

**NOTICE OF FURTHER SUBMISSION
ON A PUBLICLY NOTIFIED PROPOSED PLAN
UNDER THE FIRST SCHEDULE OF
THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991**

To: The Manager
Auckland City Planning
Private Bag 92516
Wellesley Street
AUCKLAND 1036

Further Submission On: Auckland City District Plan –
Proposed Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2006

Name of Submitter: Al Morrison
Director-General of Conservation
Department of Conservation

Address: Department of Conservation
Boulcott Street
WELLINGTON
(see below for address for service)

1. The further submissions are contained on the attached sheets.
2. The total number of sheets including this cover sheet is 14
3. The submitter does wish to be heard in support of this further submission.
4. If others make a similar submission, the submitter would be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at any hearing.

Signature W. Murray **Date** 28 - 5 - 07

Warwick Murray
Department of Conservation
acting pursuant to delegated authority on behalf of
Al Morrison
Director-General of Conservation

Address for Service Department of Conservation
Private Bag 68 908
Newton
AUCKLAND

Attention Warwick Murray
Manager Community Relations

Telephone (09) 307 9279
Facsimile (09) 377 2919
Email wmurray@doc.govt.nz

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
Auckland Regional Council	3521/1	Oppose in Part	Amend clause 1.3.6 to state that the entire area of the Proposed Plan is within the area of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park and.	The suggested wording is considered to lead to confusion as to what falls within the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park and is subject to the provisions of the HGMPA. It is considered that the proposed wording is potentially inconsistent with section 33(2) of the HGMPA.
Federated Farmers New Zealand	1243/25	Oppose	The overall submission relates to the enablement of farming activities with less restriction on private property. With regard to this particular submission point the submitter seeks: Amend clause 3.2.3(5) and other relevant parts of the Plan to take into account concerns that the policy 5 pays insufficient attention to the rights of owners to use land which has natural features such as wetland systems, indigenous vegetation and wildlife habitats.	The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submissions of DOC, which seek to have appropriate levels of protection afforded to areas that contain sensitive ecological features.
Federated Farmers New Zealand	1243/40	Oppose	Remove the words 'goats', 'deer', and 'wapiti' from clause 4.4(1)(c).	The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submissions of DOC, which seeks the restriction of species within the Hauraki Gulf Islands due to the potential adverse effects on the conservation and heritage values.
Federated Farmers New Zealand	1243/66	Oppose	Provide in clause 8.5.1 for the removal of riparian vegetation as a permitted activity.	The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submissions of DOC, which seek to have appropriate levels of protection afforded to areas that contain sensitive ecological features.
Federated Farmers New Zealand	1243/93	Oppose	Amend the definition of wetland to provide that "wetland" does not include land that is used for pastoral farming.	The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submissions of DOC, which seek to have appropriate levels of protection afforded to areas that contain sensitive ecological features.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
John Sutton	3110/2	Oppose in Part	The submission seeks a reassessment of settlement areas etc (including their subdivision potential) to better reflect the future potential of development of the Barrier.	The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submissions of DOC, which is generally supportive of the Proposed Plan's identification of Settlement Areas.
Alan H & Doreta J A Gray Claris Garden Centre and Native Plant Nursery Dianne Hayes & Bob Lawson	2436/7, 2437/7, 2438/7	Oppose	Delete Policy 4 under clause 10b.7.6. The submission seeks to delete the Dune and Wetland Conservation Area within the Claris Settlement Area.	The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submissions of DOC, which seeks to have appropriate levels of protection afforded to identified sensitive natural areas and to avoid the adverse effects of inappropriate development within Settlement Areas on such sensitive natural areas.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
Nicola A Wimsitt	1301/1,	Oppose	<p>The regulation (clause 7.11.4.2(1)) should be completely deleted.</p> <p>The submission seeks to remove the indigenous vegetation protection rules for Sites of Ecological Significance and Sensitive Areas that make vegetation removal (including the cutting of roots) a discretionary activity.</p>	<p>The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submissions of DOC, which seeks to have appropriate levels of protection afforded to identified sensitive natural areas containing significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna.</p>
Kyle F Robbins	1308/1,			
Ken Fortzer and N	1412/1,			
Ngawaka-Fortzer				
Lesley V & Beverley M	1481/1,			
Blackwell				
Michael O'Shea	1508/1,			
E A Robertson	1927/1,			
Anthony S Jury	1958/1,			
Gregory Laird	1972/1,			
Martin & Anne Mitchener	1984/1,			
Helen O'Shea	2114/1,			
D E McGregor	2145/1,			
Michael P J O'Shea	2155/1,			
Helen O'Shea	2170/1,			
Richard B Somerville-Ryan	2247/1,			
John G Sutton	2274/1,			
David F & Patricia A	2322/1,			
McCraty				
BWR Sanderson & The	2346/1,			
Workington Trust				
John R Mellars	2372/1,			
Roger A O'Shannessy	2390/1,			
J Anne Smith	2401/1,			
Marion Davison	2411/1,			
Jenepher B Frost	2439/1,			
Michael P J O'Shea	2452/1,			
Alan H & Doreta A Gray	2453/1,			
Historic Village and Art	2454/1,			
Centre				
Edward A D & Anne R Scott	2459/1,			
Anne R Scott	2460/1,			
Charles & Winnie Blackwell	2464/1,			
Gentle M Jury	2470/1,			

