

## Submissions by Submitter

### District Plan Submissions

---

**Submission Number: 71**

**Submitters: Whakatane Harbour Care Group**

**Submission Point Number: 2446**

Plan Indexes: 3.1 ObjStr1 Policy9

Submission Summary: Stance: Seek amendment

The policy is inconsistent with Strategic Objective 8 and policies 1 and 2. The policy is biased in favour of the economic and social benefits, which is inconsistent with the role and responsibility of the Council under section 5 of the RMA.

Relief Sought:

The policy to be re-worded to provide more balanced policy guidance.

**Submission Point Number: 2447**

Plan Indexes: 3.1 ObjStr8

Submission Summary: Stance: Support

It is important that the outstanding landscapes, significant indigenous biodiversity sites, and cultural heritage sites are recognised and protected from the adverse effects of inappropriate subdivision, land use and development.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number: 2448**

Plan Indexes: 3.1 ObjStr8 Policy1

Submission Summary: Stance: Support

It is important that the outstanding landscapes, significant indigenous biodiversity sites, and cultural heritage sites are recognised and protected from the adverse effects of inappropriate subdivision, land use and development.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number: 2449**

Plan Indexes: 3.1 ObjStr8 Policy2

Submission Summary: Stance: Support

It is important that the outstanding landscapes, significant indigenous biodiversity sites, and cultural heritage sites are recognised and protected from the adverse effects of inappropriate subdivision, land use and development.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number: 2450**

Plan Indexes: 8.1 ObjCP1

## Submissions by Submitter

### District Plan Submissions

---

Submission Summary:

Stance: Support

In the Whakatane harbour area this CPZ zoning includes areas of salt marsh and estuarine margins that are part of a significant indigenous biodiversity site known as the Whakatane Estuary.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 2451

Plan Indexes: 8.1 ObjCP1 Policy1

Submission Summary:

Stance: Seek amendment

In the Whakatane harbour area this CPZ zoning includes areas of salt marsh and estuarine margins that are part of a significant indigenous biodiversity site known as the Whakatane Estuary. It would be appropriate to add the word 'wetland' in policy 1 (a) to recognise that the CPZ not only contains coastal dune systems but also areas of coastal wetlands.

Relief Sought:

Retain Policy 1 under Objective CP1, and add the word 'wetlands' between the words 'coastal' and 'dune systems' in policy 1(a).

**Submission Point Number:** 2452

Plan Indexes: 8.1 ObjCP1 Policy2

Submission Summary:

Stance: Support

In the Whakatane harbour area this CPZ zoning includes areas of salt marsh and estuarine margins that are part of a significant indigenous biodiversity site known as the Whakatane Estuary.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 2453

Plan Indexes: 8.1 ObjCP2

Submission Summary:

Stance: Support

The Warren Cole walkway is a community asset, enabling access to the river's edge, peace and quiet, and views. It is appropriate that this area is recognised as an open space area where buildings and other developments are limited, and noise, odours and visual pollution can be managed.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 2454

Plan Indexes: 8.1 ObjCP2 Policy1

Submission Summary:

Stance: Support

The Warren Cole walkway is a community asset, enabling access to the river's edge, peace and quiet, and views. It is appropriate that this area is recognised as an open space area where buildings and other developments are limited, and noise, odours and visual pollution can be managed.

Relief Sought:

## Submissions by Submitter

### District Plan Submissions

---

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 2455

Plan Indexes: 8.1 ObjCP2 Policy3

Submission Summary: Stance: Support

The Warren Cole walkway is a community asset, enabling access to the river's edge, peace and quiet, and views. It is appropriate that this area is recognised as an open space area where buildings and other developments are limited, and noise, odours and visual pollution can be managed.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 2462

Plan Indexes: 8.1 ObjCP2 Policy4

Submission Summary: Stance: Support

Policy 4 is supported because it acknowledges Ngati Awa as tangata whenua and recognises their heritage, values and interests with the Whakatane river environment.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 2466

Plan Indexes: 8.1 ObjCP2 Policy2

Submission Summary: Stance: Seek amendment

This wording better reflects the role the Council has under the RMA under section 5 and Part II matters. We support the need to ensure the rivers' natural character, open space values and public access are maintained and enhanced in regard to managing land uses.

