

## Proposed Plan Change 25 - Indigenous Vegetation Summary of Submissions

Submission ID	Relief Sought	Submitter Name
1/1	We are opposed to the rationale behind the plan changes. ACC alter the rationale so as to make it completely consistent with the principles and strategies in EW [Essentially Waiheke]	Brian and Robin Griffiths
1/2	<p>Retain existing provisions with suggested amendments We oppose the indigenous vegetation plan change. The reason for opposing is that the existing provisions are adequate. In general the existing thresholds are appropriate.</p> <p>A degree of flexibility could however be built in to the provisions by giving stronger discretionary powers to an enhanced (more resources and more local personnel) tree inspection team.</p> <p>Discretion needs to be exercised regarding types of trees; eg a small (perhaps even smaller than 3m) rare tree variety is of greater value than a much taller common tree variety.</p> <p>ACC should retain the existing provisions with the amendments suggested above. This must include especially the abandonment of the "<i>restricted discretionary</i>" category and overall no relaxing of the provisions for third party involvement.</p>	*
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add allow for hand pruning with small handheld secateurs of trees.</li> <li>• Remove all references to girth of trees.</li> <li>• C. remove all reference to All indig veg. over 6 metres in height and replace with Manuka and Kanuka over 6m in height.</li> <li>• Table 1 % of clearance needs clarification re Timeframes. (is 50% the total clearance allowable for the lifetime of the property or are further applications allowed?)</li> <li>• B. Discretionary Activities c) Kanuka and Manuka only.</li> </ul>	Waiheke Community Board
3	The proposed changes should be withdrawn and public opinion sought at the end of the District Plan (HGI) operative time span.	Kristin Lewis
5	I wish to lodge the strongest objection to the proposed plan changes. I request that this [Plan Change 25] be completely withdrawn as it will result in a clearly undesirable outcome.	Michael Lee: Member Auckland Regional Council
6/1	Conditionally supports the approach taken [in] the Plan Modification if the increased leniency in some of the controls are coupled with mandatory responsibilities and obligations (in conjunction with the performance standards or conditions imposed in relation to activity applications) to reduce or completely alleviate the potential adverse effects of the relaxed controls.	The Cathcart Family
6/2	Modify the plan change to account for integrated management principles and sustainable development in conjunction with an adequate section 32 analysis.	*
6/3	Add a minimum girth measurement and root measurement to the dimensions in 6B.1.3.3(ii).	*
6/4	Add incentive mechanisms into the Plan Modification for people to plant native vegetation and maintain trees when they reach a height of 3 metres.	*
6/5	Modify the Plan Modification to make maintenance of overhead line clearances (tree trimming) by utility companies a permitted activity and develop strict performance standards set by arborists for this maintenance activity.	*
6/6	Modify the Plan Modification to recognise and protect against the adverse effects of sediment discharge that result from removal of significant	*

	amounts of all vegetation (not just native vegetation) from a site, by imposing performance standards for earthworks or by treatment of such activities as earthworks. If necessary, include cross-references in the vegetation clearance sections to earthworks.	*
6/7	Add under A (c) (ii), the following to the matters to which officers will restrict the exercise of discretion: (a) proximity to public reserves and public open spaces; and (b) the degree to which revegetation has occurred at the site.	*
6/8	Add after " <i>remedial planting</i> " in part A (c) (iv), the mitigation targeted for the remedial measures such as " <i>eg, to enhance/maintain privacy, to enhance on site drainage...</i> "	*
6/9	Modify/add to the provisions relating the removal of vegetation in Land Unit 4 that: (a) require a compelling reason to be provided for removal of vegetation; (b) adequately recognise and protect against earthworks and sediment discharge into these system (c) specifically require the stormwater and breeding habitat of these systems to be analysed and provided for prior to any vegetation clearance (including restrictions on the time frames such works can be undertaken); and (d) recognise that removal of natural areas of wetland function (or proposals that severely impact their function) should only be considered where off-site or increased on site mitigation is offered that expands/improves wetland areas.	*
7	Revision of the plan modifications that propose to impact on vegetation currently protected. Revision working party to include experienced arborists.	Greenscene Ltd.