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
Dorothy M White Ellen M Curreen Helmut Bender Carole & Neil Wright Richard & Carol Comer Maree Stanway Neil R Somerville	2475/1, 2855/1, 3641/1, 3687/1, 3741/1, 3766/1, 3800/1			
Diana V Simpson	1577/1	Oppose	Clause 7.11.4.2(1) should be completely deleted. The submission seeks to remove the indigenous vegetation protection rule for Sites of Ecological Significance and Sensitive Areas that make vegetation removal (including the cutting of roots) a discretionary activity.	The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submissions of DOC, which seeks to have appropriate levels of protection afforded to identified sensitive natural areas containing significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna.
Ken Fortzer and N Ngawaka-Fortzer	3033/1	Oppose	Delete Clause 7.11.4.2.(1). The submission seeks to remove the indigenous vegetation protection rule for Sites of Ecological Significance and Sensitive Areas that make vegetation removal (including the cutting of roots) a discretionary activity.	The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submissions of DOC, which seeks to have appropriate levels of protection afforded to identified sensitive natural areas containing significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
Kyle F Robbins Roger Bright Carol A F Rendle Trevor C Rendle Michael O'Shea James W Robertson Paul & Geraldine Downie Martin & Anne Mitchener Helen O'Shea Ben W R Sanderson Richard B Somerville-Ryan John G Sutton Dorothy M White D F & P A McCary Edward A D & Anne R Scott Helmut Bender Carole Wright Robert & Carol Comer Maree Stanway Neil R Somerville	1309/2, 1363/2, 1496/2 1502/2, 1509/2, 1890/2, 1899/2, 1954/2, 2167/2, 2188/2, 2249/3, 2266/2, 2312/2, 2350/2, 2354/2, 3632/2, 3670/2, 3734/2, 3759/2, 3797/2	Oppose	<p>Remove sensitive area 40-2, 41-3, 41-4, 41-5, 41-6, 41-7, 41-7, 41-8, 41-8, 41-9, 41-10, 41-11, 41-12, 41-13, 41-14, 42-5, 42-6, 42-7, 42-8, 42-9, 49-2, 49-3, 50-3, 50-4, 53-3, 53-4, 54-4, 54-5, 54-6, 54-7, 54-8, 55-5, 55-6, 55-7, 56-2, 56-3, 56-4, 57-4, 57-5, 57-6, 57-7, 57-8, 57-9, 57-10, 57-11, 60-2, 60-3, 60-4 from the planning maps.</p> <p>The submission seeks to remove all the sensitive areas identified for the outer islands and contained in Section 3.0 of Appendix 2d.</p>	<p>The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submissions of DOC, which seeks to have appropriate levels of protection afforded to sensitive natural areas.</p>

