

District Plan Further Submission Form

in support of or in opposition to a submission
Proposed Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2006

Please print clearly	For office use only
Full name: <u>Ping Chuen Lee - Wragge</u>	Submission No.
Organisation: (if the submission is on behalf of an organisation)	2367
Agent: (if applicable) <u>—</u>	
Address for correspondence: <u>PO Box 49, Oneroa, Waiheke</u>	
Phone: (business) <u>372 9541</u> (home) _____ (fax) _____	
e-mail address: _____	

Please use a separate form for each separate matter for submission

I / We support / oppose the submission of: Waiheke Island Sustainable Development Group
(name and address of original submitter and submission number of original submission if available)

Christopher Wragge.
P.O. Box 49, Oneroa, Waiheke.

Submission number 3715

The particular parts of the above submission which I / we support / oppose are:
(clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)

The entire submission, especially 3715/5: That the Plan be scrapped and a replacement Plan be developed in close collaboration with the community ... etc. - especially all affected communities

The reasons for my / our support or opposition to the above submission are:

1. There is tremendous evidence of community opposition against the entire Plan and its process; it falls short of its antecedent - the operative Plan and its process. ie here are submissions that have

I / We seek the whole submission be allowed
 the whole submission be disallowed
 part of the submission be allowed
 part of the submission be disallowed

made similar submissions to scrap and replace the entire proposed Plan pto →

I / We wish to be heard at the council planning hearing

Yes No

I / We would be prepared to present a joint case at the hearing with any others making a similar submission

Yes No

Signed

[Signature]

Date

28/5/07

Submission No.s =

- | | |
|----------|------------------|
| 1) 3184 | 38) 0091 |
| 2) 3199 | 39) 0092 |
| 3) 3202 | 40) 0099 |
| 4) 3218 | 41) 0101 |
| 5) 1700 | 42) 0103 |
| 6) 1701 | 43) 0104 |
| 7) 1702 | 44) 0175 |
| 8) 1703 | 45) 0238 |
| 9) 3294 | 46) 0240 |
| 10) 3295 | 47) 0246 |
| 11) 3379 | 48) 0267 |
| 12) 3396 | 49) 0286 |
| 13) 3414 | 50) 0287 |
| 14) 0040 | 51) 0288 |
| 15) 0088 | 52) 0289 |
| 16) 0516 | 53) 0290 |
| 17) 0553 | 54) 0309 |
| 18) 0615 | 55) 0310 |
| 19) 0659 | 56) 0311 |
| 20) 0678 | 57) 0312 |
| 21) 0722 | 58) 0313 |
| 22) 0747 | 59-64) 0317-0322 |
| 23) 0903 | 65-72) 0342-0350 |
| 24) 1014 | and many more. |
| 25) 1136 | |
| 26) 1151 | |
| 27) 1188 | |
| 28) 1203 | |
| 29) 2766 | |
| 30) 3296 | |
| 31) 3421 | |
| 32) 3725 | |
| 33) 3841 | |
| 34) 0773 | |
| 35) 1148 | |
| 36) 0064 | |
| 37) 0090 | |

Reason 2: Despite the enormous amount of good work and effort put in by ACC officers compiling all submissions etc,
~~the proposed plan~~ ~~plan~~ ~~following~~
 in plan subsequent to the operative plan needs an eco-community kaupapa established - a foundation from which any policy proposed for what follows the operative possesses integrity of vision and direction and allows coherent alignment of any policy rule/regulation/provision etc. that can be easily comprehended by a lay person and planner alike.

As such, there does not seem to be any kaupapa/principled, sound, sustainable principles underlying the ACC proposed plan.