8/1	[Plan Modification 25 is] not supported in [its] current form. Withdraw the proposed plan modification 25 until the statutory time for review of the Plan, allowing time for more explanation of the reasons they are being sought.	Awana Catchment Group Great Barrier Island
8/2	[Great Barrier Island] The criteria should be changed so that where an area of vegetation contains any trees greater than 600mm diameter or 6m in height then any vegetation clearance within that area should be discretionary and notifiable.	*
8/3	[Great Barrier Island] Permission to fell vegetation should require consideration of ecological, environmental; and amenity values, and notification of affected parties.	*
8/4	The proposals should be reworded to afford greater protection to areas of vegetation containing mature trees, rather than specifically relating to the size of trees that can be felled. Clearing such vegetation should always be discretionary and notifiable changes.	*
9	We OPPOSE in their entirety, the Plan Modifications 23-26 that seek to replace most of the provisions for ... Vegetation Clearance throughout most land units in the HGIDPlan. Should the ACity proceed with these Four Plan Modifications we seek that the Commissioners should decline the Plan Modifications 23-26 in their entirety.	Gulf District Plan Association Inc
10	I OPPOSE in their entirety, the Plan Modifications 23-26 that seek to replace most of the provisions for ... Vegetation Clearance throughout most land units in the HGIDPlan. Should the ACity proceed with these Four Plan Modifications I seek that the Commissioners should decline the Plan Modifications 23-26 in their entirety.	Jay Clarke
11	That the proposed plan changes be disallowed and that the Council recognises the unique environment and lifestyle of Waiheke.	Jacqui Furniss

12	That the plan changes be disallowed and that Council upholds the principle of community involvement at all times.	Kanya Stewart
13	Existing regulations should be retained.	Eve Harrison
14	I wish the Council to reject all four plan changes in their entirety.	Thomas Dietsche
15/1	The Council reject the proposed plan changes in their entirety. Refer to Essentially Waiheke, the existing HGIDP and the HGMPA.	Anne E Ripper
15/2	Oppose the introduction of the relaxed vegetation clearance control in LU 11. A clause to distinguish between Manuka/Kanuka and natives could be introduced to allow for more flexibility with more common species. Generally I believe the existing rules are sufficient and should be upheld.	*
17	The existing thresholds should be retained.	Jill Jackson
18	Retain existing controls. I object to the relaxation of current provisions relating to indigenous vegetation clearance. I wish the following decision from the Council. Retain the existing controls. Delay consideration of these changes until a proper public consultation occurs with the official review of the district plan in 2006.	Liz Ross
19	Do not allow increased density of housing - not Mt Roskill. We want more trees not more people. Reject and proposed changes which do not fit with [these points].	Yvette Hewlett
20	The increase in impermeable substances on properties means we need more not less, vegetation if substance left on lots to be sustainable. Retain the 3m rules especially on Land Unit 11. I oppose changes to the vegetation controls.	Judith Madarasz
21/1	I oppose proposed new clause 6B.3.3C and D(i) because this would allow clearance of significant areas of vegetation and important single plants.	Hanne Sorenson
21/2	I support proposed vegetation clearance restrictions for LU2.	*
21/3	I oppose proposed increase in the amount of indigenous vegetation that can be cleared from LU3 and 5 to 50%.	*
21/4	I oppose proposed decrease in indigenous vegetation clearance control for LU11.	*
22/1	Keep the permitted clearance height at 3m.	Robert Paul Morton
22/2	Do not implement the 600m at 1.5m above ground idea.	*
22/3	Do not ease the restrictions in Land Unit 11.	*
22/4	In LU's 1, 4, 7 and 9 clearance for access ways should stay included within the total allowable amount of clearance. I oppose any clearance of vegetation in LU 1 and 4.	*
23/1	Land Units 3 and 5 - Tree Height and Girth. I object to the proposed change to protected tree height and wish it to remain at 3 metres. I also object to the 600mm girth measurement as this would put at risk tall skinny species such as kowhai, nikau, cabbage trees, lancewood and any native vines such as rata and clematis.	Lynne Stewart
23/2	Land Units 3 and 5 – Vegetation Clearance I object to the proposed 50% of property clearance due to the likely size of these rural properties.	*
23/3	Land Unit 1 - Coastal Cliffs. I do not support any clearance of indigenous vegetation in this fragile area and object to the proposed changes.	*
23/4	Land Unit 4 - Wetland Systems. I object to this change. The few wetland systems we have left are too precious to be a non-notified discretionary activity.	*
