

APPEAL POINTS TO BE WITHDRAWN

It has been brought to my attention by the TTPP committee that Buller Conservation Group's appeal point concerning inconsistencies in the use of the word, 'site' could prove problematic for mediation. The TTPP committee requested further specific details regarding the relief sought. We have no further details than those already provided. After our review of our concerns around, 'site', we have decided the issue is not worth pursuing. If problems around the use of the word, 'site' at a later date arise then that will be the time to address any inconsistency. It will hopefully not impinge on any overriding policy within the Plan itself.

In which case we would like to withdraw our appeal point concerning the inconsistencies in the use of the word, 'site'.

BCG Appeal Page 1

- ~~Inconsistency in the use of some terms.—~~
 - ~~In particular the use of the word, 'site', and its sometimes reference to 'property', 'allotment'~~

BCG Appeal Page 4

Part 1:Introduction

Chapter	Provision	Rule	Relief Sought
General	Contents		Provide a Contents page in PDF and online versions.
	Site		Useage of the term, 'site'. (e.g. ECO:R1.5, EW:R3,R4,R5, OSZ:R10, GRUZ:R3, R10, SETZ:R15, FUZ:R9,) Require more consistency of its sometimes reference to 'property', 'allotment'