

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS9.8		Drayron, Terry	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Other	Ban the practise of burn offs and to introduce a more sustainable and ecological practice.		Out of scope outside TLA/DP function	
OS19.23		Fround, Kain	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Support	Support the Provision.	Accept		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS133.1		Woodfield, Kate	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	Opposes the provisions. All this land was cleared and used for farming long before the council was established.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS260.3		Gardiner, Roger	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	Add a classification or designation to the Wanaka Fish Hatchery wetland area located at Stone Street Wanaka, to recognize its significance and importance.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS281.2		Wakatipu Reforestation Trust	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Support	The addition of a policy encouraging native planting where appropriate as an alternative to planting exotic species.	Accept in Part		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS290.4		Ryan, Christine	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Support	Supports the provisions.	Accept		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS313.4		Langley, John	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Support	The plan needs to have a clear statement under Purpose which relates to enhancement of vegetation and biodiversity with supporting objectives and policies. That is increasing our indigenous vegetation and biodiversity both on private and public lands. Recommendation: The Plan should seek to reduce any further loss of indigenous vegetation. This should be stated under Purpose. Policy and objectives to such that if loss is unavoidable an equivalent "offsett" planting should be required either on the same site or elsewhere.	Accept in Part		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS315.11		The Alpine Group Limited	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	Remove the Significant Indigenous Vegetation on Minaret Station	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS339.125		Alty, Evan	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Other	Add assessment matters to assist decision makers to interpret the plan.	Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.18		Department of Conservation	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Other	Alter the structure of the indigenous vegetation and biodiversity provisions to ensure that these provisions are clear, easy for the community to use, and ensure that appropriate protection is applied when it comes to areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna.	Reject		Issue 1
OS373.58		Department of Conservation	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Other	Add a new schedule '33.10' that includes the criteria for determining the significance of indigenous biodiversity at a site.	Reject		Issue 1
OS378.37		Peninsula Village Limited and Wanaka Bay Limited (collectively referred to as "Peninsula Bay Joint Venture" (PBJV))	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity		Such further or other relief as is appropriate or desirable in order to take account of the concerns expressed in this submission	Reject		
OS380.58		Villa dellago	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Other	Encourage the movement away from annual scrub burning in the Wakatipu basin.		Out of scope outside TLA/DP function	
OS384.21		Glen Dene Ltd	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	Submission opposes criteria used to identify SNAs, as no defined objective criteria was used and no adequacy of protection evaluation	Reject		Entire report in particular the background
OS477.2		Clarke, Ian	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	Make maps in 33.9 accurate at the property level or use another mechanism to achieve the objectives of this rule.	Reject		Schedule 33.9
OS502.5		Allenby Farms Limited	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	Amend SNA area E18C as shown on the Map attached to this submission as Appendix 1.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS572.4		NZSki Limited	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Other	That the amendments to Chapter 33 of the PDP in relation to the Ski Area Sub-Zone, Ski Area Sub-Zone B and indigenous vegetation clearance are adopted as drafted in Attachments D to this submission.	Reject		33.1 Purpose. Objective 33.2.3. Objective 33.2.4. 33.3.4 Exemptions. Table 4 Alpine Environment.
OS600.138		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	All areas within the rural zones are removed from 33.9 Threatened Environment Classification Maps, with subsequent changes to the relevant provisions.	Reject		Entire report
OS706.117		Forest and Bird NZ	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity		Add assessment matters to assist decision makers to interpret the plan.	Reject		Objective 33.2.1

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS755.18		Guardians of Lake Wanaka	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity		Chapter has no specific acknowledgment of aquatic biodiversity or its protection. This chapter heading is misleading and should be revisited. Vegetation is "biodiversity".	Reject		TLA function. Regional Council Plans address land use on beds of waterbodies
OS784.12		Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity		Amend policy 33.2.1.5 to read 'Recognise anticipated activities in rural areas such as farming and the efficient use of land and resources while avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on significant indigenous biodiversity values where possible' or words to that effect.	Reject		Objective 33.2
OS788.2		Otago Fish and Game Council	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	The District Plan contains many references to indigenous biodiversity, and it appears that the term indigenous has been inserted in many locations without thought as to the effect of the qualification. See submission for further detail.	Reject		Entire report
OS788.3		Otago Fish and Game Council	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	The clearance of streamside vegetation has an effect on the habitat of trout or salmon, and this has not been stated or considered within the District Plan.	Reject		Entire report including function to maintain indigenous biodiversity.
OS806.206		Queenstown Park Limited	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity		QPL does not support the location or the extent of the four SNAs identified on its land. QPL considers that the proposed Queenstown Park Special Zone would ensure development that supports retention and enhancement of the indigenous vegetation and biodiversity values would be achieved. Should the Council decline the relief seeking the Queenstown Park Special Zone, QPL requests that the SNAs be removed from its land and the clearance of vegetation be enabled throughout the site. (a) That a Special Zone is applied to Queenstown Park and the SNAs be removed from QPL's land; or (b) If the request for a Special Zone to apply to Queenstown Park is declined, then QPL requests that the SNAs are deleted from the site and the clearance of indigenous vegetation is permitted.	Reject	Deferred to the hearing on mapping	33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS829.6		Anderson Branch Creek Ltd	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity		consideration of already protected indigenous vegetation and biodiversity [by way of covenants and DoC lands] has been left out of the plan and reference should be made to this in the rules and reference to what is already protected within the QLDC area be a consideration when applying them. (refer to full submission for clarity).	Accept in Part		These areas are exempt from SNA's. The Council need to assess all land in order to fulfil its function under s31 of the RMA.
OS829.7		Anderson Branch Creek Ltd	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity		Maintain consistency with metric system as it can be confusing when rules change between m2 to hectares.	Reject		Retain as proposed
OS829.8		Anderson Branch Creek Ltd	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity		The size of areas permitted to be cleared within an area should be tied to a percentage of land holding [.05 of a hectare is big on a ¼ ha section but on a 6000 ha farm is not] this needs to be more relative to whole landholding.	Reject		Retain as proposed
OS829.9		Anderson Branch Creek Ltd	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity		The time span of {not more than..... within any 5 yr period} is too restrictive for a lot farming activities.	Reject		Time span is appropriate in this context.
FS1015.1	313.4	Straterra	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	I seek that 313.4 be <i>allowed</i> , subject to the proposed amendments below: "The plan needs to have a clear statement under Purpose which relates to <u>maintenance and</u> enhancement of vegetation and biodiversity with supporting objectives and policies. That is <u>maintaining and</u> increasing our indigenous vegetation and biodiversity both on private and public lands. Recommendation: The Plan should seek to reduce any further loss of indigenous vegetation. This should be stated under Purpose. Policy and objectives to such that if loss is unavoidable an equivalent "offset" planting, <u>or other compensatory measures</u> , should be required either on the same site or elsewhere."	Reject		Purpose and entire report
FS1021.1	133.1	Woodfield, Kate	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Support	I seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1034.138	600.138	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1040.17	373.58	Forest and Bird	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Support	Support	Reject		Issue 1
FS1040.61	600.138	Forest and Bird	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	Oppose	Accept		Entire report
FS1049.37	378.37	LAC Property Trustees Limited	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	The submitter seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in Part		Relates to general opposition to a rezoning request
FS1080.14	572.4	Director General of Conservation	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	The Departments preference is for vegetation clearance, where it occurs on public conservation lands, to be subject to controls under the Resource Management Act including appropriate protection under section 6(c). Conservation Act approvals do not duplicate the District Council's responsibilities under section 31(b) of the Resource Management Act.	Accept		33.3.4 Exemptions

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1091.8	384.21	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Support	Allow.	Reject		Entire report in particular the background
FS1095.37	378.37	Nick Brasington	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	Allowing the proposed development will undermine the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("the Act") and any notion of sustainable management within Peninsula Bay. The site is in an Outstanding Natural Landscape and within the previously agreed Open Space Zone. Further development in this area does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. The consequent loss of open space will have adverse effects on those properties that currently exist in the area. The submitter seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	Relates to general opposition to a rezoning request
FS1097.1	9.8	Queenstown Park Limited	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's original submission.		Out of scope outside TLA/DP function	
FS1097.141	313.4	Queenstown Park Limited	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Support	Support for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Reject		Purpose and entire report
FS1097.254	380.58	Queenstown Park Limited	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.		Out of scope outside TLA/DP function	
FS1097.255	384.21	Queenstown Park Limited	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Support	Support for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission	Reject		Entire report in particular the background
FS1097.523	572.4	Queenstown Park Limited	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Support	Support the intent of the suggested changes for the reasons stated in QPL's original submission.	Reject		33.3.4 Exemptions
FS1162.171	706.117	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.2
FS1209.138	600.138	Burdon, Richard	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Support	Support entire submission	Reject		Entire report
FS1254.3	373.18	Allenby Farms Limited	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1254.40	373.58	Allenby Farms Limited	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1254.105	706.117	Allenby Farms Limited	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1287.5	373.18	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1287.131	706.117	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.4
FS1313.5	373.18	Darby Planning LP	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Issue 1

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1313.44	373.58	Darby Planning LP	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1329.16	572.4	Soho Ski Area Ltd and Blackmans Creek Holdings No. 1 LP	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Support	We seek that the part of the submission relating to Policy 32.3.4.8 be allowed to the extent it is consistent with Soho's original submission. Soho supports the addition of the new policy to Chapter 33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity proposed to recognise the continued terrain development. However, Soho is unclear on what is intended to flow from the proposed policy in terms of the methods to support the regard to re-establishment and/or rehabilitation of indigenous vegetation communities where practicable.	Reject		33.3.4 Exemptions
FS1329.17	572.4	Soho Ski Area Ltd and Blackmans Creek Holdings No. 1 LP	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity		Support/Oppose We seek that Rule 33.5.11 be amended to the extent it is inconsistent with Soho's original submission. Soho supports the concept, but opposes the addition of the proposed new rule relating to the clearance of indigenous vegetation within the SASZ's located within Public Conservation Land. The rule could be avoided through the exemption proposed in the submission by Soho, or alternatively should be expanded to include Indigenous vegetation clearance undertaken on land managed under the Conservation Act in accordance with a Conservation Management Strategy or Concession; Under the Land Act, in accordance with a Recreation Permit; or the Reserve Act in accordance with a Reserve Management Strategy.	Reject		33.3.4 Exemptions
FS1330.9	572.4	Treble Cone Investments Limited	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Support	seek that the part of the submission relating to Policy 32.3.4.8 be allowed to the extent it is consistent with TC's original submission and for the reasons expressed within this further submission.	Reject		33.3.4 Exemptions
FS1330.10	572.4	Treble Cone Investments Limited	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity		Support/Oppose - seek that Rule 33.5.11 be amended to the extent it is inconsistent with TC's original submission and for the reasons expressed within this further submission.	Reject		33.3.4 Exemptions
FS1347.35	373.18	Lakes Land Care	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
FS1347.75	373.58	Lakes Land Care	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.73		Alty, Evan	33.1 Purpose	Support	Generally support with the exception of amendments.	Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS339.74		Alty, Evan	33.1 Purpose	Other	Amend first paragraph as follows: <i>The District contains a diverse range of habitats that support indigenous plants and animals, including species that are endemic to the district, threatened either nationally or regionally. Distinctive habitats include comprising forests, shrubland, herb fields, tussock grasslands, wetlands, lake and river margins. Indigenous biodiversity is also an important component of ecosystem services and the District's landscapes.</i>	Accept in Part		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS339.75		Alty, Evan	33.1 Purpose	Other	Amend third paragraph as follows: Significant adverse effects resulting from removal clearance of indigenous vegetation should be avoided. Where the adverse effects are not significant and cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated and would diminish the District's indigenous biodiversity values, opportunities for the protection, restoration and enhancement of other similar habitats areas are encouraged to offset the adverse effects of clearance and ensure no net the loss and preferably a net gain of those indigenous biodiversity values. Biodiversity offsetting should not be applied to justify impacts on vulnerable and irreplaceable biodiversity values or biodiversity values which cannot be offset. - -	Reject		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS339.76		Alty, Evan	33.1 Purpose	Other	Amend final paragraph as follows: <i>The District's lowlands comprising the lower slopes of mountain ranges and valley floors have been modified by urban growth, farming activities and rural residential development. Much of the indigenous vegetation habitat has been removed, or modified, and the remaining remnants are likely to be vulnerable and important to retain. These areas are identified in the Land Environments of New Zealand Threatened Environment Classification as either acutely or chronically threatened environments, having less than 20% indigenous vegetation remaining.</i>	Reject		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.19		Department of Conservation	33.1 Purpose	Other	Amend the wording of 33.1 Purpose (paragraph 4) as follows: The limited removal of indigenous vegetation <u>not determined to be significant</u> is permitted, with discretion applied through the resource consent process to ensure that indigenous vegetation clearance activities exceeding the permitted limits protect, maintain or enhance indigenous biodiversity values. Where the removal of indigenous vegetation cannot be avoided or mitigated and would diminish the District's indigenous biodiversity values, opportunities for the enhancement of other areas are encouraged to offset the adverse effects of the loss of those indigenous biodiversity values. <u>Where indigenous vegetation in an area described as a Significant Natural Area in the district plan, or is determined to be an Significant Natural Area through a site specific ecological assessment, then any removal of indigenous vegetation required will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances, and where through a resource consent process the adverse effects of the activity are demonstrated as being avoided, remedied or mitigated. Biodiversity off-sets will be required to manage any residual adverse effects that cannot otherwise be mitigated.</u> Or wording of a similar effect.	Reject		Issue 1
OS600.114		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.1 Purpose	Support	Activities involving the efficient use of land including ski-field development within identified Ski Area Sub Zones, farming, fence, road and track construction can be reasonably expected to be undertaken providing such activities maintain or enhance the District's indigenous biodiversity values. This section is retained within the Purpose and reflected throughout the subsequent objectives, rules and policies.	Accept		33.1 Purpose
OS706.65		Forest and Bird NZ	33.1 Purpose	Support	Generally support with the exception of amendments.	Accept in Part		33.1 Purpose
OS706.66		Forest and Bird NZ	33.1 Purpose		Amend first paragraph as follows: The District contains a diverse range of habitats that support indigenous plants and animals, <u>including species that are endemic to the district, threatened either nationally or regionally. Distinctive habitats include comprising forests, shrubland, herb fields, tussock grasslands, wetlands, lake and river margins. Indigenous biodiversity is also an important component of ecosystem services and the District's landscapes.</u>	Accept in Part		33.1 Purpose
OS706.67		Forest and Bird NZ	33.1 Purpose		Amend third paragraph as follows: Significant adverse effects resulting from removal clearance of indigenous vegetation should be avoided. Where the adverse effects are not significant and cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated and would diminish the District's indigenous biodiversity values, opportunities for the protection, restoration and enhancement of other similar habitats areas are encouraged to offset the adverse effects of clearance and ensure no net the loss and preferably a net gain of those indigenous biodiversity values. Biodiversity offsetting should not be applied to justify impacts on vulnerable and irreplaceable biodiversity values or biodiversity values which cannot be offset. - -	Reject		33.1 Purpose

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS706.68		Forest and Bird NZ	33.1 Purpose		Amend final paragraph as follows: The District's lowlands comprising the lower slopes of mountain ranges and valley floors have been modified by urban growth, farming activities and rural residential development. Much of the indigenous vegetation habitat has been removed, or modified, and the remaining remnants are likely to be vulnerable and important to retain. These areas are identified in the Land Environments of New Zealand Threatened Environment Classification as either acutely or chronically threatened environments, having less than 20% indigenous vegetation remaining.	Reject		33.1 Purpose
OS755.19		Guardians of Lake Wanaka	33.1 Purpose		"Purpose" states "Much of the indigenous vegetation habitat has been removed" - in fact removal will also be a consequence for all of the very many other organisms dependent on vegetation. Also what about aquatic environments? Lakes, rivers streams, wetlands and aquifers are all rich habitats for biodiversity –but are not mentioned in the Purpose.	Reject		Requested relief overlaps with functions of the Otago Regional and activities on the bed of of lakes and rivers. QLDC primary function is to maintain indigenous biodiversity on land, including themargin of waterbodies and ephemeral waterbodies.
FS1015.11	339.75	Straterra	33.1 Purpose	Oppose	I seek that 339.75 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: "Significant Adverse effects resulting from clearance of indigenous vegetation should be avoided, <u>remedied or mitigated, and w</u> . Where <u>residual</u> the adverse effects are not significant and cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated and would diminish the District's indigenous biodiversity values, opportunities for the protection, restoration and enhancement of other similar habitats areas are encouraged to offset <u>or otherwise compensate for</u> the adverse effects of clearance and ensure no net the loss and preferably a net gain of those indigenous biodiversity values, <u>where applicable, and otherwise compensated for</u> . Biodiversity offsetting should not be applied to justify impacts on vulnerable and irreplaceable biodiversity values or biodiversity values which cannot be offset."	Reject		33.1 Purpose
FS1015.24	373.19	Straterra	33.1 Purpose	Oppose	I seek that 373.19 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: "The limited removal of indigenous vegetation not determined to be significant is permitted, with discretion applied through the resource consent process to ensure that indigenous vegetation clearance activities exceeding the permitted limits protect, maintain or enhance indigenous biodiversity values, <u>as appropriate in the circumstances</u> . Where the removal of indigenous vegetation cannot be avoided, <u>remedied or mitigated</u> , and would diminish the District's indigenous biodiversity values, opportunities for the enhancement of other areas are encouraged to offset <u>or otherwise compensate for</u> the adverse effects of the loss of those indigenous biodiversity values. Where indigenous vegetation in an area described as a Significant Natural Area in the district plan, or is determined to be an Significant Natural Area through a site specific ecological assessment, then any removal of indigenous vegetation required will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances, and where through a resource consent process, <u>in which</u> the adverse effects of the activity are demonstrated as being avoided, remedied or mitigated. Biodiversity off-sets <u>or other compensatory measures</u> will be required to manage any residual adverse effects that cannot otherwise be mitigated. Or wording of a similar effect."	Reject		Issue 1
FS1015.115	706.67	Straterra	33.1 Purpose	Oppose	I seek that 706.67 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: "Significant Adverse effects resulting from clearance of indigenous vegetation should be avoided, <u>remedied or mitigated. Residual adverse effects should be managed via</u> Where the adverse effects are not significant and cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated and would diminish the District's indigenous biodiversity values, opportunities for the protection, restoration and enhancement of other similar habitats are encouraged to offset or otherwise <u>compensate</u> for the adverse effects of clearance and ensure no net loss and preferably a net gain of those indigenous biodiversity values, <u>in the case of offsets, and otherwise, to provide an appropriate level of mitigation and compensation</u> . Biodiversity offsetting should not be applied to justify impacts on vulnerable and irreplaceable biodiversity values or biodiversity values which cannot be offset."	Reject		33.1 Purpose
FS1034.114	600.114	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.1 Purpose	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1040.9	373.19	Forest and Bird	33.1 Purpose	Support	Support	Reject		Issue 1
FS1097.167	339.75	Queenstown Park Limited	33.1 Purpose	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Reject		33.1 Purpose
FS1097.219	373.19	Queenstown Park Limited	33.1 Purpose	Oppose	The submitter requests that limited removal of indigenous vegetation only applies where the vegetation is not significant. This is opposed; there are times where removal of vegetation is necessary and on balance can result in better environmental outcomes.	Reject		Issue 1 and 33.1
FS1097.539	600.114	Queenstown Park Limited	33.1 Purpose	Support	Support the intent of the suggested changes.	Reject		33.1 Purpose

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1162.119	706.65	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.1 Purpose	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		33.1 Purpose
FS1162.120	706.66	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.1 Purpose	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		33.1 Purpose
FS1162.121	706.67	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.1 Purpose	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		33.1 Purpose
FS1162.122	706.68	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.1 Purpose	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		33.1 Purpose
FS1209.114	600.114	Burdon, Richard	33.1 Purpose	Support	Support entire submission	Accept		33.1 Purpose
FS1254.4	373.19	Allenby Farms Limited	33.1 Purpose	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1254.53	706.65	Allenby Farms Limited	33.1 Purpose	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		33.1 Purpose
FS1254.54	706.66	Allenby Farms Limited	33.1 Purpose	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		33.1 Purpose
FS1254.55	706.67	Allenby Farms Limited	33.1 Purpose	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		33.1 Purpose
FS1254.56	706.68	Allenby Farms Limited	33.1 Purpose	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		33.1 Purpose
FS1287.6	373.19	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.1 Purpose	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1287.92	706.66	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.1 Purpose	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		33.1 Purpose
FS1287.93	706.67	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.1 Purpose	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		33.1 Purpose
FS1287.94	706.68	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.1 Purpose	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		33.1 Purpose
FS1313.4	373.19	Darby Planning LP	33.1 Purpose	Support	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL supports the concept of biodiversity offsetting as a means of promoting the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1342.27	373.19	Te Anau Developments Limited	33.1 Purpose	Oppose	Not allow relief sought (or other similar relief south by another submitter) unless otherwise agreed through the submission process	Reject		Issue 1 and 33.1
FS1347.36	373.19	Lakes Land Care	33.1 Purpose	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS798.4		Otago Regional Council	33.2 Objectives and Policies	Support	- The submitter supports proposed provisions for the identification and protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitat of indigenous fauna, threatened species and biodiversity values, which is consistent with the Proposed RPS.	Accept		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1287.143	798.4	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2 Objectives and Policies	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as it supports the provisions in the Proposed Plan as notified relating to indigenous vegetation and biodiversity	Reject		Entire report