23/5	Land Units 7 and 9. I object to this as a non-notified discretionary activity.	*
23/6	Accessways. I object to this not being included in total vegetation clearance allowed for a site.	*
23/7	Land Unit 11 - Traditional Residential. I object to proposed changes in tree height/girth for reasons stated in [23/1 and 23/2]	*

24/1	Perhaps some species taller than 3m can be removed depending on the species BUT it mustn't be allowed up to 6m for any natives.	Carol A Handin
24/2	The current proposed changes must not be allowed.	*
25	Turn down these changes.	Jill Yvette Robson
26	NOT allow any increase in the amount of vegetation cleared or permitting any clearance in areas previously not allowed.	Rhonda and John Griffiths
27/1	I oppose the adoption of this plan change for the following reasons: 1) No reason to change the present limit of 3m height and no girth limit. Protect the few trees we have left. 2) Apparently the system is working quite well now - why change it? 3) I reject the proposed plan modifications.	Susan Washington
28/1	That on Great Barrier Island, indigenous vegetation clearance of 50% should also apply to Land Units 6, 7, 8 & 9 and in particular Manuka and Kanuka. And that the clearing of Manuka/Kanuka be permitted activity in Land Units 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, & 9.	BWR Sanderson and The Workington Trust
28/2	That my objections be considered with fairness and justice thereby reflecting on the economic needs of the people resident on GBI.	*
29	That afforestation be allowed as a permitted activity on Great Barrier.	Martin Philip Mitchener
30/1	Support the proposed changes because it gives more flexibility to the landowner without detracting from aesthetic values.	Helen O'Shea
30/2	Maintain existing use rights for farmers and whoever name is on the title to the land.	*
31	Land Unit 6,7,8 should allow higher vegetation clearance. Flexibility with vegetation clearance, Maintenance of existing use rights, sensible attitude to scrub and rubbish ie. Ti Tree.	Mickey O'Shea
32	I support the increase in vegetation clearance = 50% of the property. That existing use rights be maintained. Scrub and Manuka under 4m in height have no protection and be cleared as of right.	Michael O Shea
33	I oppose the lessening of the indigenous vegetation clearance standards as proposed by this Plan Modification No 25. That the Council does not agree to the proposed plan modification.	Lynette Loris Reed
34/1	I oppose the proposed Plan Change as a whole in its present form for the following reasons:1. The Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plan places very considerable emphasis on the retention of open space, provision of "greenbelt" areas, and ameliorating development in such a way as to give significant weight to the protection of natural landforms, vegetation, coastal environments and visual amenities. The proposed changes are diametrically at odds with this fundamental principle.	Bruce Bisset
34/2	The three major (Church Bay, Te Whau and Owhanake) and several minor rural "lifestyle" subdivisions that have been developed on Waiheke in recent times. To allow extensive clearance of native bush is diametrically at odds with the increasing importance placed on revegetation as evidenced by the conditions successively imposed on existing subdivisions.	*
34/3	There appears to be no good reason for altering the height under which native vegetation may be cleared as of right in the HGI Plan, nor for introducing a girth measurement.	*
34/4	In addition the proposal does not appear to take account of, or at the least does not take adequate account of, the provisions of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000.	*
34/5	In respect of these reasons I seek that the proposed change be declined in its entirety or, failing that, be extensively and appropriately modified so as to give relief to the intent of these submissions.	*

35	Land Units 1, 4, 7 and 9. I oppose the proposed changes as the existing rules allow protection of these areas. That the existing rules remain in place.	Ann Jillian Tetley
36	Land Units 3 and 5. I oppose the proposed changes that allow increased clearance of vegetation as this will lead to further erosion. That existing indigenous vegetation rules remain in place.	*
37	Land Units 1, 4, 7 and 9. Clearance of indigenous vegetation. I oppose the relaxation of clearance restrictions in these Land Units as this would change the cover balance. That existing indigenous vegetation clearance rules be not changed.	Stephen James Tetley
38	Land Units 3 and 5. Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation. I oppose the relaxation of clearance restrictions on these land units as this would change the cover balance. That existing indigenous vegetation clearance rules be not changed.	*
