase in the net floor area of any building used for Critical Response Facility purposes.”</p> |
| | NH – R31 | Support in part | Reword the title for clarity. | <p>Reword the title for clarity i.e.:</p> <p>“Additions and Alterations to New and Existing New Residential, Commercial and Industrial Buildings and Community Facilities, Educational Facilities and Health Facilities in the Earthquake Hazard Overlay - 200m”</p> |
| | NH – R32 | Support in part | Clarity is required for both NH – R31 and NH – R32 as to whether these provisions are for the additions and alterations to new and existing | Reword provisions NH – R31 and NH – R32 to clarify as to whether these provisions are for existing or new buildings. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-----------------------|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | <p>buildings, or whether these provisions are for new buildings, and alterations to existing buildings. If the latter clarity is required on the activity status of new buildings in both NH – R31 and NH – R32.</p> <p>Remove reference to Non-complying and Prohibited activity status for critical response facilities if not meeting requirements for discretionary activity requirements, as there are no discretionary activity requirements. The non-complying status also refers to the Flood overlays.</p> | <p>Change reference of Non-complying and Prohibited activity status to N/A, as there are no specifications for what would not meet the discretionary activity provisions and the Non-complying and Prohibited activity status refers to the Flood overlays.</p> |
| | NH – R33 | Support in part | <p>New provision NH – R33 required for the provision of alterations/additions/maintenance to existing unoccupied buildings within the Land Instability Overlay, and for new buildings that are not for sensitive activities in the Land Instability Overlay.</p> <p>Existing buildings for critical infrastructure require maintenance, and new buildings associated with critical infrastructure already located within the Earthquake Hazard Overlays will be required. Restricting this to a non-complying activity status places undue restrictions on the statutory body in charge of maintaining the infrastructure.</p> | <p>Insert new provision NH – R33 for the permitted activity of altering, adding or maintaining existing unoccupied buildings that aren't used for sensitive activities within the Land Instability Overlay, as well as for new buildings that are not for sensitive activities in the Land Instability Overlay (i.e. pump station).</p> |
| | NH – R35 | Support in part | <p>The definition of maintenance in the title only appears to refer to historic heritage and infrastructure not general buildings and structures.</p> <p>Change the wording of NH – R35 provision 1. to clarify it is the net floor area of buildings.</p> | <p>Amend the definition of maintenance in the title to refer to buildings and structures.</p> <p>Reword NH – R35 provision 1. to the following:</p> |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-----------------------|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | "1. There is no increase in the net floor area of any building used for sensitive activities." |
| | NH – R38 | Support in part | <p>There is no activity status if compliance with the specific standards is not achieved. Insert provision i.e. Restricted Discretionary where compliance not achieved.</p> <p>The definition of maintenance in the title only appears to refer to historic heritage and infrastructure not general buildings and structures.</p> <p>Provision 2. of the rule refers to an Act of God and natural disaster. Clarity is required on what an Act of God is vs. a natural disaster.</p> | <p>Insert activity status of Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary for activity status where compliance is not achieved.</p> <p>Amend the definition of maintenance in the title to refer to buildings and structures.</p> <p>Clarity on what an Act of God is vs. a natural disaster.</p> |
| | NH – R39 | Support in part | There is no activity status if compliance with the specific standards is not achieved. Insert provision i.e. Restricted Discretionary where compliance not achieved. | Insert activity status of Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary for activity status where compliance is not achieved. |
| | NH – R40 | Support in part | Reword provision to refer to buildings. | <p>Reword NH – R40 to the following:</p> <p>"1. There is no increase to the net floor area of any building used for any sensitive activity; and</p> <p>2. Where any increase in net floor area of any building meets a minimum finished floor level of 300mm above a 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) event."</p> |
| | NH – R41 | Support in part | Reword provision to refer to buildings. | <p>Reword NH – R41 to the following:</p> <p>"There is no increase in net floor area of any building used for a sensitive activity."</p> |
| | NH – R45 | Support in part | New provision NH – R45 required for the provision of alterations/additions/maintenance | Insert new provision NH – R45 for the permitted activity of altering, adding or |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|--|------------|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>to existing unoccupied buildings within the Coastal Setback Overlay, and for new buildings that are not for sensitive activities in the Coastal Setback Overlay.</p> <p>Existing buildings for critical infrastructure require maintenance, and new buildings associated with critical infrastructure already located within the Earthquake Hazard Overlays will be required. Restricting this to a non-complying activity status places undue restrictions on the statutory body in charge of maintaining the infrastructure.</p> | maintaining to existing buildings within the Coastal Setback Overlay, as well as for new buildings that are not for sensitive activities in the Coastal Setback Overlay. |
| TREE – Notable Trees | | | | |
| Notable Trees Objectives | TREE-O3 | Support in part | It is recommended that trimming or pruning of notable trees be appropriate to provide for safety benefits. | Amend the objective to provide for trimming and/or pruning of notable trees for safety benefits. |
| Notable Trees Policies | TREE-P4 | Support | <p>Council supports that trimming and pruning of notable trees are necessary to prevent serious threat to property and people and necessary for the ongoing provision of existing infrastructure.</p> <p>c.it is considered that this sentence requires the word ‘provision’ to be added after ongoing ...</p> | <p>Retain as proposed.</p> <p>Amend wording to read “Are necessary for the ongoing provision of infrastructure ...”</p> |
| | TREE-P6 | Support | This policy is supported as it allows for the removal, partial removal, or destruction of an unsafe or unsound notable when certified by a Council approved arborist. | Retain as proposed. |
| Notable Tree Rules | TREE-R2 | Support | Support the rule as it enables the safe operation of the existing infrastructure. | Retain as proposed. |
| | TREE-R3 | Support | Support the rule as it enables the safe operation of the existing infrastructure. | Retain as proposed. |
| SASM - Sites of Significance to Māori | | | | |
| Sites of Significance to Māori Policies | SASM – P13 | Support | Support without alteration as the policy provides for the maintenance, operation, repair | Retain as proposed. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|--|---------|---|--|---|
| | | | and upgrading of existing network utility structures and critical infrastructure; and small-scale earthworks for maintenance of roads and tracks | |
| Sites of significance to Māori Rules | SASM-R2 | Support in part | <p>This rule is generally supported as it provides for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - earthworks that are for the maintenance of roads/track within the footprint or modified ground compromised by the existing road/track <p>R2-2 requires that written approval is obtained from the relevant Poutini Ngai Tahu Runanga, this requirement is supported. It is suggested that the rule includes scope on timeframes for a response to the request for written approval to be supplied</p> <p>R3 – requires an ADP commitment with a form submitted to Council. Where is this form? Will any ADP be accepted or does it need a site specific form each time</p> | <p>Clarify what footprint refers to in relation to this rule, ie – within the boundaries of the road parcel</p> <p>Expand rule to include timeframe for response to request to be supplied.</p> <p>For consistency and clarity include an accepted ADP at Appendix Four that can be included in applications and decisions.</p> |
| | SASM-R9 | Support | Support this rule as its written | Retain as proposed |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | | | | |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Policies | | | | |
| | ECO-P2 | Support in part | The intent of this policy is supported as it allows activities within areas of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna where the activity has a functional need to be located in the area. It is recommended that the policy be amended to include where the activity has an operational need. | <p>Amend the policy</p> <p>The activity has an operational and functional need to be located in the area.</p> |
| Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Rules | ECO-R1 | Support | Support this rule as proposed as it provides for the maintenance, operation and repair of lawfully established tracks, structures, buildings, | Retain as proposed |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | critical infrastructure, network utilities and natural hazard mitigation activities. | |
| | ECO-R2 | Support | Supports this rule which provides for Indigenous vegetation clearance in the coastal environment as a permitted activity where the clearance is for walking/cycling tracks, roads and operation, maintenance, repair, upgrading and installation of new network utility infrastructure. | Retain as proposed |