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS339.5		Alty, Evan	33.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Raises concerns with the ability of this objective and policies that follow. There need to be clear references with each other.	Reject		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS339.77		Alty, Evan	33.2.1 Objective 1	Support	Supports the objective.	Accept		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS339.87		Alty, Evan	33.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Add new policy: Facilitate and support restoration of degraded natural ecosystems and indigenous habitats using where possible indigenous species that naturally occur and/or previously occurred in the area.	Reject		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.20		Department of Conservation	33.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Amend Objective 33.2.1 as follows: Protect, maintain and enhance indigenous biodiversity. Existing indigenous biodiversity values are protected, maintained or enhanced	Reject		Objective 33.2.1
OS373.30		Department of Conservation	33.2.1 Objective 1	Other	A new policy under this objective is required to ensure clearance of vegetation along the margins of waterways is managed appropriately for the purpose of limiting erosion as well as reducing impacts on natural character and biodiversity values of riparian margins. This new policy is a repositioning of proposed Policies 33..2.3.1 and 33.2.3.6	Reject		Issue 1
OS378.29		Peninsula Village Limited and Wanaka Bay Limited (collectively referred to as "Peninsula Bay Joint Venture" (PBJV))	33.2.1 Objective 1	Support	Supports Objective 33.2.1 and associated Policies Policy 33.2.1.6 to 33.2.1.8. Retain the provisions as notified.	Accept		33.2 Objective 1
OS600.115		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Objective 33.2.1 is rewritten as follows - Protect, maintain and or enhance the stock of indigenous biodiversity.	Reject		Offers no added value
OS706.69		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.1 Objective 1	Support	Supports the objective.	Accept		33.2 Objective 1
OS706.79		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.1 Objective 1		Add new policy: Facilitate and support restoration of degraded natural ecosystems and indigenous habitats using where possible indigenous species that naturally occur and/or previously occurred in the area.	Accept		33.2 Objective 1
OS755.20		Guardians of Lake Wanaka	33.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Support the intent of the objective and all of the many policies in this chapter but suggest that some deficiencies include the absence of clear definitions of the animal size cut-off for any quantitative assessments of biodiversity, the absence of mention of any metrics of biodiversity which might help determine whether objectives are being achieved, or capable of being achieved, the absence of specific mention in objectives or policies of biodiversity in aquatic ecosystems, and in some cases referring to vegetation as if it is all of the biodiversity in the habitats mentioned	Reject		The requests sought are too specific and relate to determining significance, are not appropriate for a resource management policy framework.
OS806.207		Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	Amend provisions to promote and encourage land management practices that result in protection and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS806.213		Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.1 Objective 1	Support	New policy - Insert new Policy 33.2.1.X: <u>To recognise that activities that by necessity result in indigenous vegetation clearance can result in long term sustainable management benefits.</u>	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1034.115	600.115	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1040.54	600.115	Forest and Bird	33.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	Oppose	Accept		33.2 Objective 1

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1049.29	378.29	LAC Property Trustees Limited	33.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	The submitter seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	Relates to general opposition of any submission lodged by Peninsula Bay Joint Venture
FS1095.29	378.29	Nick Brasington	33.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	Allowing the proposed development will undermine the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("the Act") and any notion of sustainable management within Peninsula Bay. The site is in an Outstanding Natural Landscape and within the previously agreed Open Space Zone. Further development in this area does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. The consequent loss of open space will have adverse effects on those properties that currently exist in the area. The submitter seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	Relates to general opposition of any submission lodged by Peninsula Bay Joint Venture
FS1097.173	339.87	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	Submitter suggests inserting new policy; the amendment is too directive and fails to enable sustainable management.	Reject		Objective 33.2.1
FS1162.123	706.69	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		33.2 Objective 1
FS1162.133	706.79	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		33.2 Objective 1
FS1209.115	600.115	Burdon, Richard	33.2.1 Objective 1	Support	Support entire submission	Reject		Offers no added value
FS1254.5	373.20	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.1
FS1254.15	373.30	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1254.57	706.69	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Reject		33.2 Objective 1
FS1254.67	706.79	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Reject		33.2 Objective 1
FS1287.7	373.20	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.1
FS1287.17	373.30	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1287.102	706.79	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Reject		33.2 Objective 1

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1313.6	373.20	Darby Planning LP	33.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.1
FS1313.16	373.30	Darby Planning LP	33.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1342.28	373.20	Te Anau Developments Limited	33.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	Not allow relief sought (or other similar relief south by another submitter) unless otherwise agreed through the submission process	Reject		Objective 33.2.1
FS1342.35	373.30	Te Anau Developments Limited	33.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	Not allow relief sought (or other similar relief south by another submitter) unless otherwise agreed through the submission process	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1347.37	373.20	Lakes Land Care	33.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
FS1347.47	373.30	Lakes Land Care	33.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.78		Alty, Evan	33.2.1.1	Other	Amend as follows: <i>Identify <u>and protect</u> the District's Significant Natural Areas and schedule them in the District Plan, including the ongoing identification <u>and protection</u> of Significant Natural Areas through resource consent applications, using the criteria set out in Policy 33.2.1.9.</i>	Reject		Objective 33.2.1
OS373.21		Department of Conservation	33.2.1.1	Other	Delete Policy 33.2.1.1 and add the intent of this policy to wording to be included in a new Policy 33.2.2.1 under Objective 33.2.2.	Reject		Issue 1 and Objective 33.2.1
OS590.7		Kane, Sam	33.2.1.1	Oppose	Policy 33.2.1.1 is removed	Reject		33.2.1.1
OS600.116		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.1.1	Support	Policy 33.2.1.1 is adopted as proposed.	Accept		33.2.1.1
OS706.70		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.1.1		Amend as follows: <i>Identify <u>and protect</u> the District's Significant Natural Areas and schedule them in the District Plan, including the ongoing identification <u>and protection</u> of Significant Natural Areas through resource consent applications, using the criteria set out in Policy 33.2.1.9.</i>	Reject		33.2.1.1

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1015.116	706.70	Straterra	33.2.1.1	Oppose	I seek that 706.70 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: "Identify and protect the District's Significant Natural Areas and schedule them in the District Plan, including the ongoing identification and protection of Significant Natural Areas through resource consent applications, using the criteria set out in Policy 33.2.1.9."	Accept in Part		33.2.1.1
FS1034.116	600.116	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.2.1.1	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1097.168	339.78	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.1.1	Oppose	Submitter requests insertion of the word 'protect' This is opposed; requiring protection is too directive and fails to enable sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.1
FS1162.124	706.70	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.1.1	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		33.2.1.1
FS1209.116	600.116	Burdon, Richard	33.2.1.1	Support	Support entire submission	Accept		33.2.1.1
FS1254.6	373.21	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.1.1	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Issue 1 and Objective 33.2.1
FS1254.58	706.70	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.1.1	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		33.2.1.1
FS1287.8	373.21	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.1.1	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Issue 1 and Objective 33.2.1
FS1287.95	706.70	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.1.1	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		33.2.1.1
FS1313.7	373.21	Darby Planning LP	33.2.1.1	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Issue 1 and Objective 33.2.1
FS1342.29	373.21	Te Anau Developments Limited	33.2.1.1	Oppose	Not allow relief sought (or other similar relief sought by another submitter) unless otherwise agreed through the submission process	Accept in Part		Issue 1 and Objective 33.2.1
FS1347.38	373.21	Lakes Land Care	33.2.1.1	Oppose	Opposes over-sewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.6		Alty, Evan	33.2.1.2	Other	Raises concerns with the ability of Objective 3.2.4.3 and Policies 33.2.1.1 and 33.2.17 to protect rare or threatened indigenous species	Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS339.79		Alty, Evan	33.2.1.2	Support	Supports the policy.	Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS373.22		Department of Conservation	33.2.1.2	Other	Support in part for Policy 33.2.1.2. It is recommended that this policy is moved and combined with policies under Objective 33.2.2. The presence of threatened species either nationally or at a district level is generally a factor in determining a site to be significant under the significance criteria (refer to policy 33.2.1.9b). Therefore it is recommended to replace this policy with a new policy that refers to the criteria for determining ecological significance in line with that detailed in Policy 33.2.1.9 as well as the list of threatened species in section 33.7	Reject		Issue 1
OS600.117		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.1.2	Support	Policy 33.2.1.2 is adopted as proposed.	Accept		33.2.1.2
OS706.71		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.1.2	Support	Supports the policy.	Accept		33.2.1.2
FS1034.117	600.117	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.2.1.2	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1162.125	706.71	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.1.2	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		33.2.1.2
FS1209.117	600.117	Burdon, Richard	33.2.1.2	Support	Support entire submission	Accept in Part		33.2.1.2
FS1254.7	373.22	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.1.2	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept		Issue 1
FS1254.59	706.71	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.1.2	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Reject		33.2.1.2
FS1287.9	373.22	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.1.2	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept		Issue 1
FS1313.8	373.22	Darby Planning LP	33.2.1.2	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1342.30	373.22	Te Anau Developments Limited	33.2.1.2	Oppose	Not allow relief sought (or other similar relief sought by another submitter) unless otherwise agreed through the submission process	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1347.39	373.22	Lakes Land Care	33.2.1.2	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.80		Alty, Evan	33.2.1.3	Other	Amend as follows: <i>Provide standards in the District Plan for the protection maintenance and enhancement of indigenous vegetation that is not identified as a Significant Natural Area or threatened species, which are practical to apply and that permit the removal clearance of a limited area of indigenous vegetation in specified circumstances.</i>	Reject		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS373.23		Department of Conservation	33.2.1.3	Other	Amend Policy 33.2.1.3 as follows: Provide standards in the District Plan for <u>activities that involve clearance of</u> indigenous vegetation that is not identified as a Significant Natural Area or threatened species, which are practical to apply and that permit the removal of a limited area of indigenous vegetation <u>in specified circumstances.</u>	Reject		Issue 1
OS600.118		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.1.3	Support	Policy 33.2.1.3 is adopted as proposed.	Accept		Objective 33.2.1
OS706.72		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.1.3		Amend as follows: Provide standards in the District Plan for <u>the protection maintenance and enhancement of</u> indigenous vegetation that is not identified as a Significant Natural Area or threatened species, which are practical to apply and that permit the removal clearance of a limited area of indigenous vegetation in specified circumstances.	Reject		33.2.1.3
FS1015.25	373.23	Straterra	33.2.1.3	Oppose	I seek that 373.23 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: "Provide standards in the District Plan for <u>permitted or controlled</u> activities that involve clearance of indigenous vegetation that is not identified as a Significant Natural Area or threatened species, which are practical to apply and that permit the removal of a limited area of indigenous vegetation in specified circumstances."	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1015.117	706.72	Straterra	33.2.1.3	Oppose	I seek that 706.72 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: "Provide standards in the District Plan <u>in respect of permitted and controlled activities</u> for the protection- <u>managementintenance and enhancement</u> of indigenous vegetation that is not identified as a Significant Natural Area or threatened species, which are practical to apply and that permit the clearance of a limited area of indigenous vegetation in specified circumstances."	Reject		33.2.1.3
FS1034.118	600.118	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.2.1.3	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1040.10	373.23	Forest and Bird	33.2.1.3	Support	Support	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1097.169	339.80	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.1.3	Oppose	Submitter requests amendment that strengthens the provisions unnecessarily. The amendments are too directive and fails to enable sustainable management.	Accept in Part		33.2.1.2
FS1097.220	373.23	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.1.3	Oppose	The amendments suggested by the submitter are not necessary nor practical.	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1162.126	706.72	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.1.3	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		33.2.1.3
FS1209.118	600.118	Burdon, Richard	33.2.1.3	Support	Support entire submission	Accept		33.2.1.3
FS1254.8	373.23	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.1.3	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1254.60	706.72	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.1.3	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		33.2.1.3
FS1287.10	373.23	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.1.3	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1287.96	706.72	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.1.3	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		33.2.1.3

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1313.9	373.23	Darby Planning LP	33.2.1.3	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1342.31	373.23	Te Anau Developments Limited	33.2.1.3	Oppose	Not allow relief sought (or other similar relief south by another submitter) unless otherwise agreed through the submission process	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1347.40	373.23	Lakes Land Care	33.2.1.3	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.81		Alty, Evan	33.2.1.4	Support	Supports the policy.	Accept		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.24		Department of Conservation	33.2.1.4	Other	Amend Policy 33.2.1.4 as follows: <i>Recognise Kai Tahu as kaitiaki and provide for Kai Tahu values and principles in providing for the maintenance of indigenous species and habitats. and take into account the values of tangata-whenua and kaitiakitanga.</i>	Reject		Issue 1 and Objective 33.2.1
OS706.73		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.1.4	Support	Supports the policy.	Accept		Issue 1 and Objective 33.2.1
OS806.208		Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.1.4	Oppose	Delete policy 33.2.1.4.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1097.221	373.24	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.1.4	Oppose	The amendments suggested by the submitter are not necessary nor practical.	Accept in Part		Issue 1 and Objective 33.2.1
FS1162.127	706.73	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.1.4	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		Issue 1 and Objective 33.2.1
FS1254.9	373.24	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.1.4	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Issue 1 and Objective 33.2.1
FS1254.61	706.73	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.1.4	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Reject		Issue 1 and Objective 33.2.1
FS1287.11	373.24	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.1.4	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Issue 1 and Objective 33.2.1

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1313.10	373.24	Darby Planning LP	33.2.1.4	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Issue 1 and Objective 33.2.1
FS1347.41	373.24	Lakes Land Care	33.2.1.4	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.82		Alty, Evan	33.2.1.5	Other	Amend as follows: <i>Recognise anticipated activities in rural areas such as farming and the efficient use of land and resources while having regard to however these must be undertaken in a way that protects the significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna and maintains and enhances indigenous biodiversity. the maintenance, protection or enhancement of indigenous biodiversity values.</i>	Reject		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.25		Department of Conservation	33.2.1.5	Oppose	Policy 33.2.1.5 is opposed. As the rules that give effect to these policies apply to all zones in the district it is unclear why a policy specific to rural land uses is required. The adverse effects of any indigenous vegetation clearance may be balanced against the benefits of a land use activity as a matter of course in making a decision under section 104 RMA. Given that, this policy adds no further value and is not reflected in the rules for this chapter.	Reject		Issue 1
OS600.119		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.1.5	Support	Policy 33.2.1.5 is adopted as proposed.	Accept		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.5
OS701.14		Kane, Paul	33.2.1.5		Relief sought 44. Amend 33.2.1.5 to read "Recognise anticipated activities in rural areas such as farming and the efficient use of land and resources while avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on significant indigenous biodiversity values where possible.	Reject		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.5
OS706.74		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.1.5		Amend as follows: <i>Recognise anticipated activities in rural areas such as farming and the efficient use of land and resources while having regard to however these must be undertaken in a way that protects the significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna and maintains and enhances indigenous biodiversity. the maintenance, protection or enhancement of indigenous biodiversity values.</i>	Reject		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.5
OS805.96		Transpower New Zealand Limited	33.2.1.5	Other	Support with amendments. Amend to: Recognise anticipated activities in rural areas such as farming <u>and regionally significant infrastructure</u> , and the efficient use of land and resources while having regard to the maintenance, protection or enhancement of indigenous biodiversity values.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS806.209		Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.1.5	Other	Amend <i>33.2.1.5 Recognise the importance of providing for a range of activities that have the Potential to achieve sustainable land management and anticipated activities in rural areas such as farming and the efficient use of land and resources while having regard to the maintenance, protection or enhancement of indigenous biodiversity values.</i>	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1015.12	339.82	Straterra	33.2.1.5	Oppose	I seek that 339.82 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: "Recognise anticipated activities in rural areas such as farming and the efficient use of land and resources, <u>including location-specific and/or temporary activities</u> ; however, these must be undertaken in a way that <u>manages</u> protects the significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna, <u>including their protection from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development</u> and maintains and enhances indigenous biodiversity."	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.5
FS1015.118	706.74	Straterra	33.2.1.5	Oppose	I seek that 706.74 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: "Recognise anticipated activities in rural areas such as farming and the efficient use of land and resources, <u>while avoiding, remedying or mitigating</u> however these must be undertaken in a way that <u>adverse effects on</u> protects the significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna and maintains and enhances indigenous biodiversity, and where these values are significant, <u>protecting them from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development</u> ."	Reject		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.5
FS1034.119	600.119	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.2.1.5	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1091.4	373.25	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	33.2.1.5	Oppose	Disallow. The production from rural land is important to the Queenstown Lakes District. Policy 33.2.1 .5 recognises this. Deleting this policy both indicates that rural production is not important to the QLDC and provides a blanket ban on removal of indigenous biodiversity. This is inconsistent with sustainably managing the resources of the district. Significant indigenous biodiversity needs to be recognised and provided for under section 6. This is achieved through the identification of the SNAs. However, Part II also requires efficient use of natural and physical resources. Therefore, the relief sought by DOC should be disallowed.	Accept		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.5
FS1091.25	706.74	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	33.2.1.5	Oppose	Disallow. Requiring farming to be undertaken in a way that protects insignificant indigenous vegetation at the expense of production will stifle the ability of farmers to productively use their land throughout the district. This would inhibit the development of a prosperous, resilient economy.	Reject		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.5
FS1097.170	339.82	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.1.5	Oppose	Submitter requests amendment that strengthens the provisions unnecessarily. The amendments are too directive and fails to enable sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.5
FS1097.222	373.25	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.1.5	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.5
FS1097.673	706.74	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.1.5	Oppose	Use of the word 'protect' should be qualified, for the reasons provided in QPL's original submission.	Reject		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.5
FS1132.24	373.25	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.1.5	Oppose	Policy 33.2.1.5 proposes to "recognise anticipated activities in rural areas such as farming and the efficient use of land and resources while having regard to the maintenance, protection or enhancement of indigenous biodiversity values". Policy 33.2.1.5 is an important policy for the rural area, providing balance and recognising that rural production requires some flexibility. This is particularly important in the Queenstown Lakes District where the broader benefits of rural production are often underestimated, and are at risk of being over-regulated.	Accept		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.5
FS1162.49	701.14	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.1.5	Support	Believes that the relief sought in the submission will result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be allowed.	Reject		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.5
FS1162.128	706.74	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.1.5	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.5
FS1209.119	600.119	Burdon, Richard	33.2.1.5	Support	Support entire submission	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.5
FS1254.10	373.25	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.1.5	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.5
FS1254.62	706.74	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.1.5	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.5
FS1287.12	373.25	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.1.5	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.5
FS1287.97	706.74	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.1.5	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.5

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1313.11	373.25	Darby Planning LP	33.2.1.5	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.5
FS1347.42	373.25	Lakes Land Care	33.2.1.5	Oppose	Opposes over-sewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.8		Alty, Evan	33.2.1.6	Other	Raises concerns with the non-regulatory methods such as open space covenants under the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act and considers these to be flawed. Only covenants under the Reserves Act provide security and certainty that the RMA requires.	Reject		Policy 33.2.1.6
OS339.83		Alty, Evan	33.2.1.6	Other	Amend as follows: <i>Encourage the long-term protection of indigenous vegetation and in particular Significant Natural Areas by encouraging land owners to consider non-regulatory methods such as open space covenants administered under the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act, Reserves Act, or Conservation Act and other protective mechanisms.</i>	Reject		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.26		Department of Conservation	33.2.1.6	Support	Retain Policy 33.2.1.6 as notified.	Accept		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.6
OS600.120		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.1.6	Other	Policy 33.2.1.6 is adopted as proposed but consideration is given to the benefits of 'active management' of species, including grazing, where this is demonstrably of benefit to the species under protection.	Accept		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.6
OS706.75		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.1.6		Amend as follows: Encourage the long-term protection of indigenous vegetation and in particular Significant Natural Areas by encouraging land owners to consider non-regulatory methods such as open space covenants administered under the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act, Reserves Act, or Conservation Act and other protective mechanisms.	Reject		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.6
OS806.210		Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.1.6	Support	Support. Retain.	Accept		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1034.120	600.120	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.2.1.6	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1097.152	339.8	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.1.6	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.6
FS1097.171	339.83	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.1.6	Support	Support for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Reject		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.6
FS1162.129	706.75	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.1.6	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.6
FS1209.120	600.120	Burdon, Richard	33.2.1.6	Support	Support entire submission	Accept		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.6
FS1254.11	373.26	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.1.6	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Reject		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.6

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1254.63	706.75	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.1.6	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.6
FS1287.13	373.26	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.1.6	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Reject		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.6
FS1287.98	706.75	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.1.6	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.6
FS1313.12	373.26	Darby Planning LP	33.2.1.6	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Reject		Objective 33.2.1 and Policy 33.2.1.6
FS1347.43	373.26	Lakes Land Care	33.2.1.6	Oppose	Opposes overseeing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.7		Alty, Evan	33.2.1.7	Other	Raises concerns with the ability of Objective 3.2.4.3 and Policies 33.2.1.1 and 33.2.17 to protect rare or threatened indigenous species	Reject		Does not state why. Without further evidence submission is rejected.
OS339.84		Alty, Evan	33.2.1.7	Other	Amend as follows: <i>Activities involving the clearance of indigenous vegetation are undertaken in a manner to ensure the District's indigenous biodiversity values is protected, maintained or enhanced.</i>	Reject		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.27		Department of Conservation	33.2.1.7	Other	Amend Policy 33.2.1.7 as follows: Activities involving the clearance of indigenous vegetation <u>not determined to be significant following assessment against the criteria in section 33.10</u> , are undertaken in a manner to ensure the District's indigenous biodiversity values are protected , maintained or enhanced.	Reject		Issue 1
OS600.121		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.1.7	Support	Policy 33.2.1.7 is adopted as proposed.	Accept		Policy 33.2.1.7
OS706.76		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.1.7		Amend as follows: Activities involving the clearance of indigenous vegetation are undertaken in a manner to ensure the District's indigenous biodiversity values is protected, maintained or enhanced.	Reject		Policy 33.2.1.7
OS806.211		Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.1.7		Amend. Provide further clarification within the Policy as to how it is to be achieved.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1034.121	600.121	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.2.1.7	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1162.130	706.76	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.1.7	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.1.7
FS1209.121	600.121	Burdon, Richard	33.2.1.7	Support	Support entire submission	Accept		Policy 33.2.1.7