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
Kylie F Robbins Roger Bright Carol A F Rendle Trevor C Rendle Michael O'Shea James W Robertson Paul & Geraldine Downie Martin & Anne Michener Helen O'Shea Ben W R Sanderson Richard B Somerville-Ryan John G Sutton Dorothy M White D F & P A McCary Edward A D & Anne R Scott Helmut Bender Carole Wright Robert & Carol Comer Maree Stanway Neil R Somerville	1309/5, 1363/5, 1496/5, 1502/5, 1509/5, 1890/5, 1899/5, 1954/5, 2167/5, 2188/5, 2249/6, 2266/5, 2312/5, 2350/5, 2354/5, 3632/5, 3670/5, 3734/5, 3759/5, 3797/5	Oppose	Remove the sites of ecological significance listed in Section 2.0 of Appendix 2d from the planning maps. The submission seeks to remove all the sites of ecological significance identified for the outer islands and contained in Section 2.0 of Appendix 2d.	The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submissions of DOC, which seeks to have appropriate levels of protection afforded to areas that contain sensitive ecological features.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
Carol A F Rendle	1496/2	Oppose	Remove specified zones from the Planning Maps, including areas: 40-2, 41-3, 41-4, 41-5, 41-6, 41-7, 41-8, 41-9, 41-10, 41-11, 41-12, 41-13, 41-14, 42-5, 42-6, 42-7, 42-8, 42-9, 49-2, 49-3, 50-3, 50-4, 53-3, 53-4, 54-4, 54-5, 54-6, 54-7, 54-8, 55-5, 55-6, 55-7, 56-2, 56-3, 56-4, 57-4, 57-5, 57-6, 57-7, 57-8, 57-9, 57-10, 57-11, 60-2, 60-3, 60-4, and/or any area not listed and described in Appendix 2d Section 2.0.	The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submissions of DOC, which seeks to have appropriate levels of protection afforded to areas that contain sensitive ecological values.
Nicola A Winsett	3104/7	Oppose	Opposes the sensitive areas (listed in Section 3.0 of Appendix 2d). The submission seeks to remove all the sensitive areas identified for the outer islands and contained in Section 3.0 of Appendix 2d.	The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submissions of DOC, which seeks to have appropriate levels of protection afforded to areas that contain sensitive ecological values.
Neil Wright	3690/5	Oppose (in part)	Remove the sites of ecological significance listed in Section 2.0 of Appendix 2d from the planning maps. Remove Sensitive Area 41-5 from the planning maps.	The relief sought, comprising the removal of all sites of ecological significance, is inconsistent with the primary submissions of DOC, which seeks to have appropriate levels of protection afforded to areas that contain sensitive ecological values.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
Cheryl Van Der Linden	2557/1	Oppose	That bach 92 on Rangitoto Island be able to be faithfully rebuilt to as true as original and care taken by the original family descendants.	The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submission of DOC, which generally supports the approach adopted in the Proposed Plan that accords with Part II of the Act, and in particular the protection of historic heritage. Any facsimile of rebuilt buildings will lack these historic heritage values. They will also potentially affect the recognised ecological values of Rangitoto Island, and will also be inconsistent with the Conservation Land Unit and the purposes for which DOC manages Rangitoto Island under the Conservation Act 1987.
Cheryl Van Der Linden	2557/2	Oppose	Seeks a historical village being the best outcome for Rangitoto.	The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submission of DOC, which generally supports the approach adopted in the Proposed Plan that accords with Part II of the Act, and in particular the protection of historic heritage. Any facsimile of rebuilt buildings (within a 'historical village') will lack these historic heritage values. They will also potentially affect the recognised ecological values of Rangitoto Island, and will also be inconsistent with the Conservation Land Unit and the purposes for which DOC manages Rangitoto Island under the Conservation Act 1987.
Cheryl Van Der Linden	2558/1	Oppose	That the baches, 71 Franklin, 72 Fairey, 75 Briggs, 78 Arrowsmith, 79 Price, and 93 Davis, in Islington Bay, Rangitoto, be faithfully rebuilt as true to original and care taken by the original family descendants where possible and a historical type village being the best outcome.	The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submission of DOC, which generally supports the approach adopted in the Proposed Plan that accords with Part II of the Act, and in particular the protection of historic heritage. Any facsimile of rebuilt buildings will lack these historic heritage values. See above. They will also potentially affect the recognised ecological values of Rangitoto Island, and will also be inconsistent with the Conservation Land Unit and the purposes for which DOC manages Rangitoto Island under the Conservation Act 1987.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
Ruby E M Willetts	3541/1	Oppose	Provision for previous bach holders on Rangitoto to replace a bach of similar plan as that which was removed by the authorities.	The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submission of DOC, which generally supports the approach adopted in the Proposed Plan that accords with Part II of the Act, and in particular the protection of historic heritage. Any facsimile of rebuilt buildings will lack these historic heritage values. They will also potentially affect the recognised ecological values of Rangitoto Island, and will also be inconsistent with the Conservation Land Unit and the purposes for which DOC manages Rangitoto Island under the Conservation Act 1987.
Ruby E M Willetts	3541/2	Oppose	Support from Auckland City Council for re-instatement of the leases of previous owners of baches on Rangitoto	The relief sought falls outside of the scope of the Resource Management Act and the District Plan preparation process.
James W Fairrey	3542/1	Oppose	The submission seeks the support of the Auckland City Council for the re-instatement of leases to previous owners of baches on Rangitoto	The relief sought falls outside of the scope of the Resource Management Act and the District Plan preparation process.
George F Fairrey	3543/1	Oppose	The submission seeks the support of the council of Auckland City for the re-instatement of the leases to previous owners of baches on Rangitoto	The relief sought falls outside of the scope of the Resource Management Act and the District Plan preparation process.
Kevin and Bobbe Free	546/1	Oppose	Delete the words "recognise and protect" from the objective to clause 7.9.2 and replace with the words "recognise, protect, and where possible replace".	The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submissions of DOC, which generally supports the approach adopted in the Proposed Plan, to recognise, identify and protect the significant buildings, objects and places of historical interest and values, and that is considered to accord with Part II of the Act. The relief sought is inconsistent with Part II of the Act, including in particular section 6(D).