40	The relaxation of provisions for Indigenous Vegetation clearance on Waiheke is not a desirable outcome for sustainability or environmental protection.	Gordon Shirley Hodson
41	Waiheke has very few mature native trees. Please leave the height restriction for clearing native trees at the present level of 3m.	Marilyn Smith
42	That the permitted height remains at 3m or that the 6m only relates to Kanuka/Manuka.	Katrina Anne Hastings
43	Leave the "3m maximum" rules - do not change to 6m.	Lynnette Lawry Gilmore
44	Retain the 3m rule especially in Land Unit 11 where tall vegetation is most needed.	Joan Kirk
45	These proposed changes do not go ahead.	Vanessa Pickering
46	The existing provisions in the District Plan be retained.	Stacey Shuck and Simon Griffiths
47	The proposed modification be rejected. The provisions in the present HG District Plan be upheld.	Leith Duncan
48	Please withdraw this plan change. Please retain existing height limit of 3m. Please stipulate no clearance as of right in land units 1,4, 7,9. I strongly object to the non-notified "restricted discretionary activity" category. Cost cutting should NOT be at the expense of sound decision making and should NOT restrict the opportunity of the community or individuals to have a say through the submission process about matters which affect them.	Lyndsay Lee Meager
49	I oppose proposed relaxation of indigenous vegetation clearance controls in Land Unit 11. In particular: Proposal to allow clearance of indigenous vegetation of up to 6 metres.. and proposal to allow clearance of a 3 metre strip of land around the outside perimeter of all structures I seek the following decision from Council; 1. Retain the existing provision for removal of indigenous vegetation up to 3 metres height as permitted activity. 2. Allow some clearance of larger manuka/kanuka as a discretionary activity. 3. Allow clearance of maximum of 1 metre (nb. not 3 metres as proposed) strip of land around the outside perimeter of residential structures to provide for maintenance.	Ann Jocelyn Kinghorn
50	I would like the Council to withdraw the plan change in favour of the status quo.	Janet Hunt
51	Retain the 3m rule on Land Unit 11.	Isobel Hawley
52/1	That Appendix D be amended to incorporate many more species of	Rainelia Wylde

	indigenous vegetation.	
52/2	That properties be inspected to establish all species present and have protection of a greater number of species established.	*
53	That Appendix D be expanded to include rare, endangered/threatened species of Waiheke flora.	Ivan Kitson
54	Oppose relaxation of clearance controls and raised clearance height. Do not relax controls.	Ivan Kitson
55	Amend Section 6B.1.3.3 to allow for the trimming of trees around powerlines to be a permitted activity.	Vector Limited
56	Blanket opposition to the process and the results.	Renaissance Aotearoa Foundation
57	Remove plan change 1D(i); C; and extension of clearance area for Land Unit 11 Vegetation clearance under 3m in height (iii) This will reduce the ability of native vegetation on the island to regenerate. Reduce minimum height to 1.5m	Dr. Lesley-Joan Stone
58	To retain the 3m limit for clearance of indigenous vegetation on L/U 3 or 5.	Donald Leigh Chapple
59	I oppose the change from 3m to 6m for clearing indigenous vegetation. Retain the current plan in relation to indigenous tree height.	Robyn Kaye Bailly
60	That the Council retains the protection of indigenous trees over 3m tall	Kristen Sorrenson
61	That the Council stay with a 3 metre clearance of indigenous vegetation and not adapt the proposed change of 6 metres in Land Unit 11/Traditional Residential.	Susan Grace Barker
62	That Great Barrier Island (private property) be exempt from any restrictions of clearing manuka of any size.	Charles George Blackwell
63	Implementation of 100% clearing on these classes [3, 5, 8] be a permitted activity on Great Barrier Island to encourage productivity and reduce fire hazard.	Martin Philip Mitchener
64	Vegetation clearance for the establishment of accessways should continue to be included within the total amount of indigenous vegetation clearance allowed for a site. That the Council rejects proposed plan change #25 in its entirety.	Lance Dixon and Isabel Fordham
70	The Society asks for the existing provisions in the operative plan to remain. We oppose 3 aspects of the new plan [including] Vegetation removal.	Omiha Welfare and Recreation Society Inc
71	Possibly look at a "new" settlement (centre). Consider the document produced by 'Essentially Waiheke' and keep Waiheke different from Auckland.	Margaret Ruth Humphrey
72	Turn down the proposed plan changes.	Cheryl Backstrom
73	Plan Change 25 be withdrawn until the 'first in the pipeline' "Essentially Waiheke" is formalised within the HGI Plan; Or ACity modify the proposed Plan Changes in favour of 'Variations' that reflect the community view.	Sue Fitchett
74	The proposed plan change removes the simplicity of the present rule.	Matiatia-Oneroa Ratepayers and Residents Assoc. Inc.