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1254.12	373.27	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.1.7	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1254.64	706.76	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.1.7	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.1.7
FS1287.14	373.27	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.1.7	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1287.99	706.76	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.1.7	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.1.7
FS1313.13	373.27	Darby Planning LP	33.2.1.7	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1342.32	373.27	Te Anau Developments Limited	33.2.1.7	Oppose	Not allow relief sought (or other similar relief south by another submitter) unless otherwise agreed through the submission process	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1347.44	373.27	Lakes Land Care	33.2.1.7	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.85		Alty, Evan	33.2.1.8	Oppose	Delete and Replace as follows: Where the adverse effects of an activity on indigenous biodiversity cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated, consideration will be given to whether there has been any compensation or biodiversity offset proposed and the extent to which any offset will result in a net indigenous biodiversity gain If the ecosystem or habitat cannot be avoided, adverse effects are managed by avoiding significant adverse effects: Where adverse effects are not significant: (a) they are avoided in the first instance; (b) where they cannot be avoided, they are remedied; (c) where they cannot be remedied they are mitigated; and (d) Where residual adverse effects remain, and cannot be mitigated they are offset.	Reject		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.28		Department of Conservation	33.2.1.8	Other	Amend Policy 33.1.2.8 as follows: Where the <u>there are residual</u> adverse effects of an activity on indigenous biodiversity values that <u>values</u> that cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated, consideration will be given to <u>any</u> whether there has been any compensation or biodiversity offset proposed and the extent to which any offset will result in <u>no net loss of indigenous biodiversity and preferably a</u> net indigenous biodiversity gain.	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.1.8
OS580.14		Contact Energy Limited	33.2.1.8	Support	Retain policy 33.2.1.8 which provides the option of compensation or biodiversity offsets.	Accept		Policy 33.2.1.8
OS600.122		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.1.8	Support	Policy 33.2.1.8 is adopted as proposed.	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.1.8

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS706.77		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.1.8	Oppose	Delete and Replace as follows: Where the adverse effects of an activity on indigenous biodiversity cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated, consideration will be given to whether there has been any compensation or biodiversity offset proposed and the extent to which any offset will result in a net indigenous biodiversity gain If the ecosystem or habitat cannot be avoided, adverse effects are managed by avoiding significant adverse effects. Where adverse effects are not significant: (a) they are avoided in the first instance; (b) where they cannot be avoided, they are remedied; (c) where they cannot be remedied they are mitigated; and (d) Where residual adverse effects remain, and cannot be mitigated they are offset.	Reject		Policy 33.2.1.8
OS805.97		Transpower New Zealand Limited	33.2.1.8	Oppose	Delete Policy: Where the adverse effects of an activity on indigenous biodiversity cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated, consideration will be given to whether there has been any compensation or biodiversity offset proposed and the extent to which any offset will result in a net indigenous biodiversity gain.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS806.212		Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.1.8	Support	support/amend.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1015.13	339.85	Straterra	33.2.1.8	Oppose	I seek that 339.85 be disallowed: “If the ecosystem or habitat cannot be avoided, adverse effects are managed by avoiding significant adverse effects. Where adverse effects are not significant: (a) they are avoided in the first instance; (b) where they cannot be avoided, they are remedied; (c) where they cannot be remedied they are mitigated; and (d) Where residual adverse effects remain, and cannot be mitigated they are offset.”	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.1.8
FS1015.26	373.28	Straterra	33.2.1.8	Oppose	I seek that 373.28 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: “Amend Policy 33.1.2.8 as follows: Where there are residual adverse effects of an activity on indigenous biodiversity values that cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated, consideration will be given to whether there has been any compensation, or biodiversity offset proposed and the extent to which any offset, <u>if applied</u> , will result in no net loss of indigenous biodiversity and preferably a net indigenous biodiversity gain.”	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.1.8
FS1015.119	706.77	Straterra	33.2.1.8	Oppose	I seek that 706.77 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: “Where the adverse effects of an activity on indigenous biodiversity cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated, consideration will be given to whether there has been any compensation or biodiversity offset proposed <u>to manage residual effects</u> , and the extent to which any offset will result in a net indigenous biodiversity gain, <u>and otherwise, to provide an appropriate level of mitigation and compensation</u> . If the ecosystem or habitat cannot be avoided, adverse effects are managed by avoiding significant adverse effects. Where adverse effects are not significant: (a) they are avoided in the first instance; (b) where they cannot be avoided, they are remedied; 1500 (c) where they cannot be remedied they are mitigated; and (d) Where residual adverse effects remain, and cannot be mitigated they are offset. ”	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.1.8
FS1034.122	600.122	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.2.1.8	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1085.17	706.77	Contact Energy Limited	33.2.1.8	Oppose	Oppose the suggested amendment as it seeks to implement inappropriate hierarchy. The policy is clear as written.	Accept		Policy 33.2.1.8
FS1085.18	373.28	Contact Energy Limited	33.2.1.8	Oppose	Oppose amendment. Policy is clear as written.	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.1.8
FS1085.19	600.122	Contact Energy Limited	33.2.1.8	Support	Support increased flexibility for landowners and the Council.	Accept		Policy 33.2.1.8
FS1097.172	339.85	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.1.8	Oppose	The submitter suggests that the Policy is amended by removing provision for compensation. This is opposed; environmental compensation is an important means of achieving sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.1.8
FS1097.223	373.28	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.1.8	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.1.8
FS1162.131	706.77	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.1.8	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.1.8
FS1209.122	600.122	Burdon, Richard	33.2.1.8	Support	Support entire submission	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.1.8
FS1254.13	373.28	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.1.8	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.1.8
FS1254.65	706.77	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.1.8	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept		Policy 33.2.1.8

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1287.15	373.28	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.1.8	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.1.8
FS1287.100	706.77	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.1.8	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.1.8
FS1313.14	373.28	Darby Planning LP	33.2.1.8	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.1.8
FS1342.33	373.28	Te Anau Developments Limited	33.2.1.8	Oppose	Not allow relief sought (or other similar relief south by another submitter) unless otherwise agreed through the submission process	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.1.8
FS1347.45	373.28	Lakes Land Care	33.2.1.8	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.86		Alty, Evan	33.2.1.9	Other	Amend the Criteria to read: a. <i>Representative</i> Whether an area of indigenous vegetation or habitat of indigenous fauna is representative, typical or characteristic of the natural diversity of the relevant ecological district. b. <i>Rarity –Retain</i> c <i>Diversity add and Pattern</i> Whether an area supports a high diversity of indigenous ecosystem types, indigenous taxa or has changes in species composition reflecting the existence of diverse natural features or gradients. Add “or” between each of the criteria.	Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.29		Department of Conservation	33.2.1.9	Oppose	Delete Policy 33.2.1.9 and include the ecological significance criteria in a new section 33.10.	Reject		Issue 1.
OS384.5		Glen Dene Ltd	33.2.1.9	Oppose	We do not support the small areas being included B16A) as areas of significant natural areas Remove areas of Significant Natural Areas from Glen Dene Station	Reject		SNA
OS701.15		Kane, Paul	33.2.1.9		Relief sought 45. In 33.2.1.9(e) include a new bullet point that states “has significance based on the indigenous vegetation coverage of the area”.	Reject		Policy 33.2.1.9
OS706.78		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.1.9		Amend the Criteria to read: a. <i>Representative</i> Whether an area of indigenous vegetation or habitat of indigenous fauna is representative, typical or characteristic of the natural diversity of the relevant ecological district. b. <i>Rarity –Retain</i> c <i>Diversity add and Pattern</i> Whether an area supports a high diversity of indigenous ecosystem types, indigenous taxa or has changes in species composition reflecting the existence of diverse natural features or gradients. Add “or” between each of the criteria.	Reject		Policy 33.2.1.9
OS784.13		Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	33.2.1.9		Add new bullet point is included that states the following or words to the same effect " has significance based on the indigenous vegetation coverage of the area"	Reject		Policy 33.2.1.9
OS806.227		Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.1.9	Support	Retain policy.	Reject		Policy 33.2.1.9

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS817.7		Te Ao Marama Inc	33.2.1.9	Other	TAMI has the following amendments for the proposed District Plan: - Implement Objective D1 Tangata whenua roles and interests, and Policy D1 of the National Policy Statement – Freshwater Management, particularly in Chapter 27 Subdivision and Development, Chapter 30 Energy and Utilities, and other District Plan chapters that have a direct impact on freshwater quality and quantity. For more information about Objective D and Policy D1 of the NPS-FM, see pages 85- 87 of the Ministry for the Environment’s A Guide to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2014. - Ensure that the Ngai Tahu terminology used in Chapter 5 is consistently used throughout the Plan and in the definitions and maps. - The list of taonga species in Chapter 5 to be updated to include freshwater fish species and other land based animals. - Amend the titles of the four chapters in Part Two: Strategy to have the prefix “Strategic”. The way the chapters are currently titled, and promoted by Council during the submission phase, it seems that the only strategy chapter in the Plan is “Strategic Direction”. TAMI has been informed by Council that Chapter 5 is a strategic chapter and this information has affected TAMI’s submission and the content of the Chapters 3 and 5. - A stronger link is to be made between Chapter 5 and Chapter 33: Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity; particularly, the clearance criteria in 33.2.1.9, and taonga species and related habitat, and nohoanga. - Amend the alpine limit from 1070m to 800m. This change is in line with the change in biodiversity at 800m, significant increased risk of erosion and sedimentation, and Landcare Research’s Land Use classifications.	Accept in Part	Defer the NPS issue to Chapters 27 and 30. Defer the need for consistent use of Ngai Tahu terminology to all Chapters. Defer the linkage issue to Chapter 33.	Yes - to address the Strategy / Strategic issue and Taonga species issues.
FS1091.26	706.78	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	33.2.1.9	Oppose	Disallow. The requirement for only one criteria to be satisfied for the site to be considered significant is will significantly increase the number of areas that are considered significant. This will afford protection to areas that are, in fact, not significant. That is inconsistent with sustainable management because the efficient use of land is not being adequately balanced with the need to protect significant indigenous biodiversity	Reject		Policy 33.2.1.9
FS1162.50	701.15	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.1.9	Support	Believes that the relief sought in the submission will result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be allowed.	Reject		Policy 33.2.1.9
FS1162.132	706.78	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.1.9	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		Policy 33.2.1.9
FS1254.14	373.29	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.1.9	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.1.9
FS1254.66	706.78	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.1.9	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Reject		Policy 33.2.1.9
FS1287.16	373.29	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.1.9	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.1.9
FS1287.101	706.78	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.1.9	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Reject		Policy 33.2.1.9
FS1313.15	373.29	Darby Planning LP	33.2.1.9	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.1.9

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1347.46	373.29	Lakes Land Care	33.2.1.9	Oppose	Opposes overseeing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.88		Alty, Evan	33.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Amend to read: <u>Protect and enhance significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna, including rare or threatened indigenous species.</u>	Reject		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS339.92		Alty, Evan	33.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Add the following new policy: <u>Significant adverse effects of the use and development on habitats of indigenous birds in wetlands, beds of rivers and lakes and their margins for breeding, roosting, feeding and migration are avoided and other effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u>	Reject		Objective 33.2.2
OS373.31		Department of Conservation	33.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Amend Objective 33.2.2 as follows: Protect and enhance Significant Natural Areas. Areas of significant indigenous biodiversity are recognised and protected from development activities in the Queenstown Lakes District as a matter of national importance.	Reject		Objective 33.2.2
OS373.32		Department of Conservation	33.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Include new Policy 33.2.2.1A as follows: <u>Identify the District's Significant Natural Areas and schedule them in Part 33.8 the District Plan, including the ongoing identification of Significant Natural Areas through resource consent applications, using the criteria set out in Schedule 33.10, the list of threatened species in Part 33.7, and threatened land environments shown in Part 33.9.</u>	Reject		Issue 1
OS373.36		Department of Conservation	33.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Include new Policy 33.2.2.4 as follows: <u>Require the use of biodiversity offsetting to address residual adverse effects, after avoiding, remedying or mitigating, of development activities on Significant Natural Areas to ensure no net loss of indigenous biodiversity values is achieved.</u>	Reject		Issue 1
OS635.73		Aurora Energy Limited	33.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Oppose in part Amend Objective 33.2.2 as follows: <u>Maintain Protect and where appropriate enhance Significant Natural Areas.</u>	Reject		Would weaken protection of these features.
OS706.80		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.2 Objective 2		Amend to read: <u>Protect and enhance significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna, including rare or threatened indigenous species.</u>	Reject		Objective 33.2
OS706.84		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.2 Objective 2		Add the following new policy: <u>Significant adverse effects of the use and development on habitats of indigenous birds in wetlands, beds of rivers and lakes and their margins for breeding, roosting, feeding and migration are avoided and other effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u>	Reject		Objective 33.2
OS788.1		Otago Fish and Game Council	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	An addition to Objective 33.2.2 is proposed: "33.2.2.3 - Avoid the clearance or alteration of tussock grassland where it will have adverse effect on water yield values in dry catchments".	Reject		The tussock grassland would need to be identified as an SNA to qualify under the objective.

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS806.214		Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Oppose/amend as below: <i>Objective 33.2.2 - Encourage the protection and enhancement of Significant Natural Areas</i> 33.2.2.1 Avoid the clearance of indigenous vegetation within Significant Natural Areas that would <u>significantly</u> reduce indigenous biodiversity values. 33.2.2.2 Allow the clearance of indigenous vegetation within Significant Natural Areas only in exceptional circumstances and in circumstances where these activities will have a low impact or offer compensation commensurate to the nature and scale of the clearance. 33.2.2.3 Recognise that the majority of Significant Natural Areas are located within land historically used for farming activity and provide for small scale, low impact indigenous vegetation removal, stock grazing, the construction of fences and small scale farm tracks, and the maintenance of existing fences and tracks. <u>Recognise the importance of providing public access to areas of significant indigenous vegetation and increasing the understanding of the values associated with these areas.</u> <u>Assist landowners in the management of SNA, recognising the importance of pest management in the sustainable management of these areas.</u>	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1015.14	339.88	Straterra	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	I seek that 339.88 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: "Protect and enhance significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna, including rare or threatened indigenous species, <u>from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.</u> "	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.2
FS1015.17	339.92	Straterra	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	I seek that 339.92 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: "Significant Adverse adverse effects of the use and development, <u>including location-specific and/or temporary activities</u> , on habitats of indigenous birds in wetlands, beds of rivers and lakes and their margins for breeding, roosting, feeding and migration are avoided, <u>remedied or mitigated, and where residual effects occur, they are offset or otherwise compensated for</u> ; and these areas are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development and other effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated. "	Reject		Objective 33.2.2
FS1015.27	373.31	Straterra	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	I seek that 373.31 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: "Amend Objective 33.2.2 as follows: Protect and enhance Significant Natural Areas. Areas of significant indigenous biodiversity are recognised and protected from <u>inappropriate subdivision, use, and development</u> activities in the Queenstown Lakes District as a matter of national importance."	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.2
FS1015.29	373.36	Straterra	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	I seek that 373.36 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: "Include new Policy 33.2.2.4 as follows: Require the use of biodiversity offsetting <u>or other compensatory measures</u> to address residual adverse effects, after avoiding, remedying or mitigating, of development activities on Significant Natural Areas to ensure no net loss of indigenous biodiversity values is achieved, <u>or otherwise compensate appropriately for adverse effects.</u> "	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1015.120	706.80	Straterra	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	I seek that 706.80 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: "Protect and enhance significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna, including rare or threatened indigenous species, <u>from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development, and otherwise, including in the case of location-specific and/or temporary activities, avoid, remedy or mitigate</u> adverse effects on these values, including via <u>the use of biodiversity offsets or other compensatory measures.</u> "	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2
FS1015.122	706.84	Straterra	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	I seek that 706.84 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: "Significant Adverse adverse effects of the use and development, <u>including of location-specific and/or temporary activities</u> , on habitats of indigenous birds in wetlands, beds of rivers and lakes and their margins for breeding, roosting, feeding and migration are avoided, <u>remedied or mitigated, and other effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated, and where there are residual effects, they are offset or otherwise compensated for</u> . Where the values are significant, they are <u>protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.</u> "	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2
FS1015.136	788.1	Straterra	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	I seek that 788.1 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: "33.2.2.3 - Avoid the clearance or alteration of tussock grassland where it will have <u>a net</u> adverse effect on water yield values in dry catchments".	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2
FS1040.11	373.32	Forest and Bird	33.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Support	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1097.177	339.92	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.2
FS1097.224	373.31	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.2
FS1097.226	373.36	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Support in part. Support the use of offsetting, but oppose the use of the term 'require'; it may be beneficial in some circumstances but not others. Oppose the definition of offsetting as "not net loss"	Reject		Issue 1
FS1097.714	788.1	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Oppose suggested policy because it uses the word 'avoid' without qualification. Opposition is for the reasons stated in QPL's original submission.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2
FS1132.18	339.92	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Significant wetlands are addressed at the regional level, through the Otago Regional Council Regionally Significant Wetlands inventory. Where a wetland does not meet the criteria for this inventory, we consider the outcomes sought are better achieved through non-regulatory advice and encouragement.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.2

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1132.61	788.1	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Research into the benefits of tussock grassland in respect to retention of water indicates these benefits will be catchment dependent; subsequently the protection afforded tussock grasslands will also largely be catchment dependent. This policy also requires some landowners to give up productive potential for the good of other landowners, without a value transfer mechanism to address equity issues, and no measure of efficiency or accounting between services lost and services gain to ensure a net benefit. Federated Farmers would support a non-regulatory, catchment based approach to this issue. We consider the responsibility for this approach should sit with Otago Regional Council.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2
FS1162.134	706.80	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2
FS1162.138	706.84	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2
FS1254.16	373.31	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.2
FS1254.17	373.32	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1254.21	373.36	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1254.68	706.80	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2
FS1254.72	706.84	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2
FS1287.18	373.31	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.2
FS1287.19	373.32	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1287.23	373.36	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1287.103	706.80	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2
FS1287.107	706.84	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1313.17	373.31	Darby Planning LP	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.2
FS1313.18	373.32	Darby Planning LP	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1313.22	373.36	Darby Planning LP	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1342.34	373.31	Te Anau Developments Limited	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Not allow relief sought (or other similar relief sought by another submitter) unless otherwise agreed through the submission process	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.2
FS1342.38	373.36	Te Anau Developments Limited	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Not allow relief sought (or other similar relief sought by another submitter) unless otherwise agreed through the submission process	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1347.48	373.31	Lakes Land Care	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
FS1347.49	373.32	Lakes Land Care	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1347.53	373.36	Lakes Land Care	33.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Opposes overseeing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.89		Alty, Evan	33.2.2.1	Other	Amend to read: <i>Avoid the clearance of indigenous vegetation within Significant Natural Areas <u>including those that meet the criteria in Policy 33.2.1.9</u> that would reduce indigenous biodiversity values.</i>	Accept		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.33		Department of Conservation	33.2.2.1	Support	Retain as notified.	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.1
OS600.123		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.2.1	Other	Policy 33.2.2.1 is amended as follows (or words to similar effect): Avoid the clearance of indigenous vegetation within Significant Natural Areas that would reduce indigenous biodiversity values <u>overall</u> .	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.1
OS635.74		Aurora Energy Limited	33.2.2.1	Other	Oppose in part Amend Policy 33.2.2.1 as follows: Avoid, <u>where practical</u> , the clearance of indigenous vegetation within Significant Natural Areas that would reduce indigenous biodiversity values.	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.1
OS706.81		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.2.1		Amend to read: Avoid the clearance of indigenous vegetation within Significant Natural Areas <u>including those that meet the criteria in Policy 33.2.1.9</u> that would reduce indigenous biodiversity values.	Accept		Policy 33.2.2.1
OS805.98		Transpower New Zealand Limited	33.2.2.1	Other	Oppose in part. Amend to: Avoid, <u>or where this is not practicable, remedy or mitigate the effects associated with</u> the clearance of indigenous vegetation within Significant Natural Areas that would reduce indigenous biodiversity values.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1015.15	339.89	Straterra	33.2.2.1	Oppose	I seek that 339.89 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: "Avoid, <u>remedy or mitigate</u> the clearance of indigenous vegetation within Significant Natural Areas including those that meet the criteria in Policy 33.2.1.9 that would reduce indigenous biodiversity values, <u>and where there are residual effects, these should be offset or otherwise compensated for; and, in the case of inappropriate subdivision, use, and development, protect these values from that development.</u> "	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.1
FS1034.123	600.123	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.2.2.1	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1040.55	600.123	Forest and Bird	33.2.2.1	Oppose	Oppose	Accept		Policy 33.2.2.1
FS1097.174	339.89	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.2.1	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.1
FS1097.543	600.123	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.2.1	Support	Support for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.1
FS1162.135	706.81	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.2.1	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.1
FS1209.123	600.123	Burdon, Richard	33.2.2.1	Support	Support entire submission	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.1
FS1254.18	373.33	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.2.1	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.1
FS1254.69	706.81	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.2.1	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.1
FS1287.20	373.33	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.2.1	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.1
FS1287.104	706.81	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.2.1	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.1