| NFL – Natural Features and Landscapes | | | | |
| Natural Features and Landscape Policy | NFL-P1 | Support | Support as the policy provides for the operation, maintenance and upgrading of network infrastructure within areas of outstanding natural landscapes and outstanding natural features. The policy also provides for the upgrading or new infrastructure in these areas where it has a functional need. | Retain as proposed. |
| Natural Features and Landscape Rules | NFL-R1 | Support | Support as written as it allows for the maintenance, operation and repair of lawfully established buildings, structures, network utilities, roads, and critical infrastructure within areas of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features. | Retain as proposed. |
| | NFL-R3 | Support | Support as written as it provides for natural hazard mitigation to protect critical infrastructure | Retain as proposed. |
| | NFL-10 | Support in part | The intention of this rule is supported. Concern lies with the use of the word 'minimum' and how it is implemented and is quantifiable. | Amend the rule to replace 'minimum' with a quantifiable measure. |
| PA Public Access | | | | |
| General Comment | The inclusion of a chapter in the new plan on Public Access is supported. However, in its current form is it lacking in detail. In particular, this chapter should contain Objectives, policies, rule requirements, matter for control or discretion for the construction, design, approval for Unformed Legal roads. Guidance notes on the steps required to gain approval from Council to form (open) unformed legal road. | | | |
| | | | | |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|--|-------|---|---|--|
| | | | | |
| NC - Natural Character and the Margins of Waterbodies | | | | |
| Natural Character Objectives | NC-O1 | Support. | Support as written | Retain as proposed |
| | NC-O2 | Support | Support as written | Retain as proposed |
| | NC-O3 | Support in part | Use of “minimise” rather than “mitigate” changes the focus and possibly the intent of the policy which could result in more stringent and not as practical (cost/safety/risk) requirements (i.e., more difficult and costly for Council to provide emergency and core infrastructure services). | Re-word. |
| Natural Character Policies | NC-P1 | Support in part | Use of “minimise” rather than “mitigate” changes the focus and possibly the intent of the policy which could result in more stringent and not as practical (cost/safety/risk) requirements (i.e., more difficult and costly for Council to provide emergency and core infrastructure services). | Re-word. |
| | NC-P2 | Support in part | Use of “minimise” rather than “mitigate” changes the focus and possibly the intent of the policy which could result in more stringent and not as practical (cost/safety/risk) requirements (i.e., more difficult and costly for Council to provide emergency and core infrastructure services). | Re-word. |
| | NC-P3 | Support in part | Inconsistent use of “effect” vs “affect”. Many works <u>must</u> be in the riparian margin, no other option. | Amend accordingly throughout TTPP. “functional need” must include the lack of alternatives for many situations. |
| | NC-P4 | Support in part | Recognition that this may also include the requirement for activities/structures that are engineered, as per the corresponding other policies. | |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|--------------------------------|--------------|---|---|---|
| | NC-P5 | Support | Support as written | Retain as proposed |
| Natural Character Rules | Introduction | Oppose in part | <p>While the identification of potentially multiple relevant rules to an activity is important, the wording implies that all rules must be complied with rather than the most applicable rule.</p> <p>For this section, the restrictions in NC-R1 render the other PA rules unusable.</p> | Clarification on how this wording corresponds to standard best practice in the planning sector. |
| | NC-R1 | Oppose in part | <p>The overly restrictive requirements re condition 3, when there are other more applicable rules for the construction of structures in the riparian margin to protect the integrity of the road network, makes both of the following PA rules useless. An activity that should otherwise be permitted as a structure and /or flood mitigation will always be tripped up.</p> | <p>Consider more clarification on how specific rules will apply to specific activities and limit when the general standards apply.</p> <p>Concerns over the overlap between this chapter and the requirements of the WCRC. These are regional matters and are an unnecessary double up with resource consent requirements under the RLWP.</p> |
| | NC-R2 | Oppose in part | <p>The definition of “natural hazard mitigation structure” includes provision for the associated re-contouring of land and obviously you could not construct a structure without undertaking earthworks in the margin.</p> <p>The restrictions in NC-R1 render this rule unusable.</p> | <p>Amend this chapter accordingly.</p> <p>Concerns over the overlap between this chapter and the requirements of the WCRC. These are regional matters and are an unnecessary double up with resource consent requirements under the RLWP.</p> |
| | NC-R3 | Oppose in part | <p>The definition of “natural hazard mitigation structure” includes provision for the associated re-contouring of land and obviously you could not construct a structure without undertaking earthworks in the margin.</p> <p>The restrictions in NC-R1 render this rule useless.</p> | <p>Amend this chapter accordingly.</p> <p>Concerns over the overlap between this chapter and the requirements of the WCRC. These are regional matters and are an unnecessary double up with resource consent requirements under the RLWP.</p> |
| | NC-R4 | Support in part | Numbering needs to be fixed. | Numbering needs to be fixed. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|--|----------|---|---|--|
| | NC-R5 | Support in part | Numbering needs to be fixed. | Numbering needs to be fixed. |
| | NC-R6 | Support in part | Numbering needs to be fixed. | Numbering needs to be fixed. |
| FC - Financial Contributions | | | | |
| | FC – R1 | Oppose in part | Oppose R1 – 1 where the rule includes the requirement for a 'network utility operator and / or requiring authority to make a financial contribution for i. – iv. | Remove network utility operator and / or requiring authorities from the rule. |
| SUB - Subdivision | | | | |
| Subdivision Objectives and Policies | SUB – P7 | Support in part | This policy allows for subdivisions within residential zones that do not comply with the minimum lot design and parameters. It is noted at P7-C the policy requires any increase in density does not create an adverse effect on critical infrastructure. It is considered that the policy should also require evidence from a suitably qualified person that the infrastructure (roading, reticulated water, wastewater and stormwater) has capacity to accommodate the increased density. | Reword the policy to ensure developments are required to assess that there is capacity to accommodate the increased density. |
| | SUB – R1 | Support | Support as requires that no new Council services are required and that no new roading or access points are required | Retain as proposed |
| | SUB – R2 | Support | Support that any subdivision for a network utility or critical infrastructure is a permitted activity. | Retain as proposed |
| | SUB – R3 | Support | Support that the matters of control include the design and provision of access, provision and design and construction of infrastructure and services | Retain as proposed |
| | SUB – R4 | Support | Support that the matters of control include the size, design and layout of allotments for the purpose of public network utilities and access; and the legal and physical access to and from allotments. | Retain as proposed |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-----------------------|----------------------|---|---|---|
| | SUB – R5 | Support | Support the Rule as the matters of control include design and layout of allotments, design and provision of roads, pedestrian and cycleways, design and provision of access, and the provision of infrastructure and services for drinking water, wastewater and stormwater and the adequacy of water supply for firefighting; and the requirements arising from meeting the relevant district Council Engineering Standards or NZS 4404:2010 Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure where Council standards do not exist. | Retain as proposed |
| | SUB – R6 | Support | Support for reasons noted at SUB – R5 | Retain as proposed |
| | SUB – R7 | Support in part | Support that the matters of control include subdivision layout, access and design. However, the matters of control do not include the provision and design and construction of infrastructure and services for drinking water, wastewater and stormwater and the adequacy of water supply for firefighting. | Reword the rule to include infrastructure and services for drinking water, wastewater and stormwater and the adequacy of water supply for firefighting in the matters of control |
| | SUB – R8 | Support | Support for reasons noted at SUB – R5 | Retain as proposed |
| | SUB – R9 ECO - 06 | Support in part | Support that subdivision layout, access and design are included under Discretion is restricted to. However, the provision and design and construction of infrastructure and services for drinking water, wastewater and stormwater and the adequacy of water supply for firefighting has not been included as a matter of discretion. | Reword the rule to include infrastructure and services for drinking water, wastewater and stormwater and the adequacy of water supply for firefighting under discretion is restricted to. |