75/1	I request a change for Clause C for land units 3 and 5 on Waiheke to show no indigenous vegetation over 3 metres in height may be cleared.	Peter Lumsden
75/2	That Table 1 Standards for Permitted Activities Indigenous Vegetation Clearance be amended to show for land units 3 and 5 on Waiheke that the clearance limit for land unit 3 be 500m <sup>2</sup> and for land unit 5 be 1000m <sup>2</sup>	*
75/3	For Land Units 1, 3, 4,5 and 7 on Waiheke that the existing controls for clearance of indigenous vegetation in the operative district plan should apply.	*
77/1	Opposes clause 6B1.3.3(B). Requests that the cause be deleted and that manuka clearance require resource consent.	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated

		(EDS)
77/2	Opposes table 1 as follows : a) There does not appear to be a vegetation clearance limit in Land Units 6, 8, 20,21 or 22. Requests that the intention for these land units be clarified and that indigenous vegetation clearance be tightly controlled in these areas. b) In Land Unit 10 the provision for 1000m <sup>2</sup> of clearance is excessive and will significantly undermine the character and values of this land unit. Requests that no clearance be permitted in Land Unit 10 without resource consent, except for limited clearance by Department of Conservation for buildings or infrastructure, in accordance with an approved Conservation Management Plan for the land involved. c) Opposes the permitted activity limits for land units be restricted to 25%.	*
77/3	Opposes Clause 6C1.3.3(d). Any clearance in these sensitive areas must be prohibited.	*
77/4	Opposes Table 2 in part as follows: a) There does not appear to be a vegetation clearance limit in Land Units 6, 8,20,21 or 22. Requests that the intention for these land units be clarified and that indigenous vegetation clearance be tightly controlled in these areas. b) The clearance provided for by way of a non-notified application in Land Unit 1 and 4 is excessive and inappropriate. Any vegetation clearance in these land units should be non-complying.	*
77/5	Opposes all changes to the Operative Plan.	*
78	I oppose the inclusion of plan change.	Tim Knight
79	To reject the Plan changes in their present form.	Friends of the Okahuiti Wetlands
80	No relaxation of laws that protect natural environments.	Rodger Scott
81	Delay consideration of these changes until the 2006 review of the district plan.	Christopher John Braxton
82	That the proposed amendment is not approved.	R K Fraser
83/1	That the status quo be kept along with the inclusion of a minimum stem /trunk diameter or girth as part of tree protection.	Jeremy Warden
83/2	I oppose the plan modifications in Land Unit 3 and 5 for the following reasons: 1. It could eventually constitute large areas of vegetation removal. 2. Loss of wetland ecology habitat. 3. Deterioration of water quality. 4. Loss of visual amenity. 5. Loss of significant slower growing plants under 6m eg white maire, nikau etc. 6. Local loss of plant species. 7. Increased flooding and erosion potential.	*
83/3	Land Unit 3. 1. Loss of habitat. 2. Removal of old slow growing species under 6m 3. Proliferation of weed species due to increased light levels on land harvested of vegetation eg. prsoralea, gorse, pampas and smilax around Shoal Bay area.	*
83/4	Land Unit 5. Increased erosion on foothills once vegetation removed: therefore Effecting water quality especially in Tryphena Area. Loss of Visual Amenity from both sea (Tryphena) and air (Claris).	*
83/5	Vegetation Clearance in Land Units 1,4,7 and 9 should remain non permitted activities for the following reasons (used to be restricted discretionary) This would see significant increase in time, resources and compliance costs needed to assess all the criteria under this new class.	*
83/6	Introducing Restricted Discretionary as for 4-metre width of driveway access. The submitter disagrees with this activity as the criteria does not restrict vegetation removal to a set square m <sup>2</sup> .	*

83/7	Submitter commends the intention of Council to place a minimum stem radius as part of the tree protection.	*
84/1	We oppose the permission to remove indigenous vegetation on up to 50% of the lot area in Land Units 3 and 5 for vegetation less than 6m high and with girth less than 600mm. Permission for removal of indigenous vegetation be denied.	Susan and Kevin Smith
84/2	We oppose the proposal to allow manuka up to 6 metres in height to be removed on any Land Unit on Great Barrier Island.	*
85/1	I oppose the variation in total as it is unnecessary and inappropriate and contrary to sec.5(2)(a) R.M.A. and the H.G.M.P.A 2000 and NZCPS.	William Marcus McCandless