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1313.19	373.33	Darby Planning LP	33.2.2.1	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.1
FS1347.50	373.33	Lakes Land Care	33.2.2.1	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.90		Alty, Evan	33.2.2.2	Oppose	Delete and replace as follows: Allow the clearance of indigenous vegetation within Significant Natural Areas only in exceptional circumstances and in circumstances where these activities will have a low impact or offer compensation commensurate to the nature and scale of the clearance. Allow the clearance of indigenous vegetation within Significant Natural Areas only in exceptional circumstances and in circumstances where significant adverse effects are avoided. Where adverse effects are not significant: they are avoided in the first instance; where they cannot be avoided, they are remedied; where they cannot be remedied they are mitigated; and Where residual adverse effects remain, and cannot be mitigated they are offset.	Accept in Part		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.34		Department of Conservation	33.2.2.2	Other	Amend Policy 33.2.2.2 as follows: Allow the clearance of indigenous vegetation within Significant Natural Areas only in exceptional circumstances and in circumstances where these activities will have a low impact minor adverse effects on the ecological functioning and the values that contribute to the significance of the area or offer compensation commensurate to the nature and scale of the clearance.	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.2.2
OS600.124		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.2.2	Other	Policy 33.2.2.2 is amended as follows (or words to similar effect): Allow the clearance of indigenous vegetation within Significant Natural Areas only in exceptional circumstances and or in circumstances where these activities will have a low impact or offer compensation commensurate to the nature and scale of the clearance.	Accept in Part		The modifications to the policy remove the relief sought.
OS635.75		Aurora Energy Limited	33.2.2.2	Other	Support in part. Retain Policy 33.2.2.2	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.2.2
OS706.82		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.2.2		Delete and replace as follows: Allow the clearance of indigenous vegetation within Significant Natural Areas only in exceptional circumstances and in circumstances where these activities will have a low impact or offer compensation commensurate to the nature and scale of the clearance. Allow the clearance of indigenous vegetation within Significant Natural Areas only in exceptional circumstances and in circumstances where significant adverse effects are avoided. Where adverse effects are not significant: they are avoided in the first instance; where they cannot be avoided, they are remedied; where they cannot be remedied they are mitigated; and Where residual adverse effects remain, and cannot be mitigated they are offset.	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.2.2
FS1015.16	339.90	Straterra	33.2.2.2	Oppose	I seek that 339.90 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: "Allow the clearance of indigenous vegetation within Significant Natural Areas only in exceptional circumstances and in circumstances where significant adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Where adverse effects are not significant: they are avoided in the first instance; where they cannot be avoided, they are remedied; where they cannot be remedied they are mitigated; and Where residual adverse effects remain, and cannot be mitigated they are offset, or otherwise compensated for. "	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.2

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1015.28	373.34	Straterra	33.2.2.2	Oppose	I seek that 373.34 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: "Amend Policy 33.2.2.2 as follows: Allow the clearance of indigenous vegetation within Significant Natural Areas <u>only in exceptional circumstances</u> and in circumstances where these activities will have minor adverse effects, <u>or effects that can be managed to be no more than minor</u> , on the ecological functioning and the values that contribute to the significance of the area, or offer compensation <u>appropriate commensurate</u> to the nature and scale of the clearance."	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.2
FS1015.121	706.82	Straterra	33.2.2.2	Oppose	I seek that 706.82 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: " <u>Avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects arising from the</u> Allow the clearance of indigenous vegetation within Significant Natural Areas, <u>including from location-specific and/or temporary activities, and protect these areas from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development only in exceptional circumstances and in circumstances where significant adverse effects are avoided. Where adverse effects are not significant: they are avoided in the first instance; where they cannot be avoided, they are remedied; where they cannot be remedied they are mitigated; and</u> Where residual adverse effects remain, <u>e.g., in the case of location-specific and temporary activities</u> , and cannot be mitigated they are offset, <u>or otherwise compensated for.</u> "	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.2
FS1034.124	600.124	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.2.2.2	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1040.56	600.124	Forest and Bird	33.2.2.2	Oppose	Oppose	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.2.2
FS1097.175	339.90	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.2.2	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.2
FS1097.225	373.34	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.2.2	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.2
FS1097.540	600.124	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.2.2	Support	Support the intent of the suggested changes.	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.2.2
FS1097.674	706.82	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.2.2	Oppose	Oppose placing such restrictions on clearance of indigenous vegetation within SNA.	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.2
FS1121.46	339.90	Aurora Energy Limited	33.2.2.2	Oppose	Opposes in part. Is supportive of measures that seek to reduce the loss of biodiversity values, particularly in locations identified as Significant Natural areas. Alerts that there will be instances where Aurora will be required to remove indigenous vegetation to ensure that operational efficiency of its network is maintained and to remove potential fire risks. This should be reflected in the Proposed Plan.	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.2
FS1162.136	706.82	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.2.2	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.2
FS1209.124	600.124	Burdon, Richard	33.2.2.2	Support	Support entire submission	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.2.2
FS1254.19	373.34	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.2.2	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.2
FS1254.70	706.82	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.2.2	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.2
FS1287.21	373.34	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.2.2	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.2
FS1287.105	706.82	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.2.2	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.2
FS1313.20	373.34	Darby Planning LP	33.2.2.2	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.2
FS1342.4	600.124	Te Anau Developments Limited	33.2.2.2	Support	Allow relief sought to the extent that is does not undermine or prevent the relief originally sought by Te Anau Developments (unless otherwise agreed through the submission process)	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.2.2

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1342.36	373.34	Te Anau Developments Limited	33.2.2.2	Oppose	Not allow relief sought (or other similar relief south by another submitter) unless otherwise agreed through the submission process	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.2
FS1347.51	373.34	Lakes Land Care	33.2.2.2	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.91		Alty, Evan	33.2.2.3	Other	Amend as follows: <i>Recognise that the majority of Significant Natural Areas are located within land used For farming activity and provide for small scale, low impact indigenous vegetation removal clearance to enable existing uses, stock grazing, the construction of fences and small scale farm tracks, and the maintenance of existing fences and tracks, roads, structures excluding their expansion - provided the biodiversity values are safeguarded.</i>	Reject		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.35		Department of Conservation	33.2.2.3	Oppose	Delete Policy 33.2.2.3.	Reject		Issue 1 and Policy 33.2.2.3
OS600.125		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.2.3	Support	Policy 33.2.2.3 is adopted as proposed.	Accept		Policy 33.2.2.3
OS706.83		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.2.3		Amend as follows: Recognise that the majority of Significant Natural Areas are located within land used For farming activity and provide for small scale, low impact indigenous vegetation removal clearance to enable existing uses, stock grazing, the construction of fences and small scale farm tracks, and the maintenance of existing fences and tracks, roads, structures excluding their expansion - provided the biodiversity values are safeguarded.	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.3
OS791.14		Burdon, Tim	33.2.2.3	Support	Approved.	Accept		Policy 33.2.2.3
OS794.14		Lakes Land Care	33.2.2.3	Support	Approved.	Accept		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1034.125	600.125	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.2.2.3	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1097.176	339.91	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.2.3	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.2.3
FS1097.675	706.83	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.2.3	Support	Support in part. Support the suggested amendment to recognise and provide for erection of structures within SNA.	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.2.3
FS1132.25	373.35	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.2.3	Oppose	Federated Farmers considers it is important that Council specifically recognise and provide for these low to no impact activities in the rural areas, and we seek that the policy is retained.	Accept		Issue 1 and Policy 33.2.2.3
FS1162.137	706.83	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.2.3	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.2.3
FS1209.125	600.125	Burdon, Richard	33.2.2.3	Support	Support entire submission	Reject		Policy 33.2.2.3
FS1254.20	373.35	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.2.3	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept		Issue 1 and Policy 33.2.2.3
FS1254.71	706.83	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.2.3	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.2.3
FS1287.22	373.35	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.2.3	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept		Issue 1 and Policy 33.2.2.3
FS1287.106	706.83	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.2.3	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Policy 33.2.2.3

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1313.21	373.35	Darby Planning LP	33.2.2.3	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept		Issue 1 and Policy 33.2.2.3
FS1342.37	373.35	Te Anau Developments Limited	33.2.2.3	Oppose	Not allow relief sought (or other similar relief south by another submitter) unless otherwise agreed through the submission process	Reject		33.2.1.3
FS1347.52	373.35	Lakes Land Care	33.2.2.3	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.93		Alty, Evan	33.2.3 Objective 3	Other	Amend to read: Ensure the efficient use <u>management and development</u> of land, including ski field development, farming activities and infrastructure improvements, do <u>es</u> not reduce the District's indigenous biodiversity values. Or To maintain and enhance indigenous biodiversity when undertaking land management and development activities.	Accept in Part		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS339.94		Alty, Evan	33.2.3 Objective 3	Other	Amend the policies 33.2.3.1 - 33.2.3.7 as set out in other submission points by Forest and Bird and make these assessment matters.	Accept in Part		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.37		Department of Conservation	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Replace Objective 33.2.3 with the following Objective: Ensure the efficient use of land, including ski field development, farming activities and infrastructure improvements, do not reduce the District's indigenous biodiversity values. Encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values located on unproductive land within the district.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
OS373.41		Department of Conservation	33.2.3 Objective 3	Other	Include new policy as follows: Encourage the long-term protection of indigenous vegetation, in particular Significant Natural Areas by encouraging land owners to consider non-regulatory methods such as open space covenants administered under the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act, or conservation covenant established under section 27 of the Conservation Act 1987, or Nga Whenua Rahui Kawanata under section 27A of the Conservation Act 1987.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
OS378.30		Peninsula Village Limited and Wanaka Bay Limited (collectively referred to as "Peninsula Bay Joint Venture" (PBJV))	33.2.3 Objective 3	Support	Supports Objective 33.2.3 and associated Policy 33.2.3.2, 33.2.3.4, 33.2.3.5, 33.2.3.7. Retain as notified.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
OS706.85		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.3 Objective 3		Amend to read: Ensure the efficient use <u>management and development</u> of land, including ski field development, farming activities and infrastructure improvements, <u>does</u> not reduce the District's indigenous biodiversity values. Or To maintain and enhance indigenous biodiversity when undertaking land management and development activities.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
OS706.86		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.3 Objective 3		Amend the policies 33.2.3.1 - 33.2.3.7 as set out in other submission points by Forest and Bird and make these assessment matters.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS806.215		Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Oppose/amend. Objective 33.2.3 - <i>Ensure the efficient use of land, including ski field development, farming activities and infrastructure improvements that land management practice's do not significantly reduce the District's indigenous biodiversity values.</i>	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS806.216		Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Policies 33.2.3.1 to 33.2.3.7 – Amend. Retain provisions that use the terms 'encourage' and 'recognise and provide for'. Amend others so as to include consistent language.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1040.12	373.37	Forest and Bird	33.2.3 Objective 3	Support	Support in part	Accept in Part		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1049.30	378.30	LAC Property Trustees Limited	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	The submitter seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in Part		Relates to general opposition of any submission lodged by Peninsula Bay Joint Venture
FS1091.5	373.37	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Disallow. It is not clear by what is meant by "unproductive land". The ability to irrigate in the Rural Zone is important to increase the productivity of rural land. Increasing productivity leads to a prosperous, resilient farming community. The increase in prosperity and resilience of one sector will contribute to an increase in prosperity and resilience of the District's economy. The Policy as notified is enabling of land use.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1095.30	378.30	Nick Brasington	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Allowing the proposed development will undermine the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("the Act") and any notion of sustainable management within Peninsula Bay. The site is in an Outstanding Natural Landscape and within the previously agreed Open Space Zone. Further development in this area does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. The consequent loss of open space will have adverse effects on those properties that currently exist in the area. The submitter seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	Relates to general opposition of any submission lodged by Peninsula Bay Joint Venture
FS1097.178	339.93	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1097.227	373.37	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.3 Objective 3	Support	Support amendment 'to encourage' protection and enhancement	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
FS1097.676	706.85	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.3 Objective 3	Support	Support in part for the reasons stated in QPL's original submission.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1132.26	373.37	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	We support the focus on encouraging protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on land deemed to be unproductive. However, developing assessment criteria for ascertaining what may be considered 'unproductive land' is problematic. Subsequently, we seek the retention of the Objective as proposed, and that the submitter's concerns be addressed through methods advising and encouraging the voluntary identification of unproductive areas with support given to private landowners to ensure the protection or enhancement of biodiversity values in these areas.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1132.55	706.85	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	The proposed wording already addresses the submitter's concerns while providing for reasonable land use in the rural areas.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1162.139	706.85	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1162.140	706.86	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1254.22	373.37	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1254.26	373.41	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1254.73	706.85	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1254.74	706.86	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1287.24	373.37	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1287.28	373.41	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1287.108	706.85	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1287.109	706.86	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1313.23	373.37	Darby Planning LP	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1313.27	373.41	Darby Planning LP	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1342.12	373.41	Te Anau Developments Limited	33.2.3 Objective 3	Support	Allow relief sought to the extent that is does not undermine or prevent the relief originally sought by Te Anau Developments (unless otherwise agreed through the submission process)	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1342.39	373.37	Te Anau Developments Limited	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Not allow relief sought (or other similar relief south by another submitter) unless otherwise agreed through the submission process	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1347.54	373.37	Lakes Land Care	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
FS1347.58	373.41	Lakes Land Care	33.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS339.95		Alty, Evan	33.2.3.1	Other	Amend as follows: Provide standards controlling the clearance of indigenous vegetation within 20 meters of water bodies, and Ensure that proposals for clearance do not reduce indigenous biodiversity values, create erosion, or adversely affect natural character along the margins of waterways.	Accept in Part		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.38		Department of Conservation	33.2.3.1	Other	This policy combined with the wording of Policy 33.2.3.6 will be best placed as a mechanism for ensuring the maintenance and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity is achieved under Objective 33.2.1	Reject		Issue 1
OS706.87		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.3.1		Amend as follows: Provide standards controlling the clearance of indigenous vegetation within 20 meters of water bodies, and Ensure that proposals for clearance do not reduce indigenous biodiversity values, create erosion, or adversely affect natural character along the margins of waterways.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1015.18	339.95	Straterra	33.2.3.1	Oppose	I seek that 339.95 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: "Ensure that <u>the adverse effects of proposals, including location-specific and/or temporary activities, for clearance do not reduce on</u> indigenous biodiversity values, create erosion, or adversely affect natural character along the margins of waterways, are avoided, remedied or mitigated, and where residual effects occur, they are offset or otherwise compensated for; and these areas are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development."	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1097.179	339.95	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.3.1	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1132.56	706.87	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.3.1	Oppose	The proposed wording already addresses the submitter's concerns while providing for reasonable land use in the rural areas.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1162.141	706.87	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.3.1	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1254.23	373.38	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.3.1	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1254.75	706.87	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.3.1	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1287.110	706.87	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.3.1	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1313.24	373.38	Darby Planning LP	33.2.3.1	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1347.55	373.38	Lakes Land Care	33.2.3.1	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS339.96		Alty, Evan	33.2.3.2	Oppose	Delete this policy.	Accept in Part		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.39		Department of Conservation	33.2.3.2	Oppose	Policy 33.2.3.2 is opposed. This concept is likely captured by the provisions for biodiversity offsetting that is detailed in earlier policies and suggested new policy. Therefore this Policy will be redundant given the relief sought elsewhere in this section.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
OS600.126		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.3.2	Support	Policy 33.2.3.2 is adopted as proposed.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
OS706.88		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.3.2	Oppose	Delete this policy.	Accept		Objective 33.2.3
FS1034.126	600.126	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.2.3.2	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1162.142	706.88	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.3.2	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
FS1209.126	600.126	Burdon, Richard	33.2.3.2	Support	Support entire submission	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
FS1254.24	373.39	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.3.2	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1254.76	706.88	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.3.2	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
FS1287.111	706.88	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.3.2	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
FS1313.25	373.39	Darby Planning LP	33.2.3.2	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1347.56	373.39	Lakes Land Care	33.2.3.2	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.97		Alty, Evan	33.2.3.3	Other	Amend as follows: <i>Encourage the retention and enhancement of indigenous vegetation including in locations that have potential for regeneration, provide connectivity, stability, and particularly where productive values are low, or in riparian areas or gullies.</i>	Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.40		Department of Conservation	33.2.3.3	Support	Retain Policy 33.2.3.3 as notified.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
OS600.127		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.3.3	Support	Policy 33.2.3.3 is adopted as proposed.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS706.89		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.3.3		Amend as follows: Encourage the retention <u>and enhancement</u> of indigenous vegetation <u>including</u> in locations that have potential for regeneration, provide connectivity, stability, <u>and</u> particularly where productive values are low, or in riparian areas or gullies.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
OS791.15		Burdon, Tim	33.2.3.3	Support	Approved.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
OS794.15		Lakes Land Care	33.2.3.3	Support	Approved.	Accept in Part		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1034.127	600.127	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.2.3.3	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1162.143	706.89	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.3.3	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1209.127	600.127	Burdon, Richard	33.2.3.3	Support	Support entire submission	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1254.25	373.40	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.3.3	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1254.77	706.89	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.3.3	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1287.112	706.89	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.3.3	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1313.26	373.40	Darby Planning LP	33.2.3.3	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1347.57	373.40	Lakes Land Care	33.2.3.3	Oppose	Opposes over-sewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.98		Alty, Evan	33.2.3.4	Other	Amend to read: <i>When considering the proposals for the clearance of indigenous vegetation, avoid: effects on threatened species; areas within a land environment (defined by the Land Environments of New Zealand at Level IV) identified as having less than 20% indigenous vegetation remaining;</i>	Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.42		Department of Conservation	33.2.3.4	Oppose	Delete Policy 33.2.3.4.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
OS590.9		Kane, Sam	33.2.3.4	Oppose	Policy 33.2.3.4 is amended to specify it applies only to the Urban zone.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
OS600.128		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.3.4	Other	Policy 33.2.3.4 is amended to specify it applies only to the Urban zone.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS706.90		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.3.4		Amend to read: When considering the proposals for the clearance of indigenous vegetation, avoid: effects on threatened species; areas within a land environment (defined by the Land Environments of New Zealand at Level IV) identified as having less than 20% indigenous vegetation remaining;	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
OS791.16		Burdon, Tim	33.2.3.4	Oppose	LENZ maps create uncertainty for rural assessments of indigenous vegetation.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3 and Rules
OS794.16		Lakes Land Care	33.2.3.4	Oppose	LENZ maps create uncertainty for rural assessments of indigenous vegetation.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1034.128	600.128	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.2.3.4	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1040.57	600.128	Forest and Bird	33.2.3.4	Oppose	Oppose	Accept		Objective 33.2.3
FS1162.144	706.90	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.3.4	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1209.128	600.128	Burdon, Richard	33.2.3.4	Support	Support entire submission	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
FS1254.27	373.42	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.3.4	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1254.78	706.90	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.3.4	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1287.113	706.90	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.3.4	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1313.28	373.42	Darby Planning LP	33.2.3.4	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1347.59	373.42	Lakes Land Care	33.2.3.4	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.99		Alty, Evan	33.2.3.5	Oppose	This is more of an assessment matter and should be included in a separate section.	Reject		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.43		Department of Conservation	33.2.3.5	Oppose	Delete Policy 33.2.3.5	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
OS600.129		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.3.5	Other	Policy 33.2.3.4 is amended to specify it applies only to the Urban zone.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS701.16		Kane, Paul	33.2.3.5		Relief sought 46. In 33.2.3.5 include the phrase at the end of the policy "taking into account the current and historical land uses on the site".	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
OS706.91		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.3.5	Oppose	This is more of an assessment matter and should be included in a separate section.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3 and Assessment Matters
OS784.14		Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	33.2.3.5		Land Environments New Zealand Classification is not an appropriate tool to be relied on in the proposed plan. Land to which this policy applies should be identified as possessing Indigenous Vegetation of significance for protection. Specific account should be given to the current and historical land uses on the site in the policy framework.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
OS791.17		Burdon, Tim	33.2.3.5	Oppose	LENZ maps create uncertainty for rural assessments of indigenous vegetation.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
OS794.17		Lakes Land Care	33.2.3.5	Oppose	LENZ maps create uncertainty for rural assessments of indigenous vegetation.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1034.129	600.129	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.2.3.5	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1040.58	600.129	Forest and Bird	33.2.3.5	Oppose	Oppose	Accept		Objective 33.2.3
FS1097.709	784.14	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.3.5	Support	Support the intent of the submission for the reasons provided in QPL's original submission.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
FS1162.51	701.16	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.3.5	Support	Believes that the relief sought in the submission will result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be allowed.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
FS1162.145	706.91	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.3.5	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1209.129	600.129	Burdon, Richard	33.2.3.5	Support	Support entire submission	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
FS1254.28	373.43	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.3.5	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1254.79	706.91	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.3.5	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1287.114	706.91	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.3.5	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1313.29	373.43	Darby Planning LP	33.2.3.5	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1347.60	373.43	Lakes Land Care	33.2.3.5	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS339.100		Alty, Evan	33.2.3.6	Other	Incorporate into the policy: <i>'Ensure indigenous vegetation removal does not adversely affect the natural character of the margins of water ways'</i>	Accept in Part		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.44		Department of Conservation	33.2.3.6	Oppose	Delete Policy 33.2.3.6.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
OS706.92		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.3.6		Incorporate into the policy: <i>'Ensure indigenous vegetation removal does not adversely affect the natural character of the margins of water ways'</i>	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1132.19	339.100	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.3.6	Oppose	There is no degree of significance; requiring no adverse effects on natural character would set a regulatory bar that is impractical, impossible to meet and difficult to police.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
FS1132.57	706.92	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.3.6	Support	The proposed provisions relating to indigenous vegetation removal are already sufficient. There does not need to be any further broadening of the policies relating to address indigenous vegetation removal around waterways, and such a broad policy would unnecessarily restrict reasonable land use and farm management.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
FS1162.146	706.92	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.3.6	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
FS1254.29	373.44	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.3.6	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1254.80	706.92	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.3.6	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
FS1287.115	706.92	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.3.6	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
FS1313.30	373.44	Darby Planning LP	33.2.3.6	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1347.61	373.44	Lakes Land Care	33.2.3.6	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.101		Alty, Evan	33.2.3.7	Oppose	This is an assessment matter. This matter is likely to cumulatively exacerbate biodiversity loss by reducing the area of habitat available and over time may lead to extirpation of species from areas.	Reject		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.45		Department of Conservation	33.2.3.7	Oppose	Delete Policy 33.2.3.7.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3
OS600.130		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.3.7	Support	Policy 33.2.3.7 is adopted as proposed.	Accept		Objective 33.2.3
OS706.93		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.3.7		This is an assessment matter. This matter is likely to cumulatively exacerbate biodiversity loss, by reducing the area of habitat available and over time may lead to extirpation of species from areas.	Reject		Objective 33.2.3