Relief Sought:

Seek the words 'To provide' be changed to "To require".

**Submission Point Number:** 2480

Plan Indexes: 11.1 ObjGen1

Submission Summary: Stance: Support

The landscape and natural features are an asset to the district and it is appropriate that they are given protection in the Plan.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 2484

Plan Indexes: 11.1 ObjGen2 Policy1

Submission Summary: Stance: Support

The landscape and natural features are an asset to the district and it is appropriate that they are given protection in the Plan.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

## Submissions by Submitter

### District Plan Submissions

---

**Submission Point Number:** 2570

Plan Indexes: 11.1 ObjGen2 Policy2

Submission Summary: Stance: Support

The landscape and natural features are an asset to the district and it is appropriate that they are given protection in the Plan.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 2598

Plan Indexes: 11.1 ObjGen3

Submission Summary: Stance: Support

The landscape and natural features are an asset to the district and it is appropriate that they are given protection in the Plan.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 2599

Plan Indexes: 11.1 ObjGen3 Policy1

Submission Summary: Stance: Support

The landscape and natural features are an asset to the district and it is appropriate that they are given protection in the Plan.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 2600

Plan Indexes: 11.1 ObjGen3 Policy2

Submission Summary: Stance: Support

The landscape and natural features are an asset to the district and it is appropriate that they are given protection in the Plan.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 2601

Plan Indexes: 11.1 ObjGen3 Policy3

Submission Summary: Stance: Support

The landscape and natural features are an asset to the district and it is appropriate that they are given protection in the Plan.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

## Submissions by Submitter

### District Plan Submissions

---

**Submission Point Number:** 2602

Plan Indexes: 11.1 ObjGen4

Submission Summary

Stance: Support

The landscape and natural features are an asset to the district and it is appropriate that they are given protection in the Plan.

We support objectives and policies that manage health and safety, preserve the natural character of the surface of water and manage conflicts between users and manage the adverse effects of incompatible use and development of resources.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 2603

Plan Indexes: 11.1 ObjGen4 Policy1

Submission Summary:

Stance: Support

The landscape and natural features are an asset to the district and it is appropriate that they are given protection in the Plan.

We support objectives and policies that manage health and safety, preserve the natural character of the surface of water and manage conflicts between users and manage the adverse effects of incompatible use and development of resources.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 2605

Plan Indexes: 11.1 ObjGen4 Policy2

Submission Summary:

Stance: Support

The landscape and natural features are an asset to the district and it is appropriate that they are given protection in the Plan.

We support objectives and policies that manage health and safety, preserve the natural character of the surface of water and manage conflicts between users and manage the adverse effects of incompatible use and development of resources.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 2607

Plan Indexes: 13.2.1

Submission Summary:

Stance: Seek amendment

It would be inappropriate to locate a helipad and have helicopter operations in the Whakatane Riverbank Reserve area. This area is being developed for the benefit and enjoyment of the walking and cycling public, who can enjoy the peace and quiet, river views and amenities of the area. Helicopter activities would be noisy, smelly and a potential safety hazard.

## Submissions by Submitter

### District Plan Submissions

---

Relief Sought:

Make helipads non-complying in the Active Reserve zone relating to the Whakatane Riverbank Reserve Policy Area.

**Submission Point Number:** 2612

Plan Indexes: 15.6.1BS139A

Submission Summary: Stance: Support

The Whakatane Estuary is recognised as a regionally important biodiversity site and the native vegetation and fauna that are present in this site justify its inclusion in Schedule A.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 2616

Plan Indexes: Whakatāne 106B

Submission Summary: Stance: Seek amendment

Whakatane DC Designation 195: It is unclear what this designation relates to as the (electronic) copy of the list of Designations in the appendix only includes designations up to number 187.