85/2	To remain with the existing provisions, policies, rules and objectives of the Operative District Plan (Hauraki Gulf Islands Section).	*
86/1	We consider inserting a new requirement relating to 6m height and 600mm girth for some land units is inconsistent with the operative plan and could cause confusion with people's expectation of what is permitted. We ask that Council retain the current 3m height and area controls.	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Of New Zealand: Hauraki Islands Branch
86/2	We oppose the changes to Land Units 3 and 5 to allow for increased clearance. We believe the existing rules are sufficient to achieve consistency with the objectives for productive farmland.	*
86/3	We oppose the changes to Land Units 1, 4, 7 and 9. We ask for existing controls and the non-notified discretionary status to remain.	*
86/4	The proposed definition of indigenous vegetation is we believe seriously flawed and inconsistent with the intent of the plan. The definition should be simplified so that it does not restrict consideration of what is native vegetation.	*
86/5	We oppose the relaxation of indigenous vegetation clearance controls for Land Unit 11. We ask for the existing controls to remain.	*
87	Farmer should be able to keep all of his cleared land clear - not 50%. Correct maps. Allow farmer to keep cleared land clear of scrub.	George Samuel Medland
88	For firewood purpose 6 metres height Manuka (0-50mm dia) is useless. Bigger Manuka is needed for firewood. Lift restriction on height.	W J Frieswijk
89	To reject the proposed plan change No 25 and introduce amendments and increase the protection of indigenous vegetation.	Judith Ackroyd
91/1	Great Barrier Community Board is very keen to support changes that reduce the overall cost of sustainable development and changes that are sympathetic to the traditional values and growth requirements of our communities.	Great Barrier Community Board
91/2	Great Barrier Community Board requests that harvesting of manuka/kanuka less than 8m or less than 800mm girth at 1.5m be a Permitted Activity in Land Units (GBI) 2,3,4,5,6,8,and 9.	*
91/3	Great Barrier Community Board request that Clause 6B.1.3.3.D be amended to include Land Units 1-11.	*
91/4	Great Barrier Community Board request that the exception under Clause 6B.1.3.3.D.(i) be changed to read "...permitted building platform & accessway...".	*
91/5	Great Barrier Community Board request that Clause 6B.1.3.3.C be amended to include Land Units 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9 and 10.	*
91/6	Great Barrier Community Board requests that Clause 6B.1.3.3.A be deleted.	*
91/7	Great Barrier Community Board request that Clause 6B.1.3.3.B be changed to read "...manuka/kanuka less than 8 meters in height or less than 800mm girth (measured at 1.5 metres), may be cleared. Great Barrier Community Board request that the plan reflect the above definition	*



	throughout.	
91/8	Great Barrier Community Board request that (for GBI) Table 1 Permitted Activities Indigenous Vegetation Clearance row 3.3 be modified as follows: LU1-not permitted LU2-50% of site area LU3-50% of site area LU4-50%of non swamp area of site LU5-50% of site area LU6-50% of site area LU7-not permitted LU8-50% of site area LU9-50% of site area LU10-10% of site area.	*
91/9	Great Barrier Community Board request that Clause 6C.1.3.3.A be deleted.	*
91/10	Great Barrier Community Board request that the proposed definition [Indigenous Vegetation] be deleted.	*
91/11	Great Barrier Community Board request that (for GBI) Table 2 Discretionary Activities Indigenous Vegetation Clearance row 3.3 be modified as follows: LU1-not specified-refer Part 6E. LU2-not specified-refer Part 6E LU3-100% of site area. LU4-100% of nonswamp area of site. LU5-100% of site area. LU6-100% of site area. LU7-not specified-refer Part 6E. LU8-100% of site area. LU9-100% of site area. LU10-not specified-refer Part 6E.	*
92	6B1.3.3 Add allow for hand pruning with small handheld secateurs of trees. Remove all references to girth of trees. C. remove all reference to All indig veg. over 6 metres in height and replace with Manuka and Kanuka over 6m in height. Table 1 % of clearance needs clarification re Timeframes. (is 50% the total clearance allowable for the lifetime of the property or are further applications allowed?) B. Discretionary Activities c) Kanuka and Manuka only.	Sean Deery
93	I oppose the proposed plan changes to part 6 of vegetation clearance standards. Leave the current standards for the above mentioned alone. Do not change them.	Kate Rowntree
94	I oppose the proposed plan changes to part 6 of vegetation clearance standards. Leave the current standards for the above mentioned alone. Do not change them.	Gregory John Cantwell