| | SUB – R10 | Support in part | Support the intent of the rule. However, the rule does not provide for accesses to be considered for the allotments under discretion is restricted to. | Reword the rule as follows: g. The provision of infrastructure and services for transport , drinking water, wastewater and stormwater, telecommunications and energy |
| | SUB – R11 | Support in part | Support the intent of the rule. However, the rule does not provide for accesses to be | Reword the rule as follows: |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|---|---|--|
| | | | considered for the allotments under discretion is restricted to. | c. The provision of infrastructure and services for transport , drinking water, wastewater and stormwater, telecommunications and energy |
| | SUB – R12 | Support in part | Support the intent of the rule. However, the rule does not provide for accesses to be considered for the allotments under discretion is restricted to. | Reword the rule as follows: d. The provision of infrastructure and services for transport , drinking water, wastewater and stormwater, telecommunications and energy |
| | SUB – S3 | Support | Support the provision of the standard for water supply for new allotments | Retain as proposed |
| | SUB – S4 | Support | Support the provision of the standard for management of stormwater for new allotments | Retain as proposed |
| | SUB – S5 | Support | Support the provision of the standard for management and disposal of wastewater for new allotments | Retain as proposed |
| | SUB – S6 | Support | Support the provision of the standard for transport and access requirements | Retain as proposed |
| CE – Coastal Environment | | | | |
| Coastal Environment Objective | CE – O3 | Support in part | Use of “minimise” rather than “mitigate” changes the focus and possibly the intent of the objective which could result in more stringent and not as practical (cost/safety/risk) requirements (i.e., more difficult and costly for Council to provide emergency and core infrastructure services). | Reword objective to provide clarity on the focus and intent of the provision. |
| Coastal Environment Policies | CE - P1 | Support | Provided the mapped features detailed in this policy in the Coastal Environment Overlay are accurately located this policy is supported. | N/A |
| | CE - P3 | Oppose in part | Objective NENV – O3 recognises the need for infrastructure to sometimes be located in significant areas, however this policy does not recognise this. New provision f is requested to be inserted to recognise the need for regionally significant infrastructure to sometimes be located within these locations. | Reword CE – P3 to give effect to NENV – O3 and provide for the instances that regionally significant infrastructure needs to be located within these areas. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-----------------------|--------------|---|--|--|
| | CE – P6 | Support in part | Use of “minimise” rather than “mitigate” changes the focus and possibly the intent of the policy which could result in more stringent and not as practical (cost/safety/risk) requirements (i.e., more difficult and costly for Council to provide emergency and core infrastructure services). | Reword policy to provide clarity on the focus and intent of the provision. |
| | CE - P7 | Support in part | Use of “minimise” rather than “mitigate” changes the focus and possibly the intent of the policy which could result in more stringent and not as practical (cost/safety/risk) requirements (i.e., more difficult and costly for Council to provide emergency and core infrastructure services). | Reword policy to provide clarity on the focus and intent of the provision. |
| | CE - P8 | Support in part | Request the addition of regionally significant infrastructure into this provision. | Reword this policy to provide for the maintenance repair and operation of regionally significant infrastructure that is existing. |
| | Introduction | Oppose in part | While the identification of potentially multiple relevant rules to an activity is important, the wording implies that all rules must be complied with rather than the most applicable rule. For this section, the restrictions in NC-R1 render the other PA rules unusable. | Clarification on how this wording corresponds to standard best practice in the planning sector. |
| | CE - R1 | Support in part | Clarity is requested for the listed activities of this provision that are not within an area of High Coastal Natural Character or the Outstanding Coastal Environment. Provision is only provided for where the maintenance or repair are within those overlays, and it is not clear as to what the activity status is for those listed activities outside of these areas. | Reword this provision or add additional provisions to CE – R1 to clarify the activity status outside of the two areas referred to. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-----------------------|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | Insert activity status i.e. Restricted Discretionary where these specific provisions are not achieved. | Insert activity status where compliance not achieved. |
| | CE - R4 | Support in part | Clarity is requested on the definition of a Statutory Agency referred to by this provision. GDC request to be considered as a statutory agency as the provision to construct natural hazard mitigation structures would support the maintenance of the roading network. | Reword this provision to clarify the definition of statutory agency, and ensure that the roading network is provided to be protected. |
| | CE - R6 | Support in part | Clarity is requested on the definition of a Statutory Agency referred to by this provision. GDC request to be considered as a statutory agency as the provision to repair existing natural hazard mitigation structures would support the maintenance of the roading network. | Reword this provision to clarify the definition of statutory agency, and ensure that the roading network is provided to be protected. |
| | CE - R9 | Support in part | Clarity is requested on the definition of a Statutory Agency referred to by this provision. GDC request to be considered as a statutory agency as the provision to repair existing natural hazard mitigation structures would support the maintenance of the roading network. | Reword this provision to clarify the definition of statutory agency, and ensure that the roading network is provided to be protected. |
| | CE - R10 | Support | The definition of maintenance in the provision only appears to refer to historic heritage and infrastructure not the maintenance of walking/cycling tracks etc that the provision is providing for. | Amend the definition of maintenance in the title to refer to the activity being provided for. |
| | CE - R12 | Support in part | The title of this provision implies that this rule is for natural hazard mitigation and earthworks that are not provided for as a permitted activity, however these activities in this overlay are provided for as a permitted activity with the activity status of non-compliance being restricted discretionary. | Reword the title to the following: "Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures and Earthworks in the Coastal Environment in High Coastal Natural Character Overlay Area identified in Schedule Seven and the Outstanding Coastal Environment not meeting |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|--|-----------|---|--|---|
| | | | Advice Note 1 states that the rules in the Earthworks chapter do not apply to Controlled Activities under Rule CE – R11. This should be changed to Rule CE – R12 as R11 is a permitted activity provision. | permitted activity standards provided for as a Permitted Activity Amend Advice Note 1 to refer to correct rule. |
| | CE - R13 | Support in part | Insert activity status i.e. Discretionary where these specific provisions are not achieved. | Insert activity status where compliance not achieved. |
| | CE - R14 | Support in part | Insert activity status i.e. Discretionary where these specific provisions are not achieved. | Insert activity status where compliance not achieved. |
| | CE - R15 | Support in part | Insert activity status i.e. Discretionary where these specific provisions are not achieved. | Insert activity status where compliance not achieved. |
| | CE - R18 | Support in part | The title of this provision implies that this rule is for earthworks that are not provided for as a permitted activity, however earthworks in this overlay are provided for as a permitted activity with the activity status of non-compliance being restricted discretionary. | Reword the title to the following: “Earthworks within the Outstanding Coastal Environment Area not meeting permitted activity standards provided for as a Permitted Activity ” |
| | CE - R19 | Oppose in part | The title of this provision refers to Rule CE – R11, however rule CE – R11 refers to earthworks and non-compliance with rule CE – R11 is stated as being a Restricted Discretionary activity. | Reword the title to refer to the correct provision and not CE – R11. |
| | | | | |
| Natural Environment Strategic Objectives (as referred to in CE chapter) | NENV – O1 | Support in part | Reword provision to refer to which specifications of Poutini Ngāi Tahu's cultural and spiritual values. | Reword i.e.: “To recognise and protect the natural character, landscapes and features, ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity that contribute to the West Coast's character and identity and recognise Poutini Ngāi Tahu's cultural and spiritual values.” |
| | NENV – O3 | Support | Support recognised need for infrastructure to sometimes be in significant areas. | |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-------------------------|------------|---|--|---|
| EW - Earthworks | | | | |