Relief Sought:

Seek to have the purpose of the designation clarified.

**Submission Point Number:** 2638

Plan Indexes: Whakatāne 106B

Submission Summary: Stance: Oppose

CPZ zoning is more appropriate for this site, which is part of modified coastal dune system and is land immediately adjacent to the coastal marine area. Farming as is consistent with Rural 1 Plains is unlikely to occur on this piece of land.

Relief Sought:

Seek to change to CPZ zoning.

**Submission Point Number:** 4283

Plan Indexes: 11.1 ObjGen1 Policy1

Submission Summary: Stance: Support

The landscape and natural features are an asset to the district and it is appropriate that they are given protection in the Plan.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 4286

Plan Indexes: 15.1 ObjIB1

Submission Summary: Stance: Support

Support

Relief Sought:

Retain.

## Submissions by Submitter

### District Plan Submissions

---

**Submission Point Number:** 4287

Plan Indexes: 15.1 ObjIB1 Policy1

Submission Summary:

Stance: Support

Support.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 4288

Plan Indexes: 15.1 ObjIB1 Policy2

Submission Summary:

Stance: Support

Support.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 4289

Plan Indexes: 15.1 ObjIB1 Policy3

Submission Summary:

Stance: Support

Support.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 4290

Plan Indexes: 15.1 ObjIB2

Submission Summary:

Stance: Support

Support.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 4291

Plan Indexes: 15.1 ObjIB2 Policy1

Submission Summary:

Stance: Support

Support.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 4292

Plan Indexes: 15.1 ObjIB2 Policy2

Submission Summary:

Stance: Support

Support.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 4293

Plan Indexes: 15.1 ObjIB2 Policy3

Submission Summary:

Stance: Support

Support

## Submissions by Submitter

### District Plan Submissions

---

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 4294

Plan Indexes: 15.2

Submission Summary:

Stance: Support

Support.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 4295

Plan Indexes: 15.6.1

Submission Summary:

Stance: Support

Support.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 4296

Plan Indexes: 15.6.2

Submission Summary:

Stance: Support

Support.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 4297

Plan Indexes: 15.6.3

Submission Summary:

Stance: Support

Support.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 4298

Plan Indexes: 4.1.14

Submission Summary:

Stance: Support

In the Whakatane harbour area this CPZ zoning includes areas of salt marsh and estuarine margins that are part of a significant indigenous biodiversity site known as the Whakatane Estuary.

Relief Sought:

Retain.

**Submission Point Number:** 4299

Plan Indexes: 11.1 ObjGen2

Submission Summary:

Stance: Support

The landscape and natural features are an asset to the district and it is appropriate that they are given protection in the Plan.

Relief Sought:

Retain.



## Submissions by Submitter

### District Plan Submissions

---

**Submission Number:** 75

**Submitters:** Ms Louise Shaw, Peter West

**Submission Point Number:** 32

Plan Indexes: 15.1 ObjIB1

Submission Summary: Stance: Support

We support the provision.

Relief Sought:

Expand the objective to include the word “restoration” alongside “Maintenance and enhancement”.

**Submission Point Number:** 33

Plan Indexes: 15.1 ObjIB1 Policy1

Submission Summary: Stance: Oppose

he policy mixes up concepts: the methods given are ecological restoration system components. They would be the desired outcomes, not the “promote” and “encourage” methods. The two example methods do not “encourage” or “promote”, without actual encouragements they are really impositions and constrictions on landowners.

Relief Sought:

Alter the wording to give example methods that actually “promote and encourage” such as rates rebates for voluntarily protected areas, and financial assistance with fencing and pest control.

**Submission Point Number:** 34

Plan Indexes: 15.1 ObjIB1 Policy2

Submission Summary: Stance: Oppose

The policy is “unreasonable” by its own definition. It requires a change in land-use in situations where the existing/alternative land use is “reasonable use”.