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1034.130	600.130	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.2.3.7	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1162.147	706.93	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.3.7	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1209.130	600.130	Burdon, Richard	33.2.3.7	Support	Support entire submission	Accept		Objective 33.2.3
FS1254.30	373.45	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.3.7	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1254.81	706.93	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.3.7	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1287.116	706.93	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.3.7	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1313.31	373.45	Darby Planning LP	33.2.3.7	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.3
FS1347.62	373.45	Lakes Land Care	33.2.3.7	Oppose	Opposes oversteering as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.102		Alty, Evan	33.2.4 Objective 4	Support	Supports the objective.	Accept		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.46		Department of Conservation	33.2.4 Objective 4	Support	Retain as notified.	Accept		Objective 33.2.4
OS706.94		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.4 Objective 4	Support	Supports the objective.	Accept		Objective 33.2.4
OS806.217		Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.4 Objective 4	Support	Support/amend. <i>Protect the indigenous biodiversity and landscape values of alpine environments from the effects of vegetation clearance and exotic tree and shrub planting, while recognising the importance of providing access to the Remarkables Alpine Recreation Area, and the important social and economic benefits derived from enabling low impact activities within the alpine environment.</i>	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS806.218		Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.4 Objective 4	Other	New Policy - 33.2.4.3 <i>Recognise the importance of providing public access to the Remarkables Alpine Recreation Area, and the benefits associated with increasing use and understanding of the alpine environment.</i>	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1162.148	706.94	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.4 Objective 4	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		Objective 33.2.4

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1254.31	373.46	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.4 Objective 4	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Reject		Objective 33.2.4
FS1254.82	706.94	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.4 Objective 4	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Reject		Objective 33.2.4
FS1287.117	706.94	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.4 Objective 4	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Reject		Objective 33.2.4
FS1313.32	373.46	Darby Planning LP	33.2.4 Objective 4	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Reject		Objective 33.2.4
FS1347.63	373.46	Lakes Land Care	33.2.4 Objective 4	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.103		Alty, Evan	33.2.4.1	Other	Amend as follows: <i>Recognise that alpine environments contribute to the distinct indigenous biodiversity and landscape qualities of the District and are vulnerable to should be protected from change through vegetation clearance or establishment of exotic plants.</i>	Reject		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.47		Department of Conservation	33.2.4.1	Support	Retain as notified.	Accept		Entire report
OS706.95		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.4.1		Amend as follows: Recognise that alpine environments contribute to the distinct indigenous biodiversity and landscape qualities of the District and are vulnerable to <u>should be protected from</u> change through vegetation clearance or establishment of exotic plants.	Reject		Objective 33.2.4
FS1015.19	339.103	Straterra	33.2.4.1	Oppose	I seek that 339.103 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: "Recognise that alpine environments contribute to the distinct indigenous biodiversity and landscape qualities of the District <u>and</u> should be protected from change through vegetation clearance or establishment of exotic plants, <u>in the case of inappropriate development in outstanding natural landscapes; and otherwise, including in the case of location-specific and/or temporary activities, adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated, and where residual effects occur, they are offset or otherwise compensated for.</u> "	Reject		Objective 33.2.4
FS1015.123	706.95	Straterra	33.2.4.1	Oppose	I seek that 706.95 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: "Recognise that alpine environments contribute to the distinct indigenous biodiversity and landscape qualities of the District <u>and the adverse effects of development on these values should be avoided, remedied or mitigated. Where these values are significant, they should be protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, protected from change through vegetation clearance or establishment of exotic plants.</u> "	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.4
FS1097.180	339.103	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.4.1	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.4
FS1097.677	706.95	Queenstown Park Limited	33.2.4.1	Oppose	Oppose use of the word 'protect' should be qualified, for the reasons provided in QPL's original submission.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.4

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1132.58	706.95	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.2.4.1	Oppose	Protection of these values within the alpine environment requires active management. The requirement 'to protect' puts a very high regulatory bar in place, and unnecessarily restricts otherwise legitimate and reasonable land use in the alpine environment.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.4
FS1162.149	706.95	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.4.1	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.4
FS1254.32	373.47	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.4.1	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Reject		Objective 33.2.4
FS1254.83	706.95	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.4.1	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.4
FS1287.118	706.95	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.2.4.1	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Objective 33.2.4
FS1313.33	373.47	Darby Planning LP	33.2.4.1	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Reject		Objective 33.2.4
FS1340.42	339.103	Queenstown Airport Corporation	33.2.4.1	Oppose	The proposed amendment contains ambiguous drafting ("should be protected from") and may unnecessarily constrain the ability of regionally significant infrastructure to upgrade and develop in alpine areas.	Accept		Objective 33.2.4
FS1347.64	373.47	Lakes Land Care	33.2.4.1	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.104		Alty, Evan	33.2.4.2	Support	Supports the policy.	Accept		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.48		Department of Conservation	33.2.4.2	Support	Retain as notified.	Accept		Entire report
OS706.96		Forest and Bird NZ	33.2.4.2	Support	Supports the policy.	Accept		Objective 33.2.4
OS791.18		Burdon, Tim	33.2.4.2	Support	Approved.	Accept		Objective 33.2.4
OS794.18		Lakes Land Care	33.2.4.2	Support	Approved.	Accept		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1162.150	706.96	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.2.4.2	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		Objective 33.2.4
FS1254.33	373.48	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.4.2	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Reject		Objective 33.2.4

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1254.84	706.96	Allenby Farms Limited	33.2.4.2	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Reject		Objective 33.2.4
FS1313.34	373.48	Darby Planning LP	33.2.4.2	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities. Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Reject		Objective 33.2.4
FS1347.65	373.48	Lakes Land Care	33.2.4.2	Oppose	Opposes over-sewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS290.5		Ryan, Christine	33.3 Other Provisions and Rules	Support	Strongly support the exemption of walkways - important to facilitate access into natural areas so that people can enjoy them.	Accept		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS610.19		Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek No. 1 LP	33.3 Other Provisions and Rules	Other	Support in part. Insert a new exception, as Rule 33.3.4.4, as follows: <u>Indigenous vegetation clearance undertaken on land managed under the Conservation Act in accordance with a Conservation Management Strategy or Concession; Under the Land Act, in accordance with a Recreation Permit; or the Reserve Act in accordance with a Reserve Management Strategy.</u>	Reject		33.3.4 Exemptions
FS1097.134	290.5	Queenstown Park Limited	33.3 Other Provisions and Rules	Support	Support for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Accept in Part		33.3.4 Exemptions
FS1229.22	610.19	NX Ski Limited	33.3 Other Provisions and Rules	Support	NZSki Limited support this submission point. There is duplication in the assessment of the clearance of indigenous vegetation within Ski Area Sub-Zones between QLDC, DOC, ORC and LINZ. It would be more efficient to recognise and accept the expert assessment of other statutory bodies with regards to indigenous biological values within the defined Ski Area Sub-Zones and would still align with the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Strategic Directions chapter (Section 3.2.4) and Objectives 33.2.1, 33.2.3. NZSki Limited seeks that this submission be accepted by QLDC.	Reject		33.3.4 Exemptions
OS339.105		Alty, Evan	33.3.2 Clarification	Support	Support this section, especially 33.3.2.1-33.3.2.3. These policies make it clear that the rules apply to all zones including unformed roads.	Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.49		Department of Conservation	33.3.2 Clarification	Other	Delete clarification points 33.3.2.4 to 7	Reject		Issue 1
OS706.97		Forest and Bird NZ	33.3.2 Clarification	Support	Support this section, especially 33.3.2.1-33.3.2.3. These policies make it clear that the rules apply to all zones including unformed roads.	Accept		33.3.2 Clarification
OS784.15		Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	33.3.2 Clarification		33.3.2 if the relief sought by JBIL in relation to the Land Environments New Zealand classification (sought under 33.2.3.5) is granted a consequential amendment of clause 33.3.2.6 will also be required.	Reject		33.3.2 Clarification
OS784.21		Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	33.3.2 Clarification		If relief sought by JBIL in relation to Table 33.7 a consequential amendment of clause 33.3.2.7 will also be required.	Reject		33.3.2 Clarification
OS805.99		Transpower New Zealand Limited	33.3.2 Clarification	Oppose	Add new clarification point: <u>Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Significant Natural Areas are not considered to be 'natural areas' for the purposes of the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities) Regulations 2009 (NESETA).</u>	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS806.219		Queenstown Park Limited	33.3.2 Clarification	Oppose	Delete clarification point 33.3.2.3.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1162.151	706.97	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.3.2 Clarification	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		33.3.2 Clarification
FS1254.34	373.49	Allenby Farms Limited	33.3.2 Clarification	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept		Issue 1
FS1254.85	706.97	Allenby Farms Limited	33.3.2 Clarification	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Reject		33.3.2 Clarification
FS1313.35	373.49	Darby Planning LP	33.3.2 Clarification	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept		Issue 1
FS1347.66	373.49	Lakes Land Care	33.3.2 Clarification	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS373.50		Department of Conservation	33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules	Other	Amend 33.3.3.1 as follows: For the purposes of determining compliance with Rules 33.4.1 to 33.4.3, indigenous vegetation shall be measured cumulatively over the area(s) to be cleared. Amend 33.3.3.4 as follows: For the purpose of 33.3.3.2 and 33.3.3.3 above Structural dominance means indigenous species that are in the tallest stratum. Delete 33.3.3.5 and Delete 33.3.3.6.	Reject		Issue 1
OS600.131		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules	Support	33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules is adopted as proposed.	Accept		33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules
OS784.16		Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules		Further consideration be given to the manner in which indigenous vegetation is assessed. Particularly in terms of whether 'structural dominance' is achieved.	Reject		33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules
FS1034.131	600.131	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1091.6	373.50	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules	Oppose	Disallow. The relief sought has the potential to prevent many land use activities throughout SNAs. Sustainable management requires a balancing of land use while avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects. The relief sought does not adequately represent sustainable management because blanket protection is sought.	Accept in Part		Issue 1 and 33.3.3

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1097.710	784.16	Queenstown Park Limited	33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules	Support	Support the intent of the submission for the reasons provided in QPL's original submission.	Accept in Part		33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules
FS1209.131	600.131	Burdon, Richard	33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules	Support	Support entire submission	Accept		33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules
FS1254.35	373.50	Allenby Farms Limited	33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Issue 1 and 33.3.3
FS1313.36	373.50	Darby Planning LP	33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Issue 1 and 33.3.3
FS1342.40	373.50	Te Anau Developments Limited	33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules	Oppose	Not allow relief sought (or other similar relief sought by another submitter) unless otherwise agreed through the submission process	Accept in Part		Issue 1 and 33.3.3
FS1347.67	373.50	Lakes Land Care	33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules	Oppose	Opposes over-sewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.106		Alty, Evan	33.3.3.1	Support	Support.	Accept		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS706.98		Forest and Bird NZ	33.3.3.1		Support.	Accept		33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules
FS1162.152	706.98	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.3.3.1	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules
FS1254.86	706.98	Allenby Farms Limited	33.3.3.1	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Reject		33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules
OS339.107		Alty, Evan	33.3.3.2	Other	Amend. The main problem is the use of indigenous vegetation rather than coverage by indigenous species. Need to include words 'coverage by' and 'vascular and non-vascular and plant'.	Accept in Part		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS706.99		Forest and Bird NZ	33.3.3.2		Amend. The main problem is the use of indigenous vegetation rather than coverage by indigenous species. Need to include words coverage by and vascular and non-vascular and plant.	Accept in Part		Definitions

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS806.220		Queenstown Park Limited	33.3.3.2	Oppose	33.3.3.2 and 33.3.3.3 - oppose/amend. Amend rules to reduce coverage percentages.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1162.153	706.99	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.3.3.2	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules
FS1254.87	706.99	Allenby Farms Limited	33.3.3.2	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Reject		33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules
FS1287.119	706.99	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.3.3.2	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Reject		33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules
OS339.108		Alty, Evan	33.3.3.3	Other	Need to include words 'coverage by' and 'vascular and non-vascular and plants'.	Accept in Part		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS706.100		Forest and Bird NZ	33.3.3.3		Need to include words coverage by and vascular and non-vascular and plants.	Accept in Part		Definitions (Issue 2)
FS1162.154	706.100	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.3.3.3	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules
FS1254.88	706.100	Allenby Farms Limited	33.3.3.3	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Reject		33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules
FS1287.120	706.100	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.3.3.3	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Reject		33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules
OS339.109		Alty, Evan	33.3.3.4	Other	Needs to be clearer. Amend as follows: <i>Structural dominance is attained when indigenous species are in the tallest stratum and are visually conspicuous, and coverage by indigenous species exceeds 20% of the total area.</i>	Reject		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS706.101		Forest and Bird NZ	33.3.3.4		Needs to be clearer. Amend as follows: <i>Structural dominance is attained when indigenous species are in the tallest stratum and are visually conspicuous, and coverage by indigenous species exceeds 20% of the total area.</i>	Accept		33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules
FS1162.155	706.101	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.3.3.4	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules
FS1254.89	706.101	Allenby Farms Limited	33.3.3.4	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules
FS1287.121	706.101	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.3.3.4	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		33.3.3 Application of the indigenous vegetation rules