| | EW-R1 | Support in part | Standards appear to be best practice however, as with NC rules below, the restriction in the general rule condition 1 may render the PA rule EW-R2 for maintenance associated with local road networks unusable. | As per below, clarification around application of the rules to typical Council infrastructure activities is needed. Amend R1.1 to include “ d. These are earthworks including stockpiles required for network utility or critical infrastructure maintenance, operation, repair, upgrade, or installation of new network utilities including public roads. |
| | EW-R2 | Support in part | Standards are best practice however, as with NC rules below, the restriction in the general rule condition 1 may render the PA rule EW-R2 for maintenance associated with local road networks unusable. | As per below, clarification around application of the rules to typical Council infrastructure activities is needed. |
| LIGHT – Light | | | | |
| Light Objectives | LIGHT – O1 | Support | Support as the objective as it enables artificial outdoor lighting for transportation safety. | Retain as proposed. |
| Light Policies | LIGHT – P1 | Support | Support as the policy enables artificial outdoor lighting for transportation and safety. | Retain as proposed. |
| | LIGHT – R1 | Support | Support as the rule requires lighting to be directed away from state highways, arterial or principal roads, oncoming traffic. | Retain as proposed. |
| | LIGHT – R5 | Support | Support as the rule provides for the consideration of the effects on the transport networks as a matter of discretion. | Retain as proposed |
| NOISE - Noise | | | | |
| Noise Objectives | NOISE – O2 | Support | Support the objective as it provides for the function and operation of existing and permitted future noise generating activities and | Retain as proposed. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|------------------------|------------|---|--|--------------------------|
| | | | community infrastructure are not compromised by adverse effects including reverse sensitivity effects from noise sensitive activities. | |
| Noise Policies | NOISE – P1 | Support | Support the policy as it recognises and provides for critical infrastructure as a noise generating activity. | Retain as proposed. |
| | NOISE – P3 | Support | Support the policy as it identifies airports as a noise generating activity that requires noise mitigation measures to be implemented for sensitive activities. | Retain as proposed. |
| | NOISE - R1 | Support | Relevant standards referred to. | |
| | NOISE – R2 | Support | Support this rule as it provides for noise generated from the construction of roads as a PA. | Retain as proposed |
| SIGN - Sign | | | | |
| Sign Objectives | SIGN – O1 | Support | Support as the objective provides for signs that contribute to infrastructure and community activities. | Retain as proposed. |
| Sign Policies | SIGN – P1 | Support | Support the policy as it provides for signs while maintaining public safety and access needs. | Retain as proposed. |
| | SIGN – P3 | Support | Support the policy as it ensures the signs do not adversely affect traffic safety or obstruct roads or footpaths. | Retain as proposed |
| | SIGN-R1 | Support in part | Advice note does not include requirements for approvals from Council for local roads. Again, use of language is not consistent, i.e. “transport corridor” rather than “road reserve” references to rail, etc. | Clarity and consistency. |
| | SIGN-R2 | Support in part | Clarification between ‘formed’ and ‘unformed’ legal roads. Not defined. Does formed refer to sealed and unformed legal roads refer to a ‘paper road’? | Clarity and consistency. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|---|------------|---|---|---|
| | | | Why no requirement for compliance with the general standards? | |
| | SIGN – R13 | Support in part | Support the intent of the rule, however the rule permits a sign on an adjoining site. Signs on adjoining site has the potential to cause traffic implications where motorists have passed the site the sign is referring to. | Remove the wording ‘adjoining site from R13 - 1 |
| | SIGN – R15 | Support in part | Support the intent of the rule, however the rule permits a sign on an adjoining site. Signs on adjoining site has the potential to cause traffic implications where motorists have passed the site the sign is referring to. | Remove the wording ‘adjoining site from R13 - 1 |
| | SIGN – R19 | Support in part | The intent of the rule is support. Recommend that the matters of discretion include content of the sign. Advice note does not include requirements for approvals from Council for local roads. | Reword to include ‘content of sign at R19-c Clarity and consistency. |
| Part 3 – Area Specific Matters | | | | |
| OSRZ – Open Space and Recreation Zone Objectives | | | | |
| | OSRZ – P9 | Support | Support this policy and it provides for the ongoing operation and appropriate management of cemeteries, gravel and shingle extraction for roading networks and other local purposes, quarries for rock and water supplies and drainage networks where they support local community needs. | Retain as proposed. |
| Open Space Zone | OSRZ – P11 | Support in part | Support the policy as it provides for cemeteries and limited associated facilities and structures | Clarity on what is meant by ‘limited’. |
| NOSZ – Natural Open Space Zone Rules | | | | |
| | NOSZ – R1 | Oppose in part | This rule is headed Park Facilities and Park Furniture, the rule is supported in relation to park facilities and park furniture. However, NOSZ-R1, R2, R3 and R5 then refer to NOSZ – R1 performance standards to be complied with. | Reword to provide clarity. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|---|-----------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | | | These subsequent rules do not relate to park facilities and park furniture. | |
| | NOSZ – R8 | Support | Support the rule as it provides matter of discretion which consider compliance with transport standards, vehicle access and parking design and location and stormwater management and treatment. | Retain as proposed. |
| OSZ - Open Space Zone Rules | | | | |
| | OSZ – R1 | Oppose in part | Refer to comment at NOSZ – R1. | Reword to provide clarity. |
| | OSZ – R10 | Oppose in part | OSZ – R10 – 1 is supported, however reference to OSZ – R1 at OSZ-R10 – 2 is confusing as OSZ – R1 is headed Park facilities and Park Furniture. | Reword to provide clarity. |
| SARZ – Sport and Active Recreation Zone Rules | | | | |
| | SARZ – R1 | Oppose in part | Refer to comment at NOSZ – R1. | Reword to provide clarity |
| | SARZ – R3 | Oppose in part | Refer to comment at NOSZ – R1 | Reword to provide clarity |
| CMUZ – Commercial and Mixed Use Zones Policies | | | | |
| | CUMZ – P2 | Support | Support the policy as it provides for activities while ensuring convenient and safe access. | Retain as proposed. |
| | CUMZ – P5 | Support | Support the policy as it provides for new commercial and mixed use developments have sufficient capacity and suitable connection to wastewater, water supply, stormwater and safe and efficient transport networks. | Retain as proposed. |
| | CUMZ – P8 | Support | Support this policy that requires where new CUMZ are developed, infrastructure should be funded and installed to the standards required by Councils and the Plan. Significant infrastructure serving multiple properties should be vested to Council for ongoing maintenance and renewal. | Retain as proposed. |
| | CUMZ – P9 | Support in part | Support the intent of the policy, however, it refers to modes of transport. Parking is not considered a mode of transport? | Remove parking for clarity. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-------------------------------------|------------|---|---|---------------------|
| | CUMZ – P10 | Support | Support the policy which provides encouragement for low impact stormwater designs. | Retain as proposed. |
| | CUMZ – P11 | Support | Support the policy that ensures that developments are serviced with all required infrastructure in an effective and efficient manner. Requires new infrastructure such as roads and three waters which services multiple properties to be vested to Council rather than be retained as private. | Retain as proposed. |
| | CUMZ – P12 | Support | Support the policy as it provides for avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects on strategic infrastructure. | Retain as proposed. |
| | CUMZ – P13 | Support | Support the policy as it provides for safe urban design including pedestrian and vehicle safety. | Retain as proposed. |
| | CUMZ – P15 | Support | Support the policy as it provides for low speed vehicle movements, high quality pedestrian environment, consolidated on-street parking, efficient wastewater, water supply and stormwater infrastructure that maximises the use of existing services, allows for a range of transport options. | Retain as proposed. |
| COMZ - Commercial Zone Rules | COMZ – R4 | Support | Support the rule which requires relocated buildings to be connected to all infrastructure services. | Retain as proposed. |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone Rules | MUZ – R3 | Support | Support the rule that requires provision for carparking and vehicle service access is at the side or rear of the building. Support the advice note that requires the rule to comply with the standards outlined in the Transport Chapter. | Retain as proposed. |
| | MUZ – R8 | Support | Support the rule which requires relocated buildings to be connected to all infrastructure services. | Retain as proposed. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|--|-----------|---|--|---|
| NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone | NCZ – R4 | Support | Support the rule which requires relocated buildings to be connected to all infrastructure services. | Retain as proposed. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ – R6 | Support | support the intent of the rule that provides provisions for carparking and vehicle service access. | Retain as proposed. |