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
Daniel F Arrowsmith	498/1	Oppose	Replace the words "recognise and protect" with "recognise, protect and, where possible, replace" in clause 7.9.2 (objective in respect of buildings, objects, properties and places of special value).	The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submissions of DOC, which generally supports the approach adopted in the Proposed Plan, to recognise, identify and protect the significant buildings, objects and places of historical interest and values, and that is considered to accord with Part II of the Act. The relief sought is inconsistent with Part II of the Act, including in particular section 6(f).
Steve Pearce	149/2	Oppose	For bach 53 (map ref 30-36), include in the Plan special provision allowing for solar power. The submission seeks to provide for solar power as a lesser activity status than the discretionary activity status provided for under the Plan (Rule 7.9.4).	The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submissions of DOC, which generally supports the approach adopted in the Proposed Plan, to recognise, identify and protect the significant buildings, objects and places of historical interest and values, and that is considered to accord with Part II of the Act.
Rangitoto Is Historic Conservation Trust	2065/1	Oppose	Provision needed for the protection are "Solar Panel Lighting and Enlarged Toilets" to take self composting types for baches on Rangitoto The submission seeks to provide for solar power as a lesser activity status than the discretionary activity status provided for under the Plan (Rule 7.9.4).	The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submissions of DOC, which generally supports the approach adopted in the Proposed Plan, to recognise, identify and protect the significant buildings, objects and places of historical interest and values, and that is considered to accord with Part II of the Act.
Joanne West	2589/3	Oppose	Allow solar power to be installed on Rangitoto baches. The submission seeks to provide for solar power as a lesser activity status than the discretionary activity status provided for under the Plan (Rule 7.9.4)	The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submissions of DOC, which generally supports the approach adopted in the Proposed Plan, to recognise, identify and protect the significant buildings, objects and places of historical interest and values, and that is considered to accord with Part II of the Act.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
D F M Burton	3582/2	Oppose	<p>Seeks provision for solar panels on Bach 54 (map ref 30-50) on Rangitoto</p> <p>The submission seeks to provide for solar power as a lesser activity status than the discretionary activity status provided for under the Plan (Rule 7.9.4).</p>	<p>The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submissions of DOC, which generally supports the approach adopted in the Proposed Plan, to recognise, identify and protect the significant buildings, objects and places of historical interest and values, and that is considered to accord with Part II of the Act.</p>