Relief Sought:

Get rid of this policy.

**Submission Point Number:** 35

Plan Indexes: 15.1 ObjIB1 Policy3

Submission Summary: Stance: Support

It is important to recognise when people are actually enhancing biodiversity voluntarily.

Relief Sought:

Support.

**Submission Point Number:** 4300

Plan Indexes: 15.1 ObjIB2

Submission Summary: Stance: Oppose

## Submissions by Submitter

### District Plan Submissions

---

The areas of “significant indigenous biodiversity” are often incorrectly mapped, and in a lot of cases are too onerous for individual landowners. The mapped area includes grazing areas (completely cleared in 1960’s) and plantation forest. It appears that the schedules were prepared from outdated aerial photographs. Policy IB2/3 states that the areas’ significance will be determined by using criteria from Appendix F BOP Regional Policy Statement (which cannot be applied from aerial photographs). The ecologist recommended further evaluation.

The second issue with the IB schedules is that some land parcels are over-represented (with a large proportion of land covered in the new schedule). It is un-reasonable to impose a restrictive land-use schedule over such large proportions of a single piece of land. It would be more reasonable to limit the amount of area from any one parcel to say 30% of its area. Our farm is about 80% covered by the new schedule.

The third issue with the IB schedules is that many land parcels are not represented at all. All land is capable of supporting indigenous biodiversity. The effect of the schedules (as proposed) is to penalise people who have historically encouraged land restoration while rewarding those who have clear-felled, drained, and sprayed their own areas. This objective (as proposed) will actually have the opposite effect from that intended (it contradicts Objective IB1). We think that WDC should work with landowners to classify a nominated minimum area (say 5% of every site) to be included in the schedule (or under an alternative protection method as listed in Policy IB1/3).

#### Relief Sought:

Amend the schedules. Work with landowners to accurately map areas of SIB using BOP Regional Policy Statement App. F. Work with landowners to nominate areas of SIB for the schedule that cover no more than 30% of the land parcel. Apply a minimum nominated scheduled area to all rural zoned land parcels.

**Submission Point Number:** 4301

Plan Indexes: 15.6.1

#### Submission Summary:

Stance: Oppose

The areas of “significant indigenous biodiversity” are often incorrectly mapped, and in a lot of cases are too onerous for individual landowners. The mapped area includes grazing areas (completely cleared in 1960’s) and plantation forest. It appears that the schedules were prepared from outdated aerial photographs. Policy IB2/3 states that the areas’ significance will be determined by using criteria from Appendix F BOP Regional Policy Statement (which cannot be applied from aerial photographs). The ecologist recommended further evaluation.

The second issue with the IB schedules is that some land parcels are over-represented (with a large proportion of land covered in the new schedule). It is un-reasonable to impose a restrictive land-use schedule over such large proportions of a single piece of land. It would be more reasonable to limit the amount of area from any one parcel to say 30% of its area. Our farm is about 80% covered by the new schedule.

The third issue with the IB schedules is that many land parcels are not represented at all. All land is capable of supporting indigenous biodiversity. The effect of the schedules (as proposed) is to penalise people who have historically encouraged land restoration while rewarding those who have clear-felled, drained, and sprayed their own areas. This objective (as proposed) will actually have the opposite effect from that intended (it contradicts Objective IB1). We think that WDC should work with landowners to classify a nominated minimum area (say 5% of every site) to be included in the schedule (or under an alternative protection method as listed in Policy IB1/3).

#### Relief Sought:

Amend the schedules. Work with landowners to accurately map areas of SIB using BOP Regional Policy Statement App. F. Work with landowners to nominate areas of SIB for the schedule that cover no more than 30% of the land parcel. Apply a minimum nominated scheduled area to all rural zoned land parcels.