| Industrial Zone – Objectives and Policies | | | | |
| | INZ – O2 | Support | Support the objective as written which ensures that the development maximised the efficient use of existing infrastructure and requires the development of new infrastructure where it does not exist to the standards required by Council and the plan. | Retain as proposed. |
| | INZ – P1 | Support | Support the policy which recognises the substantial investment in infrastructure by ensuring that new industrial areas are located where they support the efficient use of infrastructure. | Retain as proposed. |
| | INZ – P3 | Support | Support the policy which requires developers to fund and install infrastructure to the standards required by Council and the plan. | Retain as proposed. |
| | INZ – P11 | Support | Support the policy which requires the careful onsite management and treatment of stormwater. | Retain as proposed. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ – R1 | Support in part | <p>Generally support this rule which requires external storage and carparking areas to be screened by a fence or landscaping that does not restrict visibility. Support the requirement for contaminated stormwater run-off management.</p> <p>Confirmation of the suitability of the Auckland design guide for stormwater in relation to local environment conditions and site constraints.</p> | Ensure that these standards do not put unrealistic or unsuitable requirements in place. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|---|------------|---|--|---|
| | GIZ – R9 | Support | Support this rule as it provides or parking and access and landscape treatments. | Retain as proposed. |
| LIZ - Light Industrial Zone | LIZ – R1 | Support in part | Refer to comment at GIZ – R1 | Ensure that these standards do not put unrealistic or unsuitable requirements in place. |
| RESZ – Residential Zones Objectives and Policies | | | | |
| | RESZ – O1 | Support | Support the objective which enables individual residential lifestyle options while ensuring developments are serviced with all required infrastructure. | Retain as proposed. |
| | RESZ – P2 | Support | Support the policy which provides for safe, efficient and easily accessible movement for pedestrians, cyclist and vehicles. | Retain as proposed. |
| | RESZ – P4 | Support | Support the policy which provides for non-residential activities to establish provided they do not have a significant adverse effect related to scale, car parking and vehicle movements. | Retain as proposed. |
| | RESZ – P10 | Support in part | Support the policy which ensures that developments are serviced with all required infrastructure in an effective and efficient manner. This policy requires new infrastructure such as roads and three waters where it serves multiple households for the infrastructure should be vested in the appropriate public agency. Prior policies required the infrastructure to be vested to Council. | Consistency. Check and reword policy to align with earlier policies. |
| | RESZ – P16 | Support | Support the policy as it recognises that reverse sensitivity effects should be avoided from residential development adjacent to strategic infrastructure. | Retain as proposed. |
| GRZ – General Residential Zone | | | | |
| | GRZ – R1 | Support in part | The rule is generally support in particular R1-8 which requires all units and buildings used for a residential activity to be connected to the | Amend the rule to require stormwater to be managed in accordance with NZS4404:2010. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|--|-----------|---|--|--|
| | | | community water supply, wastewater networks and stormwater from the site used for the activity must not drain to public roads. However, it is not supported that secondary flows are permitted to be drained to the public road. | |
| | GRZ – R5 | Support | Support the maximum number of vehicle movements contained in R5-4. | Retain as proposed. |
| | GRZ – R8 | Support | Support the maximum number of vehicle movements contained in R8-2. | Retain as proposed. |
| | GRZ – R13 | Support | Support the matters of discretion in relation to design and location of parking areas. | Retain as proposed. |
| | GRZ – R14 | Support | Support this rule in particular that no heavy vehicles movements are generated. In relation to matters of discretion support the design and location of parking and access at R14-b. | Retain as proposed. |
| | GRZ- R15 | Support | Support the matters of discretion in relation to design and location of parking and access, and water supply, wastewater and stormwater management. | Retain as proposed. |
| | GRZ – R16 | Support | Support the matter of discretion for the development of medium density housing in particular the provision of infrastructure to service the development, design and location of parking and access. | Retain as proposed. |
| | GRZ – R17 | Support | Support the matter of discretion for the Papakainga Developments in particular the provision of infrastructure to service the development, design and location of parking and access | Retain as proposed. |
| LLRZ – Large Lot Residential Zone | | | | |
| | LLRZ – R1 | Support in part | Support the rule as it requires all residential activity to be connected to the community water supply and wastewater networks with appropriate stormwater management on site. | Remove reference to 'except secondary flow purposes. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|--|------------|---|---|--|
| | | | However, it is not supported that secondary flows are permitted to be drained to the public road. | |
| | LLRZ – R4 | Support | Support that reinstatement work includes connections to all infrastructure services. | Retain as proposed. |
| | LLRZ – R12 | Support | Support the matter of discretion in relation to design and location of parking and access, water supply, wastewater and stormwater requirements. | Retain as proposed. |
| | LLRZ – R13 | Support | Support that no heavy vehicle movements are generated under this rule. Support the matters of discretion in particular the design and location of parking and access, water supply wastewater and stormwater requirements. | Retain as proposed. |
| | LLRZ – R14 | Support | Support the matter of discretion in relation to design and location of parking and access, water supply, wastewater and stormwater requirements. | Retain as proposed. |
| MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone | | | | |
| | MRZ – R1 | Support in part | Support that no heavy vehicle movements are generated under this rule and that all residential units and buildings used for a residential activity must be connected to the community water supply and wastewater networks and stormwater from site must not drain to any public road, however, it is not supported that secondary flows are excluded. Support the matters of discretion in particular the design and location of parking and access, water supply wastewater and stormwater requirements. | Remove reference to 'except secondary flow purposes. |
| | MRZ – R4 | Support | Support that reinstatement work includes connections to all infrastructure services. | Retain as proposed. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|---|------------|---|--|--|
| | MRZ – 10 | Support | Support the matters of control in relation to connection to water supply, wastewater and stormwater | Retain as proposed |
| | MRZ – R11 | Support | Support the matters of control in relation to provisions of infrastructure to service the development, design and location of parking and access. | Retain as proposed. |
| | MRZ – R12 | Support in part | Support the matters of discretion in relation to design and location of parking and access. It is however considered that the provisions of infrastructure to service the development be added to this rule | Reword to include provisions of infrastructure to service the development. |
| | MRZ – R13 | Support | Support the matters of discretion in relation to design and location of parking and access and the provision of infrastructure to service the development. | Retain as proposed. |
| | MRZ – R14 | Support in part | Support the matters of discretion in relation to design and location of parking and access. It is however considered that the provisions of infrastructure to service the development be added to this rule. | Reword to include provisions of infrastructure to service the development. |
| RURZ - Rural Zone Objectives and Policies | | | | |
| Rural Objectives | RURZ – O4 | Support | Support the objective that supports the expansion of existing settlements and necessary infrastructure while reducing the risk associated with natural hazards. | Retain as proposed. |
| | RURZ – O6 | Support | Support the objective as it ensures that appropriate levels of infrastructure servicing for rural areas, on site infrastructure servicing is expected in these areas. | Retain as proposed. |
| Rural Policies (Infrastructure in Rural Areas) | RURZ – P11 | Support | Support the policy that recognises that subdivision and development in GRUZ, RLS, SETZ – PREC3 and SETZ – PREC4 should recognise the character and form of rural infrastructure. | Retain as proposed. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|--|------------|---|---|---------------------|
| | RURZ – P12 | Support | Support the policy that ensures sufficient wastewater , water supply, refuse disposal, roading, footpath, parking infrastructure servicing is provided as part of a new development. | Retain as proposed. |
| | RURZ – P13 | Support | Support the policy where community scale infrastructure is developed to support more than 10 privately owned lots this should be to appropriate standards and vested in the Council to ensure ongoing maintenance and renewal. | Retain as proposed. |