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS373.51		Department of Conservation	33.3.4 Exemptions	Other	Retain section 33.3.4 exemptions as notified, but delete 33.3.4.3 and amend point 33.3.4.3 as follows: Indigenous vegetation clearance for the construction of walkways or trails up to 1.5 metres in width provided that it does not involve the clearance of any threatened plants listed in section 33.7 or any tree greater than a height of 4 metres, <u>or clearance within any area identified as being an Significant Natural Area when assessed against the criteria in Part 33.10.</u>	Reject		Issue 1 and Rule 33.3.4 - Exemptions
OS701.18		Kane, Paul	33.3.4 Exemptions		Relief sought 48. In 33.3.4 include a new exemption that allows previously unirrigated land to be irrigated.	Reject		Entire report.
OS784.18		Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	33.3.4 Exemptions		JBIL seeks a new rule that exempts the clearance of indigenous vegetation rules for the purposes of irrigating new farm areas.	Reject		Entire report.
OS806.221		Queenstown Park Limited	33.3.4 Exemptions	Support	33.3.4.2, 33.3.4.3 – support/insert Insert a further exemption for the clearance of indigenous vegetation required for the purposes of constructing a gondola between Remarkables Park, Queenstown Park and the Remarkables ski field.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1040.13	373.51	Forest and Bird	33.3.4 Exemptions	Support	Support	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1091.7	373.51	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	33.3.4 Exemptions	Oppose	Disallow. It is not clear why a value assessment needs to occur prior to the removal of non-significant vegetation. Requiring a value assessment decreases the ability for land users to use land efficiently and increases the cost of using that land. That is inconsistent with the strategic direction to create a prosperous, resilient and equitable economy.	Reject		Issue 1 and Rule 33.3.4 - Exemptions
FS1097.228	373.51	Queenstown Park Limited	33.3.4 Exemptions	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Accept in Part		33.3.4 Exemptions
FS1132.27	373.51	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.3.4 Exemptions	Oppose	Oppose broadening the scope to include Significant Natural Areas. We consider point 33.3.4.3 provides for reasonable use of the land, and that the allowances are also reasonable for SNAs.	Accept		Issue 1 and Rule 33.3.4 - Exemptions
FS1162.53	701.18	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.3.4 Exemptions	Support	Believes that the relief sought in the submission will result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be allowed.	Reject		Entire report.
FS1254.36	373.51	Allenby Farms Limited	33.3.4 Exemptions	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept		Issue 1 and Rule 33.3.4 - Exemptions
FS1287.25	373.51	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.3.4 Exemptions	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept		Issue 1 and Rule 33.3.4 - Exemptions
FS1313.37	373.51	Darby Planning LP	33.3.4 Exemptions	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Issue 1 and Rule 33.3.4 - Exemptions
FS1347.68	373.51	Lakes Land Care	33.3.4 Exemptions	Oppose	Opposes overseeing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.113		Alty, Evan	33.3.4.1	Oppose	Delete this Exemption.	Reject		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS706.105		Forest and Bird NZ	33.3.4.1	Oppose	Delete this Exemption.	Reject		33.3.4 Exemptions
FS1097.680	706.105	Queenstown Park Limited	33.3.4.1	Support	Identification as SNA is not necessary if an area is already protected by QEII or covenant, and this suggestion could be an impediment to those protection mechanisms.	Accept in Part		33.3.4 Exemptions
FS1132.59	706.105	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.3.4.1	Oppose	The proposed exemptions reflect the fact that there are alternative methods of achieving the protection and active management of Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity. The proposed exemption recognises that, as these alternative methods are essentially achieving the same ultimate goal, there is no need for the District Plan to also regulate these areas. Removing the exemption would act as a serious disincentive to those landowners considering voluntary protection of Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity.	Accept		33.3.4 Exemptions
FS1162.159	706.105	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.3.4.1	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		33.3.4 Exemptions
FS1254.93	706.105	Allenby Farms Limited	33.3.4.1	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		33.3.4 Exemptions
FS1287.124	706.105	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.3.4.1	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		33.3.4 Exemptions
OS339.114		Alty, Evan	33.3.4.2	Other	Delete the exemption for drains. Clearance of drains can result in further drainage of wetlands, and increased sedimentation in water ways.	Reject		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS600.132		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.3.4.2	Support	33.3.4.2is adopted as proposed.	Accept		33.3.4 Exemptions
OS635.76		Aurora Energy Limited	33.3.4.2	Support	Retain Rule 33.3.4.2	Accept		33.3.4 Exemptions
OS701.17		Kane, Paul	33.3.4.2		Relief sought 47. In 33.3.4.2 include the phrase "For the avoidance of doubt, existing irrigated land can continue to be irrigated. This land is excluded from the indigenous vegetation clearance rules".	Reject		33.3.4 Exemptions
OS706.106		Forest and Bird NZ	33.3.4.2		Delete the exemption for drains. Clearance of drains can result in further drainage of wetlands, and increased sedimentation in water ways.	Reject		33.3.4 Exemptions
OS784.17		Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	33.3.4.2		JBIL seeks that the phrase "For the avoidance of doubt, existing irrigated land can continue to be irrigated. This land is excluded from the indigenous vegetation clearance rules" be added to the rule for clarity.	Reject		33.3.4 Exemptions
OS805.100		Transpower New Zealand Limited	33.3.4.2	Support	Retain Section 33.3.4.2 Indigenous vegetation clearance for the operation and maintenance of existing and in service / operational roads, tracks, drains, utilities, structures and/or fence lines, but excludes their expansion.	Accept		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1034.132	600.132	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.3.4.2	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1132.60	706.106	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.3.4.2	Oppose	The clearance of drains is a fundamental necessity for rural production, and should remain as an exemption. In terms of water quality (sedimentation), the submitters concerns are addressed through Otago Regional Council's water plan 6A.	Accept in Part		33.3.4 Exemptions
FS1162.52	701.17	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.3.4.2	Support	Believes that the relief sought in the submission will result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be allowed.	Reject		33.3.4 Exemptions
FS1162.160	706.106	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.3.4.2	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		33.3.4 Exemptions
FS1209.132	600.132	Burdon, Richard	33.3.4.2	Support	Support entire submission	Accept		33.3.4 Exemptions
FS1254.94	706.106	Allenby Farms Limited	33.3.4.2	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		33.3.4 Exemptions
FS1287.125	706.106	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.3.4.2	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		33.3.4 Exemptions
OS339.115		Alty, Evan	33.3.4.3	Support	Support the exemption.	Accept		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS706.107		Forest and Bird NZ	33.3.4.3	Support	Support the exemption.	Accept		33.3.4 Exemptions
FS1162.161	706.107	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.3.4.3	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		33.3.4 Exemptions
FS1254.95	706.107	Allenby Farms Limited	33.3.4.3	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Reject		33.3.4 Exemptions
OS323.6		Frost, Jed - represented by Attn: Nick Geddes Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates	33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation	Oppose	Rules 33.4.1 to 33.4.3 conflict with the rights afforded to each property owner within Lots 4, 14, 17, 19 & 101 DP 26634, which have been approved for residential buildings with associated landscaping. Requests areas of A23A are removed from Lots 4, 14, 17, 19 & 101 DP 26634.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS373.52		Department of Conservation	33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation	Oppose	Amend non-compliance status for 33.4.2 and 33.4.3 of Table 1 to a non-complying activity status.	Reject		Rule 33.4 – Table 1 Activity Status
OS613.19		Treble Cone Investments Limited.	33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation	Other	Support in part. Insert a new exception, as Rule 33.3.4.4, as follows: <u>Indigenous vegetation clearance undertaken on land managed under the Conservation Act in accordance with a Conservation Management Strategy or Concession; Under the Land Act, in accordance with a Recreation Permit; or the Reserve Act in accordance with a Reserve Management Strategy.</u>	Reject		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
OS806.222		Queenstown Park Limited	33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation	Other	Amend. Delete Table 1 and amend Tables 2, 3, and 4 to include a column headed "non compliance status".	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1229.23	613.19	NXski Limited	33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation	Support	NZski Limited support this submission point. There is duplication in the assessment of the clearance of indigenous vegetation within Ski Area Sub-Zones between QLDC, DOC, ORC and LINZ. It would be more efficient to recognise and accept the expert assessment of other statutory bodies with regards to indigenous biological values within the defined Ski Area Sub-Zones and would still align with the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Strategic Directions chapter (Section 3.2.4) and Objectives 33.2.1, 33.2.3. NZski Limited seeks that this submission be accepted by QLDC.	Reject		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
FS1254.39	373.52	Allenby Farms Limited	33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Rule 33.4 – Table 1 Activity Status
FS1313.38	373.52	Darby Planning LP	33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Rule 33.4 – Table 1 Activity Status
FS1342.41	373.52	Te Anau Developments Limited	33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation	Oppose	Not allow relief sought (or other similar relief sought by another submitter) unless otherwise agreed through the submission process	Accept in Part		Rule 33.4 – Table 1 Activity Status
FS1347.69	373.52	Lakes Land Care	33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS339.110		Alty, Evan	33.4.1	Support	Support, non compliance should be a discretionary activity.	Accept		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS600.133		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.4.1	Support	33.4.1is adopted as proposed.	Accept		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
OS706.102		Forest and Bird NZ	33.4.1	Support	Support, non compliance should be a discretionary activity.	Accept		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
FS1034.133	600.133	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.4.1	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1162.156	706.102	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.4.1	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
FS1209.133	600.133	Burdon, Richard	33.4.1	Support	Support entire submission	Accept		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
FS1254.90	706.102	Allenby Farms Limited	33.4.1	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Reject		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
OS339.111		Alty, Evan	33.4.2	Oppose	Make the removal of SNA a non-complying activity.	Reject		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS600.134		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.4.2	Support	33.4.2 is adopted as proposed.	Accept		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
OS706.103		Forest and Bird NZ	33.4.2	Oppose	Make the removal of SNA a non-complying activity.	Reject		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
FS1034.134	600.134	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.4.2	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1097.181	339.111	Queenstown Park Limited	33.4.2	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Reject		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
FS1097.678	706.103	Queenstown Park Limited	33.4.2	Oppose	For the reasons stated in QPL's original submission; All clearance in SNA should not be a non-complying activity.	Accept in Part		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
FS1121.47	339.111	Aurora Energy Limited	33.4.2	Oppose	Opposes in part. Is supportive of measures that seek to reduce the loss of biodiversity values, particularly in locations identified as Significant Natural areas. Alerts that there will be instances where Aurora will be required to remove indigenous vegetation to ensure that operational efficiency of its network is maintained and to remove potential fire risks. This should be reflected in the Proposed Plan.	Reject		Entire report
FS1162.157	706.103	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.4.2	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
FS1209.134	600.134	Burdon, Richard	33.4.2	Support	Support entire submission	Accept		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1254.91	706.103	Allenby Farms Limited	33.4.2	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
FS1287.122	706.103	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.4.2	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
OS339.112		Alty, Evan	33.4.3	Oppose	Make non-compliance with 'alpine environments' rule a non-complying activity.	Reject		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS600.135		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.4.3	Support	33.4.3 is adopted as proposed.	Accept		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
OS706.104		Forest and Bird NZ	33.4.3	Oppose	Make non-compliance with 'alpine environments' rule a non-complying activity.	Reject		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
FS1034.135	600.135	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.4.3	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1097.182	339.112	Queenstown Park Limited	33.4.3	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Accept in Part		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
FS1097.679	706.104	Queenstown Park Limited	33.4.3	Oppose	It is not necessary nor reasonable to impose such restrictions on activities in the alpine environment.	Accept in Part		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
FS1162.158	706.104	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.4.3	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
FS1209.135	600.135	Burdon, Richard	33.4.3	Support	Support entire submission	Accept		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
FS1254.92	706.104	Allenby Farms Limited	33.4.3	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
FS1287.123	706.104	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.4.3	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
FS1340.43	339.112	Queenstown Airport Corporation	33.4.3	Oppose	The proposed amendment may result in minor indigenous vegetation clearance required for the safe and effective operation of regionally significant infrastructure being deemed a non-complying activity. This is considered to be inappropriate as it is unduly onerous.	Accept in Part		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
FS1340.45	706.104	Queenstown Airport Corporation	33.4.3	Oppose	The proposal would see the installation of aircraft navigational infrastructure in alpine environments become a non-complying activity, which is unduly onerous.	Accept in Part		33.4 Rules – Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation
OS339.116		Alty, Evan	33.5 Rules - Standards for Permitted Activities	Oppose	5000m ² is large and will not enable the maintenance of indigenous biodiversity throughout the district. The Rule fails to provide opportunities to protect areas meeting the criteria for SNA's. Delete and replace with standards restricting clearance of indigenous vegetation of certain plants/communities or 500m ² generally.	Accept		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS373.53		Department of Conservation	33.5 Rules - Standards for Permitted Activities	Oppose	Amend 33.5.3 as follows: Within a land environment (defined by the Land Environments of New Zealand at Level IV) that has 20 percent or less remaining in indigenous cover, clearance is less than 500m² in area of any site and, 50m² in area of any site less than 10ha, in any continuous period of 5 years (refer to section 33.9). <u>The site is not considered to be a Significant Natural Area when considered against the criteria in section 33.10.</u> Delete standard 33.5.5.	Reject		Issue 1
OS439.2		Lake McKay Station Ltd	33.5 Rules - Standards for Permitted Activities	Other	Considers that the proposed Rules for the SNAs are too restrictive to allow general maintenance of existing access tracks and an upgrade or widening of the tracks would be impossible.	Reject		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
OS706.108		Forest and Bird NZ	33.5 Rules - Standards for Permitted Activities	Oppose	5000m ² is large and will not enable the maintenance of indigenous biodiversity throughout the district. The Rule fails to provide opportunities to protect areas meeting the criteria for SNA's. Delete and replace with standards restricting clearance of indigenous vegetation of certain plants/communities or 500m ² generally.	Reject		33.5 Table 2
OS806.223		Queenstown Park Limited	33.5 Rules - Standards for Permitted Activities	Other	Delete Table 1 and amend Tables 2, 3, and 4 to include a column headed "non compliance status". Table 2 - 33.5.1 – 33.5.4 – oppose/amend Amend the rules to enable indigenous vegetation clearance within Queenstown Park as a permitted activity. Amend to recognise the importance of managing weed species and the fact that the indigenous vegetation is interspersed with weeds Table 3 – support/amend Amend to exempt earthworks and clearance for the purposes of public walkways and trails, fencing, and the gondola access from Queenstown Park to the Remarkables Ski area	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1040.14	373.53	Forest and Bird	33.5 Rules - Standards for Permitted Activities	Support	Support	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1097.183	339.116	Queenstown Park Limited	33.5 Rules - Standards for Permitted Activities	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1097.229	373.53	Queenstown Park Limited	33.5 Rules - Standards for Permitted Activities	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1097.421	439.2	Queenstown Park Limited	33.5 Rules - Standards for Permitted Activities	Support	Agree with the submitter that the proposed Rules for the SNAs are too restrictive to allow general maintenance of existing access tracks and an upgrade or widening of the tracks would be impossible.	Reject		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1097.681	706.108	Queenstown Park Limited	33.5 Rules - Standards for Permitted Activities	Oppose	The suggested amendment is overly restrictive and is not necessary.	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1162.162	706.108	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.5 Rules - Standards for Permitted Activities	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1254.37	373.53	Allenby Farms Limited	33.5 Rules - Standards for Permitted Activities	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1254.96	706.108	Allenby Farms Limited	33.5 Rules - Standards for Permitted Activities	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1287.26	373.53	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.5 Rules - Standards for Permitted Activities	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1287.126	706.108	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.5 Rules - Standards for Permitted Activities	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1313.39	373.53	Darby Planning LP	33.5 Rules - Standards for Permitted Activities	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1342.42	373.53	Te Anau Developments Limited	33.5 Rules - Standards for Permitted Activities	Oppose	Not allow relief sought (or other similar relief south by another submitter) unless otherwise agreed through the submission process	Accept in Part		Issue 1
FS1347.70	373.53	Lakes Land Care	33.5 Rules - Standards for Permitted Activities	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS323.7		Frost, Jed - represented by Attn: Nick Geddes Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates	33.5.1	Oppose	Rules 33.4.1 to 33.4.3 conflict with the rights afforded to each property owner within Lots 4, 14, 17, 19 & 101 DP 26634, which have been approved tfor residential buildings with associated landscaping. Requests areas of A23A are removed from Lots 4, 14, 17, 19 & 101 DP 26634.	Reject		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
OS809.16		Queenstown Lakes District Council	33.5.1	Other	33.5.1 Change to – Clearance of indigenous vegetation less than 2.0m in height and less than 5000m ² in any area of any site over 10ha and, 500m ² in any area of any site less than 10ha, in any continuous period of 5 years.	Reject		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
OS323.8		Frost, Jed - represented by Attn: Nick Geddes Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates	33.5.2	Oppose	Rules 33.4.1 to 33.4.3 conflict with the rights afforded to each property owner within Lots 4, 14, 17, 19 & 101 DP 26634, which have been approved tfor residential buildings with associated landscaping. Requests areas of A23A are removed from Lots 4, 14, 17, 19 & 101 DP 26634.	Reject		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
OS323.9		Frost, Jed - represented by Attn: Nick Geddes Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates	33.5.3	Oppose	Rules 33.4.1 to 33.4.3 conflict with the rights afforded to each property owner within Lots 4, 14, 17, 19 & 101 DP 26634, which have been approved tfor residential buildings with associated landscaping. Requests areas of A23A are removed from Lots 4, 14, 17, 19 & 101 DP 26634.	Reject		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
OS477.1		Clarke, Ian	33.5.3	Oppose	Amend Rule 33.5.2. 50msq is too small an area to be practical.	Reject		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
OS600.136		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.5.3	Oppose	Rule 33.5.3. is deleted from Table 2 Adopt the remainder of Table 2: Setting out permitted activity standards associated with clearance of indigenous vegetation not located within a Significant Natural Area or within Alpine Environments is adopted as proposed.	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1034.136	600.136	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.5.3	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1040.59	600.136	Forest and Bird	33.5.3	Oppose	Oppose	Reject		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1209.136	600.136	Burdon, Richard	33.5.3	Support	Support entire submission	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
OS323.10		Frost, Jed - represented by Attn: Nick Geddes Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates	33.5.4	Oppose	Rules 33.4.1 to 33.4.3 conflict with the rights afforded to each property owner within Lots 4, 14, 17, 19 & 101 DP 26634, which have been approved tfor residential buildings with associated landscaping. Requests areas of A23A are removed from Lots 4, 14, 17, 19 & 101 DP 26634.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS809.17		Queenstown Lakes District Council	33.5.4	Other	33.5.4 Change to – Clearance is more than 20m from the edge of a water body or the edge of a natural watercourse including streams and wetlands.	Reject		Entire report
OS323.11		Frost, Jed - represented by Attn: Nick Geddes Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates	33.5.5	Oppose	Rules 33.4.1 to 33.4.3 conflict with the rights afforded to each property owner within Lots 4, 14, 17, 19 & 101 DP 26634, which have been approved tfor residential buildings with associated landscaping. Requests areas of A23A are removed from Lots 4, 14, 17, 19 & 101 DP 26634.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS339.117		Alty, Evan	33.5.5	Support	Support.	Accept		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS706.109		Forest and Bird NZ	33.5.5	Support	Support.	Accept		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
OS809.18		Queenstown Lakes District Council	33.5.5	Other	33.5.5 Change to – Is for the purpose of cutting and removal of indigenous trees that have been subject to windthrow and/or are dead standing attributed to natural causes or have become dangerous to persons or property. (Prior to the commencement of any works relating to 33.5.5, persons must notify Council in writing at least 10 working days prior to the commencement of the works in order to allow Council an opportunity to confirm the permitted activity status of the proposed works). Should it be identified that an indigenous tree presents an imminent hazard, any work that is considered necessary to immediately abate the hazard may proceed at once, though evidence shall be submitted to council identifying the urgency for the works.	Reject		Entire report
FS1162.163	706.109	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.5.5	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1254.97	706.109	Allenby Farms Limited	33.5.5	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
OS323.12		Frost, Jed - represented by Attn: Nick Geddes Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates	33.5.6	Oppose	Rules 33.4.1 to 33.4.3 conflict with the rights afforded to each property owner within Lots 4, 14, 17, 19 & 101 DP 26634, which have been approved tfor residential buildings with associated landscaping. Requests areas of A23A are removed from Lots 4, 14, 17, 19 & 101 DP 26634.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS163.3		Woodfield, Vaughn	33.5.7	Oppose	Reject the scheduling of SNA E38A-1 on Lot 6 Stevensons Road, in particular the restrictions on earthworks.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS323.13		Frost, Jed - represented by Attn: Nick Geddes Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates	33.5.7	Oppose	Rules 33.4.1 to 33.4.3 conflict with the rights afforded to each property owner within Lots 4, 14, 17, 19 & 101 DP 26634, which have been approved tfor residential buildings with associated landscaping. Requests areas of A23A are removed from Lots 4, 14, 17, 19 & 101 DP 26634.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS339.118		Alty, Evan	33.5.7	Oppose	Earth works result in significant adverse effects and should not be a permitted activity in SNA's in order to meet RMA requirements meet the Plan's strategic direction, Objectives and Policies with regard to nature conservation values.	Reject		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS706.110		Forest and Bird NZ	33.5.7	Oppose	Earth works result in significant adverse effects and should not be a permitted activity in SNA's in order to meet RMA requirements meet the Plan's strategic direction, Objectives and Policies with regard to nature conservation values.	Reject		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1020.3	163.3	Woodfield, Vaughn	33.5.7	Support	Rezoning from general Rural will severely restrict the viability of the lot this area is on. It is planned to install irrigation in this area, and construct stock control fencing. Limiting the clearance area as detailed will prevent installation of these systems that make land management more efficient. Additionally, the restriction on the amount of land that can be cleared to the levels proposed will hinder the owner (current or future) from constructing an access way along the legal right of way to Lot 7. According to Rural Area Rule 5.3.5.1 ii each residential unit shall have legal access to a formed road. The legal access to Lot 7 building platform runs through E38A_2, hence limiting clearance to that prescribed for SNA denies them the ability to form an access way along the legal right of way.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1097.184	339.118	Queenstown Park Limited	33.5.7	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Reject		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1097.682	706.110	Queenstown Park Limited	33.5.7	Oppose	Some earthworks may be necessary in SNA, and can be undertaken without causing significant adverse effects.	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1162.164	706.110	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.5.7	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1254.98	706.110	Allenby Farms Limited	33.5.7	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1287.127	706.110	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.5.7	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
OS323.14		Frost, Jed - represented by Attn: Nick Geddes Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates	33.5.8	Oppose	Rules 33.4.1 to 33.4.3 conflict with the rights afforded to each property owner within Lots 4, 14, 17, 19 & 101 DP 26634, which have been approved tfor residential buildings with associated landscaping. Requests areas of A23A are removed from Lots 4, 14, 17, 19 & 101 DP 26634.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS339.119		Alty, Evan	33.5.8	Oppose	Reject, there should not be any permitted clearance within SNAs.	Reject		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.54		Department of Conservation	33.5.8	Other	Amend Table 3 so that there shall be no permitted standard allowing vegetation clearance within an area determined as a Significant Natural Area.	Reject		Entire report
OS706.111		Forest and Bird NZ	33.5.8	Oppose	Reject, there should not be any permitted clearance within SNAs.	Reject		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
OS809.19		Queenstown Lakes District Council	33.5.8	Other	33.5.8 Change to – The clearance of indigenous vegetation below 2.0m in height shall not exceed 50m ² in any area in any continuous period of 5 years.	Reject		Entire report
FS1040.15	373.54	Forest and Bird	33.5.8	Support	Support	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1097.185	339.119	Queenstown Park Limited	33.5.8	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Reject		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1097.230	373.54	Queenstown Park Limited	33.5.8	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1097.721	809.19	Queenstown Park Limited	33.5.8	Oppose	The rule needs amendment to provide greater clarification as to its application.	Reject		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1132.28	373.54	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.5.8	Oppose	SNAs within the District often occur on private land, including farmland. Management of SNAs on private land requires a balance between providing reasonable flexibility around use of that land, while maintaining the values in the SNAs overall. We consider the permitted activity approach achieves this balance.	Accept		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1162.165	706.111	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.5.8	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1254.38	373.54	Allenby Farms Limited	33.5.8	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified for Chapter 3 and Chapter 33 Amendments proposed to Policy 3.2.4.2.2 and Policy 30.2.3.6 on biodiversity off-setting create confusion for the methodology of the principle and inappropriately limit the concept and application of environmental compensation. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1254.99	706.111	Allenby Farms Limited	33.5.8	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1287.27	373.54	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.5.8	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1287.128	706.111	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.5.8	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1313.40	373.54	Darby Planning LP	33.5.8	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1340.44	339.119	Queenstown Airport Corporation	33.5.8	Oppose	It is practical and efficient to provide for small-scale vegetation clearance in Significant Natural Areas. This provision as notified will reduce onerous resource consent requirements (for example minor vegetation clearance associate with the upgrade of existing significant infrastructure located within a SNA) and enable efficient allocation of Council resources.	Accept		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1342.43	373.54	Te Anau Developments Limited	33.5.8	Oppose	Not allow relief sought (or other similar relief south by another submitter) unless otherwise agreed through the submission process	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1347.71	373.54	Lakes Land Care	33.5.8	Oppose	Opposes overseeing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS323.15		Frost, Jed - represented by Attn: Nick Geddes Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates	33.5.9	Oppose	Rules 33.4.1 to 33.4.3 conflict with the rights afforded to each property owner within Lots 4, 14, 17, 19 & 101 DP 26634, which have been approved for residential buildings with associated landscaping. Requests areas of A23A are removed from Lots 4, 14, 17, 19 & 101 DP 26634.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS339.120		Alty, Evan	33.5.9	Other	Retain with amendment: <i>Does not involve exotic tree or shrub planting, or establishment of pasture or crop.</i>	Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS600.137		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.5.9	Other	Rule 33.5.9 is amended to specify a degree of scale or size of the proposed area of planting. The remainder of table 3: Activities within Significant Natural Areas identified in Schedule 33.8 and on the District Plan maps is adopted as proposed.	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
OS706.112		Forest and Bird NZ	33.5.9		Retain with amendment: Does not involve exotic tree or shrub planting, or establishment of pasture or crop.	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1034.137	600.137	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	33.5.9	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1040.60	600.137	Forest and Bird	33.5.9	Oppose	Oppose	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1132.20	339.120	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	33.5.9	Support	The standards should provide for the establishment of pasture and crop.	Reject		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1162.166	706.112	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.5.9	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1209.137	600.137	Burdon, Richard	33.5.9	Support	Support entire submission	Reject		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1254.100	706.112	Allenby Farms Limited	33.5.9	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Reject		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
FS1287.129	706.112	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.5.9	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Reject		33.5 Table 3 SNAs
OS339.121		Alty, Evan	33.5.10	Other	Retain with amendments: <i>Does not involve the clearance of indigenous vegetation, the planting of shelterbelts, or any exotic tree or shrub planting of exotic species.</i> Retain clarification.	Accept		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.55		Department of Conservation	33.5.10	Support	Retain as notified	Accept		Entire report
OS706.113		Forest and Bird NZ	33.5.10		Retain with amendments: Does not involve the clearance of indigenous vegetation, the planting of shelterbelts, or any exotic tree or shrub planting of exotic species. Retain clarification.	Accept in Part		Table 4 33.5.10
OS784.19		Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	33.5.10		Remove the controls on clearance above a specified altitude.	Reject		Table 4 33.5.10
FS1091.27	706.113	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	33.5.10	Oppose	Disallow. The planting of shelter belts is important to enable wind protection for rural activities. This enables productivity of farming to be maintained or increased, improving the efficiency of land use activities throughout the district. Managing the effects of wilding trees more adequately satisfies the requirement of sustainable management than an out-right ban.	Reject		Table 4 33.5.10
FS1097.683	706.113	Queenstown Park Limited	33.5.10	Oppose	Providing some activities as permitted within SNA is practical and appropriate.	Accept in Part		33.5 Table 3 SNAs.
FS1162.167	706.113	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.5.10	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		Table 4 33.5.10
FS1254.101	706.113	Allenby Farms Limited	33.5.10	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Accept in Part		Table 4 33.5.10
FS1287.130	706.113	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	33.5.10	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 33	Accept in Part		Table 4 33.5.10