## Submissions by Submitter

### District Plan Submissions

---

**Submission Point Number:** 4302

Plan Indexes: 15.6.2

Submission Summary: Stance: Oppose

The areas of “significant indigenous biodiversity” are often incorrectly mapped, and in a lot of cases are too onerous for individual landowners. The mapped area includes grazing areas (completely cleared in 1960’s) and plantation forest. It appears that the schedules were prepared from outdated aerial photographs. Policy IB2/3 states that the areas’ significance will be determined by using criteria from Appendix F BOP Regional Policy Statement (which cannot be applied from aerial photographs). The ecologist recommended further evaluation.

The second issue with the IB schedules is that some land parcels are over-represented (with a large proportion of land covered in the new schedule). It is un-reasonable to impose a restrictive land-use schedule over such large proportions of a single piece of land. It would be more reasonable to limit the amount of area from any one parcel to say 30% of its area. Our farm is about 80% covered by the new schedule.

The third issue with the IB schedules is that many land parcels are not represented at all. All land is capable of supporting indigenous biodiversity. The effect of the schedules (as proposed) is to penalise people who have historically encouraged land restoration while rewarding those who have clear-felled, drained, and sprayed their own areas. This objective (as proposed) will actually have the opposite effect from that intended (it contradicts Objective IB1). We think that WDC should work with landowners to classify a nominated minimum area (say 5% of every site) to be included in the schedule (or under an alternative protection method as listed in Policy IB1/3).

Relief Sought:

Amend the schedules. Work with landowners to accurately map areas of SIB using BOP Regional Policy Statement App. F. Work with landowners to nominate areas of SIB for the schedule that cover no more than 30% of the land parcel. Apply a minimum nominated scheduled area to all rural zoned land parcels.

**Submission Point Number:** 4303

Plan Indexes: 15.6.3

Submission Summary: Stance: Oppose

The areas of “significant indigenous biodiversity” are often incorrectly mapped, and in a lot of cases are too onerous for individual landowners. The mapped area includes grazing areas (completely cleared in 1960’s) and plantation forest. It appears that the schedules were prepared from outdated aerial photographs. Policy IB2/3 states that the areas’ significance will be determined by using criteria from Appendix F BOP Regional Policy Statement (which cannot be applied from aerial photographs). The ecologist recommended further evaluation.

The second issue with the IB schedules is that some land parcels are over-represented (with a large proportion of land covered in the new schedule). It is un-reasonable to impose a restrictive land-use schedule over such large proportions of a single piece of land. It would be more reasonable to limit the amount of area from any one parcel to say 30% of its area. Our farm is about 80% covered by the new schedule.

The third issue with the IB schedules is that many land parcels are not represented at all. All land is capable of supporting indigenous biodiversity. The effect of the schedules (as proposed) is to penalise people who have historically encouraged land restoration while rewarding those who have clear-felled, drained, and sprayed their own areas. This objective (as proposed) will actually have the opposite effect from that intended (it contradicts Objective IB1). We think that WDC should work with landowners to classify a nominated minimum area (say 5% of every site) to be included in the schedule (or under an alternative protection method as listed in Policy IB1/3).

## Submissions by Submitter

### District Plan Submissions

---

Relief Sought:

Amend the schedules. Work with landowners to accurately map areas of SIB using BOP Regional Policy Statement App. F. Work with landowners to nominate areas of SIB for the schedule that cover no more than 30% of the land parcel. Apply a minimum nominated scheduled area to all rural zoned land parcels.

**Submission Point Number:** 4304

Plan Indexes: 15.1 ObjIB2 Policy1

Submission Summary: Stance: Support

This is a good sound policy that protects and enhances natural areas.

Relief Sought:

Support.

**Submission Point Number:** 4305

Plan Indexes: 15.1 ObjIB2 Policy2

Submission Summary: Stance: Support

This is a good sound policy that protects and enhances natural areas.

Relief Sought:

Support.

**Submission Point Number:** 4306

Plan Indexes: 15.1 ObjIB2 Policy3

Submission Summary: Stance: Support

This is a good sound policy that protects and enhances natural areas.

Relief Sought:

Support