| | RURZ – P14 | Support | Support that new infrastructure should be put in place at the time of development at the expense of the developer. | Retain as proposed. |
| Reverse sensitivity | RURZ – P16 | Support | Support the policy that provides there should be sufficient buffers from infrastructure such as wastewater treatment plants and land disposal area, water supply catchments to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on the infrastructure. | Retain as proposed. |
| GRUZ – General Rural Zone Rules | | | | |
| | GRUZ – R1 | Support | Support the rule as it requires a 10m setback from the road boundary which ensures protection from matters such as visibility, noise and vibration from heavy vehicles on the roading network | Retain as proposed. |
| | GRUZ – R4 | Support | Support the rule that requires an onsite wastewater, water supply and stormwater system are developed to serve the entire papakainga | Retain as proposed. |
| | GRUZ – R7 | Support | Support the rule that requires the reinstatement work of the relocated building includes connections to all infrastructure services. | Retain as proposed. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-----------------------|------------|---|---|---|
| | GRUZ – R9 | Support | The rule for a home business in the GRUZ is supported. The rule provides maximum vehicle numbers which with the provision of a suitable access are acceptable. | Retain as proposed. |
| | GRUZ – R15 | Support | Support the matters of control under this rule in relation to methods of wastewater and stormwater treatment and disposal, methods of ensuring safe drinking water supply, parking and access. | Retain as proposed. |
| | GRUZ – 17 | Support in part | Support the matters of control in relation to methods of wastewater and stormwater treatment and disposal, methods of ensuring safe drinking water supply. However, recommend adding parking and access. | Reword to include parking and access as a matter of control. Consistency. |
| | GRUZ – R18 | Support | Support the matters of control for mineral extraction, prospecting and exploration in relation to the management of access, parking, traffic generation and transport of miners from the site, design and location of ancillary buildings, structures and infrastructure. | Retain as proposed. |
| | GRUZ – 19 | Support | Support the matters of control in relation to management of access, traffic and parking, method of effluent management and disposal, methods of wastewater and stormwater treatment and disposal. | Retain as proposed. |
| | GRUZ – 20 | Support | Support the matters of control in relation to management of access, traffic and parking, method of effluent management and disposal, methods of wastewater and stormwater treatment and disposal. | Retain as proposed. |
| | GRUZ – 21 | Support | Support the matters of control in relation to management of access, traffic and parking, method of effluent management and disposal, methods of wastewater and stormwater | Retain as proposed. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-----------------------------------|------------|---|---|--|
| | | | treatment and disposal, methods of water supply | |
| | GRUZ – 22 | Support | Support the matters of control in relation to traffic and parking, methods of wastewater and treatment and disposal. | Retain as proposed |
| | GRUZ – 23 | Support in part | Support the intent of the rule and matters of discretion in relation to requirements for wastewater, water supply or stormwater servicing. Recommend adding management of access and parking, traffic generation. | Reword to include management of access and parking and traffic generation as a matter of discretion. |
| | GRUZ – 24 | Support | Support the matters of discretion for non-rural activities in relation to management of access, traffic and parking, methods of water supply, wastewater and stormwater treatment and disposal. | Retain as proposed. |
| | GRUZ – R25 | Support | Refer to GRUZ – R18 | Retain as proposed. |
| RLZ – Rural Lifestyle Zone | | | | |
| | RLZ – R1 | Support | Support the 10 setback from road boundary for activities under this rule. | Retain as proposed. |
| | RLZ -R4 | Support | Support the requirement in this rule for onsite wastewater, water supply and stormwater systems to be developed to serve the entire papakainga. | Retain as proposed. |
| | RLZ – R7 | Support | Support the requirement the reinstatement work includes the connections to all infrastructure services. | Retain as proposed. |
| | RLZ – R 14 | Support | Support the matters of discretion in relation to management of traffic and parking, methods of wastewater treatment and disposal | Retain as proposed. |
| | RLZ – R15 | Support | Support the matters of discretion in relation to management of access, parking, traffic generation and transport of minerals from the | Retain as proposed. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|------------------------|------------|---|---|---------------------|
| | | | site, design and location of ancillary buildings and structures and infrastructure. | |
| SETZ – Settlement Zone | SETZ – R1 | Support | Support that all residential units where serviced by a network utility operator for wastewater, water supply or stormwater all residential units and buildings must be connected to the community wastewater, water supply and stormwater infrastructure; and where the settlement is not serviced on site collection, treatment and disposal must be undertaken in accordance with NZS4404:2010 or the relevant Council Engineering Technical standards. | Retain as proposed. |
| | SETZ – R2 | Support | Support the setback from road boundary; support that no building or structure or tree shall protrude into the Airport approach path of any airport or aerodrome described in appendix 9. | Retain as proposed. |
| | SETZ – R4 | Support | Support that the rule requires onsite wastewater, water supply and stormwater systems to be developed to serve the entire papakainga. | Retain as proposed. |
| | SETZ – R8 | Support | Support the requirement for reinstatement work to include connections to all infrastructure. | Retain as proposed. |
| | SETZ – R13 | Support | Support the rule as it provides appropriate consideration of vehicle crossing and access standards in appendix one. | Retain as proposed. |
| | SETZ – R14 | Support | Support the rule as it provides appropriate consideration of vehicle crossing and access standards in appendix one. | Retain as proposed. |
| | SETZ – R19 | Support | Support the matters of discretion in relation to design and location of parking and access. | Retain as proposed. |
| | SETZ – R20 | Support | Support the matters of discretion in relation to designs, size and location of parking and access. | Retain as proposed. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-----------------------------|------------|---|---|---------------------|
| | | | Support that performance standards of SETZ R1 and RS are complied with. | |
| | SETZ – R21 | Support | Support the matters of discretion in relation to deigns, size and location of parking and access, methods of wastewater treatment and disposal. Support that performance standards of SETZ R1 and RS are complied with. | Retain as proposed. |
| | SETZ – R21 | Support in part | Number needs fixed. (community facilities, education facilities etc) Support matter of discretion in relation to vehicle movements and access, design and location of parking and access, methods of water supply, wastewater and stormwater treatment and disposal. | Fix numbering. |
| | SETZ – R22 | Support in part | Number needs fixed (Rural Industry) Support matters of discretion in relation to design and location of parking and access, methods of water supply, wastewater and stormwater treatment and disposal. | Fix numbering. |
| | SETZ – 23 | Support in part | Number needs fixing (Mineral....) Support matters of discretion in relation to management of access, parking, traffic generation and transport of minerals from the site, design and location of ancillary buildings, structures and infrastructure. | Fix numbering. |
| AIRPZ – Airport Zone | | | | |
| Airport Objectives | AIRPZ – O1 | Support | Support the objective that supports the continued operation of the Greymouth Aerodrome as critical infrastructure recognising the contribution they make to the economic and social wellbeing and health of communities of the West Coast. | Retain as proposed |
| | AIRPZ – O3 | Support | Support the objective the manages the potential reverse sensitivity effects on the airports and Heliports in the AIRPZ by providing | Retain as proposed. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-------------------------|------------|---|---|---------------------|
| | | | noise contours and requirements for mitigation of these effects during subdivision and development. | |
| | AIRPZ – O4 | Support | Support the objective which ensures that the airport and related activities within the AIRPZ maintain an acceptable level of noise amenity that recognises the inherent airport / heliport function, alongside the need for general amenity. | Retain as proposed. |
| Airport Policies | AIRPZ – P1 | Support | Support the policy which enables the efficient operation, use and development of the West Coast public airports and heliports by providing for aviation activities and associated infrastructure necessary for them to operate in a safe and efficient manner. | Retain as proposed. |
| | AIRPZ – P2 | Support | Support the policy that ensures that aircraft take off and landing and safe airport and heliport function is not affected by the intrusion of vegetation into approach paths within the Airport Approach Path Overlay. | Retain as proposed. |
| | AIRPZ – P3 | Support | Support the policy that manages adverse effects on amenity values arising from the on-going development, use and maintenance of the airports and helipads in the AIRPZ. | Retain as proposed. |