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1313.41	373.55	Darby Planning LP	33.5.10	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Reject		Table 4 33.5.10
FS1347.72	373.55	Lakes Land Care	33.5.10	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS339.122		Alty, Evan	33.6 Non-Notification of Applications	Support	Retain.	Accept		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS706.114		Forest and Bird NZ	33.6 Non-Notification of Applications	Support	Retain.	Accept		No comment made.
FS1162.168	706.114	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.6 Non-Notification of Applications	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		No comment made.
FS1254.102	706.114	Allenby Farms Limited	33.6 Non-Notification of Applications	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Reject		No comment made.
OS339.123		Alty, Evan	33.7 Threatened Plant List	Other	Support list provided as it is a complete and up to date list. It also needs to include threatened plants include other plants that occur naturally within the District and are listed in the current New Zealand Threat Classification as either Threatened or At Risk.	Accept in Part		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS373.56		Department of Conservation	33.7 Threatened Plant List	Other	Retain as notified although consideration should be given to inclusion of the following species: <u>Nationally Critical</u> Dysphania pusila (locally extinct?) Cardamine (b) CHR3129947; tarn) Cardamine (c) CHR511706; Pisa Range) Chaerophyllum colensoi var. delicatula Crassula peduncularis (locally extinct?) Epilobium pictum <u>Nationally Endangered</u> Centipeda minima ssp. minima Euchiton ensifer Ranunculus brevis Trithuria inconspicua <u>Nationally Vulnerable</u> Carex cirrhosa Carex rubicunda Daucus glochidiatus Geranium retrorsum Gratiola concinna Mazus novaezeelandiae Myosotus glauca Ranunculus ternatifolius	Accept in part		33.7 Threatened Plant List
OS706.115		Forest and Bird NZ	33.7 Threatened Plant List		Support list provided it is a complete and up to date list. It also needs to include threatened plants include other plants that occur naturally within the District and are listed in the current New Zealand Threat Classification as either Threatened or At Risk.	Accept in Part		33.7 Threatened Plant List
OS784.20		Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	33.7 Threatened Plant List		List should be deleted or the locations of the relevant plants specifically identified.	Reject		DCG
FS1040.16	373.56	Forest and Bird	33.7 Threatened Plant List	Support	Support	Accept in Part		33.7 Threatened Plant List
FS1162.169	706.115	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.7 Threatened Plant List	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		33.7 Threatened Plant List
FS1254.103	706.115	Allenby Farms Limited	33.7 Threatened Plant List	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Reject		33.7 Threatened Plant List
FS1313.42	373.56	Darby Planning LP	33.7 Threatened Plant List	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Reject		33.7 Threatened Plant List
FS1347.73	373.56	Lakes Land Care	33.7 Threatened Plant List	Oppose	Opposes oversewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS400.6		James Cooper	33.7.1 Identification of Threatened Plants	Oppose	The list at Rule 33.7.1 is incorrect and needs to be updated.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS115.8		Micoud, Florence	33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas	Other	That the Bullock creek spring and stream is designated Significant Natural Area and protected for its intrinsic value, Map 21.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS163.2		Woodfield, Vaughn	33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	Reject the scheduling of SNA E38A-1 on Lot 6 Stevensons Road.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS198.1		Woodfield, Kate	33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	Reject SNA area E38A_1 as shown on planning map 18	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS214.1		Woodfield, Kate	33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	Reject SNA area E38A_1 as shown on planning map 18	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS339.124		Alty, Evan	33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas	Support	Retain full list and make certain that boundaries adequately protect the full SNA and provide a buffer to avoid edge effects.	Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.		Submission appears to be the same as that by submitter 706 Forest and Bird. Refer to responses to the Forest and Bird submission.
OS373.57		Department of Conservation	33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas	Support	Retain as notified.	Accept		Entire report
OS383.82		Queenstown Lakes District Council	33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas	Other	Modify SNA F21A, F21B_1 and F21B_3 to the areas identified as 'exclusion areas' on the approved plans of RM090630. Remove SNA F21C_1 and 2.	Accept		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS383.83		Queenstown Lakes District Council	33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas	Other	Merge schedule 33.8.2 with 33.8.1. The schedules were separated for notification purposes to distinguish between the proposed and existing SNAs.	Accept		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS439.1		Lake McKay Station Ltd	33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas	Other	Amend the boundaries of the proposed Significant Natural Areas (SNA) with identifiers; E30A, E30B, E30D, E30F, and E18G for reasons of allowing future development for pasture and future development of tracks. Areas proposed to be excluded are identified in submission 439. Request that the proposed SNAs on Lake McKay Station are not made operative until consultation is completed and the final areas have been defined. Opposes the inclusion of Section 33.9 - Threatened Environments Classification - and the Rules in Table 2; 33.5.1., 33.5.2, and 33.5.3 - in the Proposed Plan until consultation has been carried out on the areas included on the Classification Maps and the rules applied within these areas. This may also require amendment of Section 33; Policies 33.2.3.4 and 33.2.3.5.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS706.116		Forest and Bird NZ	33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas	Support	Retain full list and make certain that boundaries adequately protect the full SNA and provide a buffer to avoid edge effects.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS791.19		Burdon, Tim	33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas	Other	Oppose in part. Amend these SNAs from the list where landowners are not in agreement.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS794.19		Lakes Land Care	33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas	Other	Oppose in part. Amend these SNAs from the list where landowners are not in agreement.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS806.224		Queenstown Park Limited	33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	Oppose/amend. Delete all SNAs included on QPL's land.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1020.2	163.2	Woodfield, Vaughn	33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas	Support	This submission does not appear on the submissions map, so doing a further submission to ensure it is recognised. Rezoning this from rural limits the use of the land for what it has been used for for a long time, and is planned to continue to be used for.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1097.186	339.124	Queenstown Park Limited	33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Accept in part		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1097.684	706.116	Queenstown Park Limited	33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The SNA on Queenstown Park are incorrectly identified and require amendment, therefore the submission to retain all SNA as mapped is opposed.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1162.170	706.116	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1254.104	706.116	Allenby Farms Limited	33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	Oppose in part. That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks amendments to the provisions identified in this submission for Chapter 3 and 33. The amendments will not provide for a sustainable management regime which anticipates a level of appropriate development within some significant indigenous vegetation (subject to appropriate controls). Any amendments to biodiversity offsetting principles should be clarified for consistency with case law on offsetting and to enable an environmental compensation approach.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1313.43	373.57	Darby Planning LP	33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	Seek that Chapter 33 be refined. DPL oppose the proposed changes to policy 3.2.4.2.2 on biodiversity off-setting as it creates confusion for the methodology of the principle of off-setting generally. The proposed amendments to chapter 33 are not supported as these proposals will not seek to achieve the most effective and efficient use of resource under the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The changes sought are based upon a presumption that they are needed to give effect to Goal 3.2.3 of the Proposed Plan. This is not a sound justification as it not clear what status 'Goals' have in the Plan, and whether they must be given effect to. Any lower order provisions should give effect to the objectives of the Plan, rather than goals. Amendments sought to the 33.1 purpose elevate the protection of indigenous vegetation beyond a level provided for in Part 2 of the RMA, without justification by way of a section 32 analysis. The amendments sought by the submission do not take into account the ability for appropriate subdivision use and development to occur in areas of significant vegetation, where suitable controls can be introduced to maintain or enhance the ecological values associated with such areas. The proposed amendments to encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity values on unproductive land within the district are not suitable. These would render almost all land in the District subject to such protections and would disable any future development opportunities. Removal of all exemptions for instances of indigenous vegetation clearance where appropriate, and subject to suitable controls, will render some land	Reject		Entire Report and biodiversity offsetting
FS1347.74	373.57	Lakes Land Care	33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	Opposes over-sewing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assures that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Relates to relief for an amendment to the definition of Clearance of Vegetation by Submitter 373 (DOC)
OS390.1		Run 505 Limited	33.8.1 Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	Remove Significant Natural Areas F26C1 and F26C3.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS531.32		Crosshill Farms Limited	33.8.1 Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	Amend chapter 33.8.1 Significant Natural Areas as follows: Delete SNA (E39A, SNA A Short tussock grassland and cushion field).	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS590.8		Kane, Sam	33.8.1 Significant Natural Areas	Other	These three identifiers should be removed from the list of SNA's	Reject		DCG
OS806.4		Queenstown Park Limited	33.8.1 Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	Should the relief seeking the implementation of the Queenstown Park Special Zone be declined QPL then seeks: The proposed SNAs (F32A 1, F32A, F32A3, and F32B) on Queenstown Park are deleted for the reasons outlined in section 13 of the submission.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS590.10		Kane, Sam	33.9 Threatened Environment Classification Maps	Oppose	All areas within the rural zones are removed from 33.9 Threatened Environment Classification Maps,	Reject		33.9 Threatened Environment Classification Maps and entire report
OS701.19		Kane, Paul	33.9 Threatened Environment Classification Maps		Relief sought 49. Delete Figure C2 in 33.9	Reject		33.9 Threatened Environment Classification Maps and entire report
OS784.22		Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	33.9 Threatened Environment Classification Maps		Delete these maps or identify areas for protection based on actual evidence of significant vegetation to be protected.	Reject		33.9 Threatened Environment Classification Maps and entire report
OS791.20		Burdon, Tim	33.9 Threatened Environment Classification Maps	Oppose	Remove Threatened Environment Classification maps.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
OS794.20		Lakes Land Care	33.9 Threatened Environment Classification Maps	Oppose	Remove Threatened Environment Classification maps.	Reject		33.8 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas
FS1162.54	701.19	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	33.9 Threatened Environment Classification Maps	Support	Believes that the relief sought in the submission will result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be allowed.	Reject		33.9 Threatened Environment Classification Maps and entire report

Appendix 2 to section 42A: submissions table - Definitions

RE-Sort	Category	Lowest Clause	Submitt	Name	Organisati on	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Late	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
3	2 Definitions		84	Richard Hanson			84.1		NO	Other	Amend the proposed definition of Ski Area Activities to replace b: with (b) cable cars, gondolas, chairlifts, T-bars, platter lifts, rope tows and conveyor lifts to facilitate commercial recreational activities .	Accept in Part		Rural S42A
4	2 Definitions		1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		84.1	FS1097.16	NO	Support	Support for the reasons provided by the submitter.	Accept in Part		Rural S42A
8	2 Definitions		220	Clive Manners Wood			220.1		NO	Oppose	Delete the proposed definition of Informal Airports.	Reject		Rural S42A
15	2 Definitions		243	Christine Byrch			243.36		NO	Other	Rewrite the definitions based on the following comments: Ecosystem Services – are not just the services that people benefit from.	Reject		Rural S42A
16	2 Definitions		1224	Tim Williams	Matakauri Lodge Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	243.36	FS1224.36	NO	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Sub-zone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.		Further submission not specifically related to 'ecosystem'	
17	2 Definitions		243	Christine Byrch			243.37		NO	Other	Rewrite the definitions based on the following comments: Farming Activity – write more clearly.	Reject		Rural S42A
18	2 Definitions		1224	Tim Williams	Matakauri Lodge Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	243.37	FS1224.37	NO	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Sub-zone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept		Rural S42A
21	2 Definitions		243	Christine Byrch			243.39		NO	Other	Rewrite the definitions based on the following comments: Nature Conservation Values - surely you need to define the values here. Their 'preservation and protection etc' does not define these values.	Reject		Refer to the Strategic Direction Council reply dated 7 April 2016.
22	2 Definitions		1224	Tim Williams	Matakauri Lodge Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	243.39	FS1224.39	NO	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Sub-zone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in part		Refer to the Strategic Direction Council reply dated 7 April 2017.
32	2 Definitions		243	Christine Byrch			243.44		NO	Other	Rewrite the definitions based on the following comments: Ski Area Activities - delete points (a) and (d) - too broad. Point (c) - should it be 'or' or 'and'?	Reject		Rural S42A
33	2 Definitions		1117	Jenny Carter	Remarkables Park Limited		243.44	FS1117.15	NO	Oppose	The definition of ski area activities is appropriate and provides for the activities anticipated within a ski field.	Accept in part		Rural S42A
34	2 Definitions		1224	Tim Williams	Matakauri Lodge Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	243.44	FS1224.44	NO	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Sub-zone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in part		Rural S42A
35	2 Definitions		1229	Scott Dent	NXSKI Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	243.44	FS1229.28	NO	Oppose	NZSKI Limited opposes the submitters proposed deletions of activities from the definition of Ski Area Activities. To exclude these activities would result in an inefficient use of a restricted land resource that has been identified as appropriate to contain and consolidate outdoor recreational activities and their associated effects. NZSKI Limited seeks that this submission be disallowed by QLDC.	Accept		Rural S42A
44	2 Definitions		252	Megan Justice	HW Richardson Group	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	252.2		NO	Support	The submitter supports the following definition: Mining activity	Accept in part		Rural S42A
46	2 Definitions		252	Megan Justice	HW Richardson Group	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	252.4		NO	Support	The submitter supports the following definition: Rural industrial activity	Accept		Rural S42A
53	2 Definitions		356	Louise Taylor	X-Ray Trust Limited	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	356.1		NO	Other	Insert definitions of the following terms: "sensitive activities", "valuable ecological remnants" or "ecological remnants", "nature conservation values".		Deferred to Definitions Hearing. These predominantly apply to Millbrook.	
55	2 Definitions		376	Tom Elworthy	Southern Hemisphere Proving Grounds Limited	Jo Appleyard Chapman Tripp	376.1		NO	Other	Add the following to the definition of 'Ski Area Activities' in the Waiorau Snow Farm Ski Area Sub Zone vehicle and product testing activities, being activities designed to test the safety, efficiency and durability of vehicles, their parts and accessories, and driver training activities.	Accept		The phrase requested' and driver training activities' is considered to be inherent and an already accepted part of the anticipated activities in the Waiorau Snow Farm Ski Area Sub Zone and 'cold product testing'.
60	2 Definitions		383	Vanessa van Uden	Queenstown Lakes District Council		383.5		NO	Other	Amend the definition of Ecosystem Services so it reads as follows: Ecosystem services are categorised as 'provisioning', such as food, timber and freshwater; 'regulating', such as air quality, climate and pest regulation; 'cultural' such as recreation and sense of belonging; and 'supporting', such as soil quality and natural habitat resistance to weeds.		District Wide implications. Deferred to definition hearing	
64	2 Definitions		400	Sam Buchan	James Cooper	Graeme Todd GTODD LAW	400.7		NO	Oppose	Amend the definitions of "clearance" and "vegetation" to exclude relevance to application of water.	Reject		
65	2 Definitions		1091	Campbell Hodgson	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	Gallaway Cook Allan	400.7	FS1091.9	NO	Support	Allow	Reject		
77	2 Definitions		433	Kirsty O'Sullivan	Queenstown Airport Corporation Limited	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	433.4		NO	Support	Aerodrome : Retain the definition as notified.		Deferred to Definitions Hearing	
78	2 Definitions		1117	Jenny Carter	Remarkables Park Limited		433.4	FS1117.60	NO	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		

RE-Sort	Category	Lowest Clause	Submitt	Name	Organisati on	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Late	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
79	2 Definitions		1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		433.4	FS1097.290	NO	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
136	2 Definitions		433	Kirsty O'Sullivan	Queenstown Airport Corporation	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	433.22		NO	Other	Hangar: Support in part. Amend the definition as follows: Hangar Means a structure used to store aircraft, including for maintenance, servicing and/or repair purposes.		Deferred to Definitions Hearing	
137	2 Definitions		1117	Jenny Carter	Remarkables Park Limited		433.22	FS1117.78	NO	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.		Deferred to Definitions Hearing	
138	2 Definitions		1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		433.22	FS1097.308	NO	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.		Deferred to Definitions Hearing	
142	2 Definitions		433	Kirsty O'Sullivan	Queenstown Airport Corporation	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	433.24		NO	Support	Informal Airport: Retain the definition as notified.	Accept		Rural S42A
143	2 Definitions		1117	Jenny Carter	Remarkables Park Limited		433.24	FS1117.80	NO	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Rural S42A
144	2 Definitions		1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		433.24	FS1097.310	NO	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Rural S42A
204	2 Definitions		624	D & M Columb		John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	624.37		NO	Not Stated	Definition – Farming Activity Means the use of land and buildings for the primary purpose of the production of vegetative matters and/or commercial livestock, and the use or storage of vehicles and heavy machinery.	Reject		Rural S42A
217	2 Definitions		784	Bridget Irving	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	Galloway Cook Allan Lawyers	784.1		NO	Oppose	Clearance of Vegetation - delete the following: clearance of vegetation includes the deliberate application of water where it would change the ecological conditions such that the resident indigenous plants are killed by competitive exclusion includes dry land cushion field species.	Reject		Rural S42A
218	2 Definitions		784	Bridget Irving	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	Galloway Cook Allan Lawyers	784.2		NO	Not Stated	Exclude irrigation structures from the definition of "building" and any other amendment necessary to ensure that pivot irrigators are permitted in the Rural Zone.	Reject		Rural S42A
219	2 Definitions		1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		784.2	FS1097.708	NO	Support	Support exclusion of irrigators from the definition of building.	Reject		Rural S42A
253	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	296	Karen Groome	Royal New Zealand Aero Club Inc/ Flying Nz		296.2		NO	Other	Define 'informal airports' as remote landing areas used by infrequently by helicopter operations;	Reject		Rural S42A
254	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	315	Scott Edgar	The Alpine Group Limited	Southern Land	315.1		NO	Oppose	Remove the second paragraph of the definition relating to Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation	Reject		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
255	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	339	Evan Alty			339.9		NO	Oppose	Vegetation Clearance. Amend as follows: Means the removal, trimming, felling, or modification of any vegetation and includes cutting, crushing, cultivation, soil disturbance including direct drilling, spraying with herbicide or other substance, burning. Clearance of vegetation includes the deliberate application of water or other substance, where it would change the ecological conditions such that the resident indigenous plant(s) are killed or threatened by competitive exclusion, or disease. Includes dry land cushion field species.	Accept in part		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A

RE-Sort	Category	Lowest Clause	Submitt	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Late	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
256	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		339.9	FS1097.153	NO	Oppose	Submitter suggests amendment to definition of vegetation clearance. Suggested amendments are unnecessary and impractical.	Reject		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
257	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	339	Evan Alty			339.10		NO	Oppose	Exotic Amend as follows: In relation to trees and plants means species which are not indigenous to that part of the New Zealand. Non native plant and tree species introduced into an area where they do not occur naturally.	Reject		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
258	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	339	Evan Alty			339.11		NO	Oppose	Indigenous Vegetation Amend as follows: Means vegetation that occurs naturally in New Zealand, or arrived in New Zealand through natural processes without human assistance. Intervention.	Reject		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
259	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	339	Evan Alty			339.12		NO	Support	Support Nature Conservation Values	Support		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
260	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	339	Evan Alty			339.13		NO	Other	Add new definition: 'Margin' Land immediately adjacent to the bed of a river, wetland, lake or estuary which is likely to be affected by a high water table, flooding, fluvial erosion, or sediment deposition, and often contains distinctive vegetation. The size of the margin will vary according to local site factors but may extend to the limits demarcated by natural river terraces and constructed stop banks.	Reject		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
261	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		339.13	FS1097.154	NO	Oppose	Submitter requests a definition of 'margin' is inserted. This is not necessary.	Accept		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
268	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	373	Geoff Deavoll	Department of Conservation		373.1		NO	Other	Amend the definition of 'Clearance of Vegetation' as follows: Clearance of vegetation includes, the deliberate application of water, or over sowing, where it would change the ecological conditions such that the resident indigenous plant(s) are killed by competitive exclusion. Includes dryland cushion field species.	Reject		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
269	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1040	Sue Maturin	Forest and Bird		373.1	FS1040.3	NO	Support	Support	Reject		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
270	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1091	Campbell Hodgson	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	Galloway Cook Allan	373.1	FS1091.1	NO	Oppose	Disallow: The definition for clearance of vegetation will severely constrict land use activities across the District. To include over sowing as clearance of vegetation further reduces the ability for land users to use their land without requiring resource consent. DOC has also suggested in their discussion of 33.2.2.3 that grazing of stock should be considered clearance of indigenous vegetation. This would create a significant fetter on land use within the district which is not necessary to achieve the objectives and policies relating to indigenous vegetation.	Accept		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
271	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1132	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		373.1	FS1132.22	NO	Oppose	Over sowing should not in and of itself be considered vegetation clearance. Some degree of significance is required; we would rather the concerns are addressed through specific rules rather than through amendment to the definition of 'Vegetation Clearance'.	Accept in part		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
272	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1347	Tim Burdon	Lakes Land Care		373.1	FS1347.18	NO	Oppose	Opposes over sowing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assumes that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
273	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	373	Geoff Deavoll	Department of Conservation		373.2		NO	Other	Include new definition for 'biodiversity offsets or offsetting' as follows: Measurable conservation outcomes resulting from actions designed to compensate for significant residual adverse biodiversity impacts arising from project development after appropriate avoidance, minimisation, remediation and mitigation measures have been taken. The goal of biodiversity offsetting is to achieve no net loss and create the same gain of biodiversity on the ground.	Reject		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
274	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1040	Sue Maturin	Forest and Bird		373.2	FS1040.4	NO	Support	Support in Part	Reject		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
275	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1287	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	373.2	FS1287.1	NO	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks to amend the definition of biodiversity offsetting	Accept		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
276	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1313	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	C/ Boffa Miskell Ltd	373.2	FS1313.2	NO	Not Stated	Support/Oppose: Seek that the part of the submission relating to new definition of biodiversity offsetting and no net loss, be disallowed to the extent they conflict with the original submission from DPL. DPL supports the concept of biodiversity offsetting and related definitions to clarify the intended meaning within the PDP. DPL oppose the proposed relief to the extent it conflicts with the outcomes sought in its original submissions.	Accept		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
277	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1342	Ben Farrell	Te Anau Developments Limited	John Edmonds & Associates Ltd	373.2	FS1342.23	NO	Oppose	Not allow relief sought (or other similar relief sought by another submitter) unless otherwise agreed through the submission process	Accept		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
278	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1347	Tim Burdon	Lakes Land Care		373.2	FS1347.19	NO	Oppose	Opposes over sowing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assumes that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
279	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		373.2	FS1097.215	NO	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Accept		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
280	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	373	Geoff Deavoll	Department of Conservation		373.3		NO	Other	Include a definition of 'no net loss' as follows: No overall reduction in biodiversity as measured by type, amount and condition.	Reject		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
281	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1040	Sue Maturin	Forest and Bird		373.3	FS1040.5	NO	Support	Support in Part	Reject		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
282	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1287	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	373.3	FS1287.2	NO	Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as the submission seeks to introduce a new definition for 'no net loss'	Accept		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
283	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1313	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	C/ Boffa Miskell Ltd	373.3	FS1313.3	NO	Not Stated	Support/Oppose: Seek that the part of the submission relating to new definition of biodiversity offsetting and no net loss, be disallowed to the extent they conflict with the original submission from DPL. DPL supports the concept of biodiversity offsetting and related definitions to clarify the intended meaning within the PDP. DPL oppose the proposed relief to the extent it conflicts with the outcomes sought in its original submissions.	Accept		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
284	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1132	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		373.3	FS1132.23	NO	Oppose	Accounts for biodiversity as a 'stock' of net biodiversity values. We would rather attention is given specifically to the protection of threatened species rather than the biodiversity stock overall.	Accept in part		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
285	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1347	Tim Burdon	Lakes Land Care		373.3	FS1347.20	NO	Oppose	Opposes over sowing as a vegetation clearance definition. Assumes that it is a management practice used to improve grazing species.	Accept		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
286	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		373.3	FS1097.216	NO	Oppose	Oppose for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Accept		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
287	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	400	Sam Buchan	James Cooper	Graeme Todd GTODD LAW	400.2		NO	Other	That Council provide in the definition of "building" and "structure" that the same does not include irrigation pivots or other irrigation infrastructure.	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A
288	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		400.2	FS1097.261	NO	Support	Definition of building and structure should not apply to irrigation pivots and irrigation infrastructure.	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A