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
Andrew Sharp Archibald R Blackwood Glenys Blackwood Katherine A Mason Ann Bohan Andrew Sharp Margaret E Sharp Jaeky Groves Philip D Austin Aileen Cappoli Helen L Walker Rachel Sharp Paul Sharp Ann Bohan Andrew Sharp Margaret E Sharp Rachel Sharp Paul Sharp Christine M Cutler Paul Sharp Margaret E Sharp Archibald R Blackwood Glenys Blackwood Rachel Sharp Paul Sharp Ann Bohan Margaret E Sharp Susan Wilson Andrew Sharp Rachel Sharp	387/1, 393/1, 394/1, 395/1, 396/1, 397/1, 398/1, 399/1, 400/1, 401/1, 402/1, 403/1, 404/1, 413/1, 414/1, 415/1, 416/1, 417/1, 544/3, 969/1, 970/1, 996/1, 997/1, 998/1, 999/1, 1000/1, 1002/1, 1003/1, 1004/1, 1005/1	Oppose	Seeks special provisions allowing for solar panels in Rangitoto bach community. The submission seeks to provide for solar power as a lesser activity status than the discretionary activity status provided for under the Plan (Rule 7.9.4).	The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submissions of DOC, which generally supports the approach adopted in the Proposed Plan, to recognise, identify and protect the significant buildings, objects and places of historical interest and values, and that is considered to accord with Part II of the Act.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
Steven J Davies	952/2	Oppose	<p>A historical type of village at Islington Bay involving all the bachs being faithfully rebuilt as true to original and 'caretaken' by the original family descendants where possible (including bachs 71, 72, 75, 78, 79, 92, 93, and 114).</p> <p>The submission seeks rebuilding of bachs and their inclusion in Appendix 1b - Schedule of Buildings, Objects, Properties and Places of Special Value – Inner Islands).</p>	<p>The relief sought is inconsistent with the primary submission of DOC, which generally supports the approach adopted in the Proposed Plan that accords with Part II of the Act, and in particular the protection of historic heritage. Any facsimile of rebuilt buildings will lack these historic heritage values. They will also potentially affect the recognised ecological values of Rangitoto Island, and will also be inconsistent with the Conservation Land Unit and the purposes for which DOC manages Rangitoto Island under the Conservation Act 1987.</p>

King, Rachel

From: Tapsell, Susanne
Sent: Tuesday, 29 May 2007 11:01
To: King, Rachel
Subject: FW: Proposed District Plan - Further Submissions
Attachments: DOC-further submissions HGIv2.pdf

From: Andrew Wilkinson [mailto:andrew@blakeyscott.co.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, 29 May 2007 10:45
To: hgiplan; Tapsell, Susanne
Subject: Proposed District Plan - Further Submissions

Hi there

We have identified a typographical error in the with regard to submission numbers references on pages 6 and 7 of the further submission document sent to Council yesterday on behalf of the Department of Conservation. We have made the necessary adjustment to the document, and have attached a revised version. The errors are only on pages 6 and 7; however for completeness we have rescanned the entire document.

It would be appreciated if you could dispose of the version sent yesterday and replace it with the document attached. Should you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me on 360 8531.

Regards,
Andrew

Andrew Wilkinson
Planning Consultant / Partner
Blakey Scott Planning Limited
Level 1, 218 Jervois Road, Herne Bay
P O Box 91168, AMSC 1142, AUCKLAND
Tel: (09) 360 8531 Fax: (09) 360 8561
Mob: 021 619 571 Email: andrew@blakeyscott.co.nz

Confidentiality:

The information contained in this email message (and any accompanying documents) is legally privileged and confidential. The information is intended solely for the recipient named in this message. If the person who receives this message is not the intended recipient you are notified that any review, use, disclosure, copying or distribution of this email or the information is prohibited. If you have received this message in error please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message and destroy the original message. Thank you.