| | AIRPZ – P4 | Support in part | Support the policy in relation to noise associated with the operation of the airports and heliports being within the nationally accepted standards. However, It is not clear whether this policy relates to new airport infrastructure or new noise sensitive activities adjacent to airports and heliports within the AIRPZ. | Clarify |
| | AIRPZ – P5 | Support | Support that noise sensitive activities close to the airports and heliports in the AIRPZ that have | Retain as proposed. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|---------------------------|-------------|---|--|---|
| | | | the potential to result in reverse sensitivity are to be avoided. | |
| | AIRPZ – P8 | Support | Support the policy that provides for future additions of airports and heliports to the AIRPZ where these are significant public infrastructure or public benefit | Retain as proposed. |
| | AIRPZ – P10 | Support | Support the policy that provide for the management of risks of natural hazards to the airports and helipads within the AIRPZ | Retain as proposed. |
| | AIRPZ – P11 | Support | Support the policy the minimises the development or location of large areas of open water or land disturbance which could as a significant bird attractant near airports and heliports in the AIRPZ | Retain as proposed. |
| | | | | |
| Airport Zone Rules | AIRPZ – R1 | Support | Support the rule as written. | Retain as proposed. |
| | AIRPZ – R3 | Support | Support the rule that provides for Emergency service facilities as PA. | Retain as proposed. |
| | AIRPZ – R4 | Support | Support this PA rule which provides for network utility buildings and structures within the AIRPZ while ensuring that they do not protrude into the Airport approach path. | Retain as proposed. |
| | AIRPZ – R6 | Support in part | Support this rule that provides for Industrial activities at the Greymouth Aerodrome while providing matters of discretion to manage access, traffic and parking and any impacts on the efficiency or function of the main Airport Activity. However, the matters of discretion do not include provisions for the connection, management, design of wastewater, water supply and stormwater. | Amend matters of discretion to include wastewater, water supply and stormwater management, design compliance with NZS4404:2010. |
| | AIRPZ – R7 | Support in part | As AIRPZ – R6 | Amend matters of discretion to include wastewater, water supply and stormwater |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|---------------------------------------|------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | management, design compliance with NZS4404:2010. |
| | AIRPZ – R8 | Support in part | As AIRPZ – R6 | Amend matters of discretion to include wastewater, water supply and stormwater management, design compliance with NZS4404:2010. |
| | AIRPZ – R9 | Support in part | As AIRPZ – R6 | Amend matters of discretion to include wastewater, water supply and stormwater management, design compliance with NZS4404:2010. |
| HOSZ - Hospital Zone | | | | |
| | HOSZ – R6 | support | Support that the rule includes the requirement for relocated dwellings reinstatement work to include connections to all infrastructure services within 12 months of the building being delivered to site. | Retain as proposed. |
| | HOSZ – R7 | Support in part | Support the intent of the rule, however, matters of discretion do not provide for the design and location of access nor the connection, management, design of wastewater, water supply and stormwater. | Amend matters of discretion to include wastewater, water supply and stormwater management, design compliance with NZS4404:2010 and design and location of accesses |
| MINZ - Mineral Extraction Zone | | | | |
| Mineral Extraction Policy | MINZ – P4 | Support | Support the policy as it manages traffic generation, load type and vehicle characteristics on the operation and maintenance of the transport network, ensure well located appropriately formed vehicle entrances, parking, loading and manoeuvring areas. | Retain as proposed. |
| | MINZ – R6 | Support | Support the rule in relation to the matters of control for the management of access, parking, traffic generation and transport of minerals from the site, design and location of ancillary buildings, structures and infrastructure. | Retain as proposed. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|---------------------------------|-----------|---|--|---|
| | MINZ – R7 | Support | Support the rule in relation to the matters of control for the management of access, parking, traffic generation and transport of minerals from the site, design and location of ancillary buildings, structures and infrastructure. | Retain as proposed. |
| MPZ – Maori Purpose Zone | | | | |
| | MPZ – R1 | Support in part | Support this PA in relation to the management of wastewater, water supply and stormwater systems. Recommend that R1 – 5 include that all units shall connect to the reticulated services, R1 – 6 include that Wastewater, stormwater and water supply to be designed and constructed in compliance with NZS4404:2010 | Amend wording of R5 and R6 to require connection to reticulated services in areas fully serviced, and in areas not serviced systems to be designed and constructed in compliance with NZS4404:2010. |
| | MPZ – R4 | | Support if MPZ – R1 is amended as provided above | |
| | MPZ – R7 | Support | Support that the rule includes the requirement for relocated dwellings reinstatement work to include connections to all infrastructure services within 12 months of the building being delivered to site. | Retain as proposed. |
| | MPZ – R11 | Support in part | Support the matters of discretion include methods of water supply, wastewater and stormwater, however, matters of discretion do not provide for the design and location of access | Amend the matters of discretion to include provisions for the design and location of an access. |
| | MPZ – R14 | Support | Support the matters of discretion in relation to management of traffic and parking, methods of water supply and effluent and stormwater treatment and disposal. | Retain as proposed. |
| | MPZ – R15 | Support | Support the matters of discretion in relation to management of traffic and parking, methods of water supply and effluent and stormwater treatment and disposal. | Retain as proposed. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|--------------------------|------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| | MPZ – R17 | Support | Support the matters of discretion in relation to management of traffic and parking, methods of water supply and effluent and stormwater treatment and disposal. | Retain as proposed. |
| | MPZ – R18 | Support | Support the matters of discretion in relation to management of traffic and parking, methods of water supply and effluent and stormwater treatment and disposal. | Retain as proposed. |
| PORTZ – Port Zone | | | | |
| Port objectives | PORTZ – O1 | Support | Support this objective that recognises the management of the West Coast ports to sustain their current and future potential use and development | Retain as proposed. |
| Port Policies | PORTZ – P1 | Support | Support this policy that enables the efficient operation, use and development while ensuring incompatible activities or developments do not adversely affect the efficient and safe operation of marine and port activities. | Retain as proposed. |
| | PORTZ – P3 | Support | Support this policy that provides for the maintenance and development activities that increase the ports resilience to natural hazards | Retain as proposed. |
| | PORTZ – P6 | Support | Support the use of performance standards on development and land use in the PORTZ that protects the amenity values of the adjacent commercial, residential and rural areas as long as the ability of the port to function and develop isn't hindered. | |
| | PORTZ – R1 | Support in part | Support the intention of the rule, recommend that R1 – 9 be amended to include that landscaping does not restrict visibility to or from vehicle access to the site; add a performance standard that requires buildings to connect to available network utility services where available, or for water supply, wastewater and | Amend wording of performance standard |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|---|------------|---|---|--|
| | | | stormwater systems to be designed and constructed in compliance with NZS4404:2010 | |
| | PORTZ – R6 | Support in part | This rule is supported if the amendments requested at PORTZ – R1 are adopted. | Amendment to the wording at PORTZ – R1 |
| | PORTZ – R7 | Support in part | This rule is supported if the amendments requested at PORTZ – R1 are adopted. | Amendment to the wording at PORTZ – R1 |
| STADZ - Stadium Zone | | | | |
| Stadium Objective | STADZ – O1 | Support | Spelling error ‘Stadia’ | Fix spelling of stadium |
| Stadium Policy | STADZ – P2 | Support | Spelling error ‘Stadia’ | Fix spelling of stadium |
| | STADZ – R4 | Support | Support that relocated buildings are required to connect to all infrastructure services within 12 months of the building being delivered to the site. | Retain as proposed. |
| Designations | | | | |
| Grey District Council Designations | GDC1 | Support in part | The inclusion of the designation is supported however for clarity the location of the site should be included under site identifier. | Include the legal description of the site. |
| | GDC3 | Support in part | The inclusion of the designation is supported however for clarity the location of the site should be included under site identifier. | Include the legal description of the site. |
| | GDC6 | Support in part | The inclusion of the designation is supported however for clarity the location of the site should be included under site identifier. | Include the legal description of the site. |
| | GDC7 | Support in part | The inclusion of the designation is supported however for clarity the location of the site should be included under site identifier. | Include the legal description of the site. |
| | GDC8 | Support in part | The inclusion of the designation is supported however for clarity the location of the site should be included under site identifier. | Include the legal description of the site. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-----------------------|-------|---|---|---|
| | GDC10 | Support in part | The inclusion of the designation is supported. Recommend at Site identifier – amend bw to between. | Amend bw to between. |
| | GDC11 | Support in part | The inclusion of the designation is supported. Recommend at site identifier – amend b/w to between. | Amend b/w to between. |
| | GDC14 | Support in part | The inclusion of the designation is supported however for clarity the location of the site should be included under site identifier. | Include the legal description of the site. |
| | GDC15 | Support in part | The inclusion of the designation is supported however for clarity the location of the site should be included under site identifier. | Include the legal description of the site. |
| | GDC16 | Support in part | The inclusion of the designation is supported however for clarity the location of the site should be included under site identifier. | Include the legal description of the site. |
| | GDC17 | Support in part | The inclusion of the designation is supported however for clarity the location of the site should be included under site identifier. | Include the legal description of the site. |
| | GDC18 | Support in part | The inclusion of the designation is supported however for clarity the location of the site should be included under site identifier. | Include the legal description of the site. |
| | GDC19 | Support in part | The inclusion of the designation is supported however for clarity the location of the site should be included under site identifier. | Include the legal description of the site. |
| | GDC20 | Support in part | The inclusion of the designation is supported however for clarity the location of the site should be included under site identifier. | Include the legal description of the site. |
| | GDC21 | Oppose omission of the designation | The GDC designations has missed the Designation unique identifier of GDC21, Greenstone Cemetery is missing from the GDC designation list in the plan. | Insert GDC21 Greenstone Cemetery and required information such as legal description of site, has been given effect to, no conditions or additional information. |
| | GDC22 | Support in part | The inclusion of the designation is supported however for clarity the location of the site should be included under site identifier. | Include the legal description of the site. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|--|----------|---|---|--|
| | GDC23 | Support in part | The inclusion of the designation is supported however for clarity the location of the site should be included under site identifier. | Include the legal description of the site. |
| | GDC24 | Support in part | The inclusion of the designation is supported however for clarity the location of the site should be included under site identifier. | Include the legal description of the site. |
| | GDC25 | Support in part | The inclusion of the designation is supported however for clarity the location of the site should be included under site identifier. | Include the legal description of the site. |
| | GDC26 | Support in part | The inclusion of the designation is supported however for clarity the location of the site should be included under site identifier. | Include the legal description of the site. |
| | | | <p>It is noted that the following designation from the operative Grey District plan have not been included in the TTPP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mackay and Guinness Street - Local Purpose Reserve – Iveagh Bay recreational and amenities area - Wildlife reserve – Blaketown Lagoon wildlife management reserve - Recreation reserve – Dixon Park - Recreation Reserve – Coronation Park - Recreation Reserve – Recreation Playing Fields Pt RES 994 - Recreation Reserve – Playing Fields Pt Mclean Park - Public Roding | |
| Part 4 - Appendices | | | | |
| Schedule Three – Sites and Area of Significance to Maori | Overlays | Oppose | It is recommended that all overlays be removed, reviewed and reassessed with new overlays created. Grey District Council acknowledges the benefit of overlays; however, they must be correct to be effective and beneficial to users. There are a number of overlays that extend | Remove the Overlays, review/reassess, check for accuracy and apply to the properties that they relate to only. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|---|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | over road boundaries and / or are noted as being incorrect. | |
| Schedule Four – Significant Natural Areas | Overlays | Oppose in part | It is recommended that all overlays be removed, reviewed and reassessed with new overlays created. Grey District Council acknowledges the benefit of overlays; however, they must be correct to be effective and beneficial to users. There are a number of overlays that extend over road boundaries and / or are noted as being incorrect. | Remove the Overlays, review/reassess, check for accuracy and apply to the properties that they relate to only. |
| Schedule Five – Outstanding Natural Landscapes | Overlays | Oppose | It is recommended that all overlays be removed, reviewed and reassessed with new overlays created. Grey District Council acknowledges the benefit of overlays; however, they must be correct to be effective and beneficial to users. There are a number of overlays that extend over road boundaries and / or are noted as being incorrect. | Remove the Overlays, review/reassess, check for accuracy and apply to the properties that they relate to only. |
| Schedule Six – Outstanding Natural Features | Overlays | Oppose | It is recommended that all overlays be removed, reviewed and reassessed with new overlays created. Grey District Council acknowledges the benefit of overlays; however, they must be correct to be effective and beneficial to users. There are a number of overlays that extend over road boundaries and / or are noted as being incorrect. | Remove the Overlays, review/reassess, check for accuracy and apply to the properties that they relate to only. |
| Schedule Seven – High Coastal Natural Character | Overlays | Oppose | It is recommended that all overlays be removed, reviewed and reassessed with new overlays created. Grey District Council acknowledges the benefit of overlays; however, they must be correct to be effective and beneficial to users. | Remove the Overlays, review/reassess, check for accuracy and apply to the properties that they relate to only. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|--|-----------------|---|--|--|
| | | | There are a number of overlays that extend over road boundaries and / or are noted as being incorrect. | |
| Schedule Eight – Outstanding Coastal Natural Character | Overlays | Oppose | It is recommended that all overlays be removed, reviewed and reassessed with new overlays created. Grey District Council acknowledges the benefit of overlays; however, they must be correct to be effective and beneficial to users. There are a number of overlays that extend over road boundaries and / or are noted as being incorrect. | Remove the Overlays, review/reassess, check for accuracy and apply to the properties that they relate to only. |
| Appendices | General Comment | It is recommended that the Transport Standards be included within this chapter rather than as an in Appendix One of the Plan. This would ensure that the Proposed Plan is consistent with the outcomes sought by the National Planning Standards. The Transport Standards should also be amended to ensure that vehicle designs based on use are appropriately included for both local roads and the state highway. | | |
| | TRN Table 2 | Support | The vehicle access standard for vehicle access onto a local road, arterial or collector road in regard to sight distance, vehicle access points is supported | Retain as proposed |
| | TRN Table 3 | Support in part | Table 3 does not appear to align with the Grey District Council Standards for a local road vehicle crossing from a state highway intersection as identified in the NZTA Policy Planning Manual – Appendix 5b (Table App5B/3) | Amend the table or add a new table to recognise the local road accessway separation from state highway. |
| | TRN-SX NEW | Support | A new standard should be included that states that any new or relocated vehicle crossing requires the prior approval of Council. A Works Permit Approval is required to be obtained from Council's Engineering Department prior to work being undertaken in the road corridor. This would be a similar standard to TRN-S1 that requires KiwiRail approval. | Include new Transport Standard for local road vehicle crossings requiring the approval of Councils Engineering Department. |

| Proposed Plan Section | Item | Support/support in part/oppose/oppose in part | Comment / reason | Relief Sought |
|-----------------------|------------|---|---|--|
| | TRN-SX NEW | Support | <p>The standards do not currently provide for any vehicle crossing designs for either the local roading network or state highways.</p> <p>This has the potential to cause ad hoc and poor vehicle crossing design outcomes within the roading network. For consistency it is recommended that the vehicle crossing designs for State Highways be adopted for both local and state highway roads. These are located in the NZTA Planning Policy Manual, Appendix 5B – Access standards and guidelines.</p> | Include a new standard to require either vehicle crossing design or refer to Grey District Council guidelines for vehicle crossings. |
| | TRN S2 | Support | Support the inclusion of this standard. | Retain as proposed. |
| | TRN S3 | Support | In General support of this standard. | Retain as proposed. |