RE-Sort	Category	Lowest Clause	Submitt	Name	Organisati on	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Late	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
289	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	407	Amy Wilson-White	Mount Cardrona Station Limited	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	407.1		NO	Other	Supports the definition of ski area activities but seeks the following modifications: (a) Insert a new definition for "Passenger Lift Systems" as follows: Passenger Lift Systems Means any mechanical system used to convey or transport passengers within or to a Ski Area Sub-Zone, including chairlifts, gondolas, T-bars and rope tows, and including all moving, fixed and ancillary components of such systems such as towers, pylons, cross arms, pulleys, cables, chairs, cabins, and structures to enable the embarking and disembarking of passengers. (b) Modify the definition of "Ski Area Activities" as follows: Ski Area Activities Means the use of natural and physical resources for the purpose of providing for: [...] (a) recreational activities either commercial or non commercial. (b) chairlifts, t-bars and rope tows to facilitate commercial recreational activities. Passenger lift systems [...] (f) buildings for or ancillary to the activities in (a) – (e) above	Accept in part		Refer to Rural S42A
290	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1329	Chris Ferguson	Soho Ski Area Ltd and Blackmans Creek Holdings No. 1 Ltd	Boffa Miskell Ltd	407.1	FS1329.8	NO	Support	We seek that the part of the submission seeking to add a new definition of passenger lift system be allowed. Soho supports the proposed new definition of "Passenger Lift System" as it relates to the proposed changes sought in the Soho submission to the definition of ski area activities.	Accept in part		Refer to Rural S42A
291	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1330	Chris Ferguson	Treble Cone Investments Limited	Boffa Miskell Ltd	407.1	FS1330.4	NO	Support	seek that the part of the submission seeking to add a new definition of passenger lift system be allowed for the reasons expressed within this submission	Accept		Refer to Rural S42A
292	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		407.1	FS1097.262	NO	Support	Support for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Accept in part		Refer to Rural S42A
310	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	519	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	519.1		NO	Not Stated	Add the following new definition of Exploration: 'Exploration means any activity undertaken for the purpose of identifying mineral deposits or occurrences and evaluating the feasibility of mining particular deposits or occurrences of 1 or more minerals; and includes any drilling, dredging, or excavations (whether surface or subsurface) that are reasonably necessary to determine the nature and size of a mineral deposit or occurrence; and to explore has a corresponding meaning.'	Accept		Refer to Rural S42A
311	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1356	Graeme Todd	Cabo Limited	GTodd Law	519.1	FS1356.1	NO	Oppose	All the relief sought be declined	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A
312	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		519.1	FS1015.37	NO	Support	I support this submission in its entirety as providing appropriately for minerals and mining activities in the District, in a way that is consistent with the letter and intent of the RMA.	Accept		Refer to Rural S42A
313	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1040	Sue Maturin	Forest and Bird		519.1	FS1040.22	NO	Oppose	Oppose	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A
314	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	519	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	519.2		NO	Not Stated	Add the following new definition of Mining: '(a) means to take, win or extract, by whatever means, (i) a mineral existing in its natural state in land; or(ii) a chemical substance from a mineral existing in its natural state in land; and(b) includes-(i) the injection of petroleum into an underground gas storage facility; and(ii) the extraction of petroleum from an underground gas storage facility; but(c) does not include prospecting or exploration for a mineral or chemical substance referred to in paragraph (a).'	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A
315	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1356	Graeme Todd	Cabo Limited	GTodd Law	519.2	FS1356.2	NO	Oppose	All the relief sought be declined	Accept		Refer to Rural S42A
316	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		519.2	FS1015.38	NO	Support	I support this submission in its entirety as providing appropriately for minerals and mining activities in the District, in a way that is consistent with the letter and intent of the RMA.	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A
317	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	519	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	519.3		NO	Not Stated	Clarify the definition of mining activity as follows: Mining Activity(a) means operations in connection with mining, exploring, or prospecting for any mineral; and(b) includes, when carried out at or near the site where the mining, exploration, or prospecting is undertaken-(i) the extraction, transport, treatment, processing, and separation of any mineral or chemical substance from the mineral; and(ii) the construction, maintenance, and operation of any works, structures, and other land improvements, and of any related machinery and equipment connected with the operations; and(iii) the removal of overburden by mechanical or other means, and treatment of any substance considered to contain any mineral; and(iv) the deposit or discharge of any mineral, material, debris, tailings, refuse, or wastewater produced from or consequent on the operations; and'	Accept		Refer to Rural S42A
318	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1356	Graeme Todd	Cabo Limited	GTodd Law	519.3	FS1356.3	NO	Oppose	All the relief sought be declined	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A
319	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		519.3	FS1015.39	NO	Support	I support this submission in its entirety as providing appropriately for minerals and mining activities in the District, in a way that is consistent with the letter and intent of the RMA.	Accept		Refer to Rural S42A
320	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1040	Sue Maturin	Forest and Bird		519.3	FS1040.23	NO	Oppose	Oppose	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A
321	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	519	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	519.4		NO	Not Stated	Add the following new definition of Mining Building: 'Means a building (as defined) necessary for the undertaking of mining activities (as defined).'	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A
322	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1356	Graeme Todd	Cabo Limited	GTodd Law	519.4	FS1356.4	NO	Oppose	All the relief sought be declined	Accept		Refer to Rural S42A
323	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		519.4	FS1015.40	NO	Support	I support this submission in its entirety as providing appropriately for minerals and mining activities in the District, in a way that is consistent with the letter and intent of the RMA.	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A
324	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	519	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	519.5		NO	Not Stated	Amend the definition of Prospecting so it is defined as 'Mineral Prospecting'.	Accept		Refer to Rural S42A
325	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1356	Graeme Todd	Cabo Limited	GTodd Law	519.5	FS1356.5	NO	Oppose	All the relief sought be declined	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A
326	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		519.5	FS1015.41	NO	Support	I support this submission in its entirety as providing appropriately for minerals and mining activities in the District, in a way that is consistent with the letter and intent of the RMA.	Accept		Refer to Rural S42A
327	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	519	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	519.6		NO	Not Stated	Amend the definition of Prospecting as follows: 'Mineral Prospecting: Means any activity undertaken for the purpose of identifying land likely to contain exploitable mineral deposits or occurrences; and includes the following activities:- Geological, geochemical, and geophysical surveys;- The taking of samples by hand or hand held methods;- Aerial surveys- Taking small samples by low impact mechanical methods.'	Accept in part		Refer to Rural S42A
328	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1356	Graeme Todd	Cabo Limited	GTodd Law	519.6	FS1356.6	NO	Oppose	All the relief sought be declined	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A
329	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		519.6	FS1015.42	NO	Support	I support this submission in its entirety as providing appropriately for minerals and mining activities in the District, in a way that is consistent with the letter and intent of the RMA.	Accept in part		Refer to Rural S42A
345	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	600	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		600.4		NO	Other	Definition of building: The definition is amended to specifically exclude irrigation and associated infrastructure from the definition of 'building'.	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A

RE-Sort	Category	Lowest Clause	Submitt	Name	Organisati on	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Late	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
346	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		600.4	FS1034.4	NO	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A
347	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1209	Richard Burdon			600.4	FS1209.4	NO	Support	Support entire submission	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A
348	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1091	Campbell Hodgson	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	Galloway Cook Allan	600.4	FS1091.15	NO	Support	Allow	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A
349	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		600.4	FS1097.541	NO	Support	Farm irrigators are necessary for productive farming and are an anticipated activity in the rural area.	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A
350	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	600	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		600.5		NO	Not Stated	Definition of 'Clearance of Vegetation': The definition is rewritten to exclude the application of water, as below: "Means the removal, trimming, felling, or modification of any vegetation and includes cutting, crushing, cultivation, spraying with herbicide or burning. Clearance of vegetation includes, the deliberate application of water where it would change the ecological conditions such that the resident indigenous plant(s) are killed by competitive exclusion. Includes dryland cushion field species."	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A
351	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		600.5	FS1034.5	NO	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Accept		Refer to Rural S42A
352	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1209	Richard Burdon			600.5	FS1209.5	NO	Support	Support entire submission	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A
353	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1040	Sue Maturin	Forest and Bird		600.5	FS1040.39	NO	Oppose	Oppose	Accept		Refer to Rural S42A
354	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1091	Campbell Hodgson	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	Galloway Cook Allan	600.5	FS1091.16	NO	Support	Allow.	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A
355	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	600	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		600.6		NO	Support	Adopt the following definitions as proposed: Factory Farming Farming Activity Flood Protection Work Holding informal Airport Minor Upgrading National Grid Corridor National Grid Sensitive Activities National Grid Yard Nature Conservation Values Registered Homestay Rural Selling Place Sensitive Activities-Transmission Corridor Utility Visitor Accommodation Waste Management Facility	Accept in part	Includes District wide Definitions	Refer to Rural S42A
356	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		600.6	FS1034.6	NO	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A
357	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1209	Richard Burdon			600.6	FS1209.6	NO	Support	Support entire submission	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A
358	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1342	Ben Farrell	Te Anau Developments Limited	John Edmonds & Associates Ltd	600.6	FS1342.5	NO	Support	Allow relief sought to the extent that it does not undermine or prevent the relief originally sought by Te Anau Developments (unless otherwise agreed through the submission process)	Reject		Refer to Rural S42A
359	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	600	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		600.7		NO	Other	The definition of Farm Building is amended as follows (or words to similar effect): Means a building (as defined) necessary for the exercise used for the purpose of farming activities (as defined) and: (a) Excludes buildings for the purposes of residential activities, home occupations, factory farming and forestry activities. (b) Excludes visitor accommodation and temporary accommodation.	Reject		Retain so that the definition is applicable to legitimate farming activities.
360	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		600.7	FS1034.7	NO	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Accept		Retain so that the definition is applicable to legitimate farming activities.
361	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1209	Richard Burdon			600.7	FS1209.7	NO	Support	Support entire submission	Reject		Retain so that the definition is applicable to legitimate farming activities.
362	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		600.7	FS1097.542	NO	Support	The suggested amendment to the definition of farm building provides greater clarity	Reject		Retain so that the definition is applicable to legitimate farming activities.
363	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	600	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		600.8		NO	Other	The definition of Forestry is amended as follows (or words to similar effect): Means the use of land primarily for the purpose of planting, tending, managing and harvesting of trees for timber or wood production in excess of 0.5ha 1 hectare in area.	Reject		This area is too large and the submitter has not provided an evidential basis to support these changes.
364	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		600.8	FS1034.8	NO	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Accept		This area is too large and the submitter has not provided an evidential basis to support these changes.
365	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1209	Richard Burdon			600.8	FS1209.8	NO	Support	Support entire submission	Reject		This area is too large and the submitter has not provided an evidential basis to support these changes.
366	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	600	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		600.9		NO	Other	The definition of Formed Road is amended to distinguish between publicly and privately owned roads.	Reject	This change would have wider implications than just to the Rural Zone. Defer this matter to the District Wide hearing on definitions	This change would have wider implications than just to the Rural Zone. Defer this matter to the District Wide hearing on definitions
367	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		600.9	FS1034.9	NO	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Accept	This change would have wider implications than just to the Rural Zone. Defer this matter to the District Wide hearing on definitions	This change would have wider implications than just to the Rural Zone. Defer this matter to the District Wide hearing on definitions

RE-Sort	Category	Lowest Clause	Submitt	Name	Organisati on	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Late	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
368	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1209	Richard Burdon			600.9	FS1209.9	NO	Support	Support entire submission	Reject	This change would have wider implications than just to the Rural Zone. Defer this matter to the District Wide hearing on definitions	This change would have wider implications than just to the Rural Zone. Defer this matter to the District Wide hearing on definitions
369	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1040	Sue Maturin	Forest and Bird		600.9	FS1040.40	NO	Oppose	Oppose	Accept	This change would have wider implications than just to the Rural Zone. Defer this matter to the District Wide hearing on definitions	This change would have wider implications than just to the Rural Zone. Defer this matter to the District Wide hearing on definitions
370	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	600	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		600.10		NO	Other	The definition of Indigenous Vegetation is amended as follows (or words to similar effect): Means plant communities dominated by species vegetation that occurs naturally in New Zealand, or arrived in New Zealand without human assistance. This may include a minor element of exotic vegetation but does not include renewable in nature	Reject		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42a
371	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		600.10	FS1034.10	NO	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Accept		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42a
372	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1040	Sue Maturin	Forest and Bird		600.10	FS1040.41	NO	Oppose	Oppose	Accept		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42a
373	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1209	Richard Burdon			600.10	FS1209.10	NO	Support	Support entire submission	Reject		Indigenous vegetation S42a.
375	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	610	Chris Ferguson	Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek No. 1 LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	610.20		NO	Other	Support in part. 1. To amend the definition of building, as follows: 'Shall have the same meaning as the Building Act 2004, with the following exemptions in addition to those set out in the Building Act 2004: Fences and walls not exceeding 2m in height. Retaining walls that support no more than 2 vertical metres of earthworks. Structures less than 5m ² in area and in addition less than 2m in height above ground level. Radio and television aerials (excluding dish antennae for receiving satellite television which are greater than 1.2m in diameter), less than 2m in height above ground level. Uncovered terraces or decks that are no greater than 1m above ground level. The upgrading and extension to the Arrow Irrigation Race provided that this exception only applies to upgrading and extension works than involve underground piping of the Arrow Irrigation Race. Flagpoles not exceeding 7m in height. Building profile poles, required as part of the notification of Resource Consent applications. Public outdoor art installations sited on Council-owned land. Pergolas less than 2.5 metres in height either attached or detached to a building. All components associated with passenger lift or other systems, including lift towers, cross arms, pulleys, cables, chairs, cabins, and top or bottom stations. Notwithstanding the definition set out in the Building Act 2004, a building shall include: Any vehicle, trailer, tent, marquee, shipping container, caravan or boat, whether fixed or moveable, used on a site for residential accommodation for a period exceeding 2 months.	Reject		Rural S42a
376	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		610.20	FS1097.586	NO	Support	Support the intent of the submission for the reasons stated in QPL's original submission	Reject		Rural S42a
377	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	610	Chris Ferguson	Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek No. 1 LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	610.22		NO	Other	Support in part. Amend the definition of ski area activities, as follows: Means the use of natural and physical resources for the purposes of providing for establishing, operating and maintaining the following activities and structures: (a) recreational activities either commercial or non commercial (b) chairlifts, t-bars, and rope tows or any passenger lift or other systems to facilitate commercial recreational activities. (c) use of snowgroomers, snowmobiles and 4WD vehicles for support or operational activities. (d) activities ancillary to commercial recreational activities. (e) in the Waioarau Snow Farm Ski Area Sub Zone vehicle and product testing activities, being activities designed to test the safety, efficiency and durability of vehicles, their parts and accessories. (f) Visitor and residential accommodation associated with ski area activities (g) Commercial activities associated with ski area activities or recreation activities (h) Guest facilities including ticketing, offices, restaurants, cafes, ski hire and retailing associated with any commercial recreation activity (i) Ski area operations, including avalanche control and ski patrol (j) Installation and operation of snow making infrastructure, including reservoirs, pumps, snow makers and associated elements. (k) The formation of trails and other terrain modification necessary to operate the ski area. (l) The provision of vehicle and passenger lift or other system access and parking (m) The provisions of servicing infrastructure, including water supply, wastewater disposal, telecommunications and electricity	Reject		Rural S42a
378	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1153	Amy Wilson-White	Mount Cardrona Station Ltd	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	610.22	FS1153.2	NO	Support	Seeks that submission 610 (in relation to the definition of ski area activities) is adopted.	Reject		Rural S42a
379	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1229	Scott Dent	NZSki Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	610.22	FS1229.24	NO	Support	NZSki Limited supports in part the amendments to the definition of Ski Area Activities. The submitters amended definition provides clarity of the operations that occur within the Ski Area Sub-Zone and provides for an appropriate diversification of commercial activities associated with recreation activities which supports the intention to make Ski Area Sub-Zones year round destinations. However, it is submitted that point (f) be deleted as visitor accommodation is subject to its own definition. Including visitor accommodation in the definition of a Ski Area Activity would by default make it a Permitted Activity within the Ski Area Sub-Zone (pursuant to Rule 21.4.18) which does not align with NZSki Limited's proposed Controlled Activity rule or the submitters proposed rules 21.5.32 and 21.5.33. Further, residential activity is opposed by NZSki and should also not be a Permitted Activity in accordance with Rule 21.4.18). NZSki Limited seeks that this submission be accepted in part by QLDC.	Reject		Rural S42a
380	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		610.22	FS1097.588	NO	Support	Support in part/ Support that part of the submission requesting amendment of the definition to include the range of activities needed to support a ski area, including passenger lifts.	Reject		Rural S42a

RE-Sort	Category	Lowest Clause	Submit	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Late	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
381	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	613	Chris Ferguson	Treble Cone Investments Limited.	Boffa Miskell	613.20		NO	Other	Support in part. 1. To amend the definition of building, as follows: 'Shall have the same meaning as the Building Act 2004, with the following exemptions in addition to those set out in the Building Act 2004: Fences and walls not exceeding 2m in height. Retaining walls that support no more than 2 vertical metres of earthworks. Structures less than 5m ² in area and in addition less than 2m in height above ground level. Radio and television aerials (excluding dish antennae for receiving satellite television which are greater than 1.2m in diameter), less than 2m in height above ground level. Uncovered terraces or decks that are no greater than 1m above ground level. The upgrading and extension to the Arrow Irrigation Race provided that this exception only applies to upgrading and extension works that involve underground piping of the Arrow Irrigation Race. Flagpoles not exceeding 7m in height. Building profile poles, required as part of the notification of Resource Consent applications. Public outdoor art installations sited on Council-owned land. Pergolas less than 2.5 metres in height either attached or detached to a building. All components associated with passenger lift or other systems systems, including lift towers, cross arms, pulleys, cables, chairs, cabins, and top and bottom stations and all associated infrastructure, services and facilities located within the SASZs. Notwithstanding the definition set out in the Building Act 2004, a building shall include: Any vehicle, trailer, tent, marquee, shipping container, caravan or boat, whether fixed or moveable, used on a site for residential accommodation for a period exceeding 2 months.'	Reject		Rural S42a
382	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		613.20	FS1097.593	NO	Support	Support the intent of the submission for the reasons stated in QPL's original submission	Reject		Rural S42a
383	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	613	Chris Ferguson	Treble Cone Investments Limited.	Boffa Miskell	613.21		NO	Other	Support in part. Amend the definition of ski area activities, as follows: Means the use of natural and physical resources for the purposes of providing for establishing, operating and maintaining the following activities and structures: (a) recreational activities either commercial or non commercial (b) chairlifts, t-bars, and rope tows, passenger lift or other systems to facilitate access and commercial recreational activities. (c) use of snowgroomers, snowmobiles and 4WD vehicles for support or operational activities. (d) activities ancillary to commercial recreational activities. (e) in the Waioarau Snow Farm SASZ vehicle and product testing activities, being activities designed to test the safety, efficiency and durability of vehicles, their parts and accessories (f) Visitor and residential accommodation associated with ski area activities (g) Commercial activities associated with ski area activities or recreation activities (h) Guest facilities including ticketing, offices, restaurants, cafes, ski hire and retailing associated with any commercial recreation activity (i) Ski area operations, including avalanche control and ski patrol (j) Installation and operation of snow making infrastructure, including reservoirs, pumps, snow makers and associated elements. (k) The formation of trails and other terrain modification necessary to operate the SASZ. (l) The provision of vehicle and passenger lift or other system access and parking (m) The provisions of servicing infrastructure, including water supply, wastewater disposal, telecommunications and electricity	Reject		Rural S42a
384	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		613.21	FS1097.595	NO	Support	Support in part. Support that part of the submission requesting amendment of the definition to include the range of activities needed to support a ski area, including passenger lifts.	Reject		Rural S42a
391	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	615	James Aoake	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	615.21		NO	Oppose	Amend definition as follows: Ski Area Activities Means the use of natural and physical resources for the purpose of providing for: (a) recreational activities either commercial or non-commercial (b) chairlifts, gondolas, surface lifts, t-bars and rope tows to facilitate commercial recreational activities. (c) use of snowgroomers, snowmobiles and 4WD vehicles for support or operational activities. (d) activities ancillary to commercial recreational activities, including earthworks and vegetation clearance. (e) in the Waioarau Snow Farm Ski Area Sub Zone vehicle and product testing activities, being activities designed to test the safety, efficiency and durability of vehicles, their parts and accessories.	Reject		Indigenous Vegetation S42A
392	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1105	Kay Curtis	Cardrona Valley Residents and Ratepayers Society Inc		615.21	FS1105.21	NO	Support	Support all aspects of the Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited submission and seek that the relief sought by Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited is allowed by the Council, to ensure: • The resort is able to continue to cater for guests of all abilities and disciplines so that it remains the most diverse ski-field in New Zealand and remains a premier resort for snow sports in Australasia. • The resort is able to develop, operate, maintain and upgrade its network of infrastructure, accommodation, food and beverage service, retail and mountain based tourism activities. • The resort is able to operate year round and continue to invest in and grow new four season visitor attractions activities, with significant growth in the provision of summer activities	Reject		Indigenous Vegetation S42A
393	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1137	Kay Curtis			615.21	FS1137.22	NO	Support	Seeks that the relief sought by Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited is accepted by the Council. Has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has	Reject		Indigenous Vegetation S42A
394	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1229	Scott Dent	NXSKI Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	615.21	FS1229.26	NO	Support	NZSKI Limited support the proposed amendment to the definition of Ski Area Activities that incorporates earthworks and the clearance of indigenous vegetation. NZSKI support the existing provisions that exclude earthworks within the Ski Area Sub-Zone and their primary submission seeks to require indigenous vegetation clearance in these areas to be Permitted. As such, incorporating these two activities into the definition of Ski Area Activities which are Permitted by virtue of proposed Rule 21.4.18 is supported. NZSKI Limited seeks that this submission be accepted by QLDC.	Reject		Indigenous Vegetation S42A
436	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	701	Paul Kane			701.1		NO	Not Stated	Relief Sought 33. Delete the phrase "clearance of vegetation includes the deliberate application of water where it would change the ecological conditions such that the resident indigenous plants are killed by competitive exclusion. Includes dry land cushion field species" from the definition of "Clearance of Vegetation" in chapter 2.	Reject		Indigenous Vegetation S42A
437	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1162	James Wilson Cooper		GTODD Law	701.1	FS1162.36	NO	Support	Believes that the relief sought in the submission will result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be allowed.	Reject		Indigenous Vegetation S42A
438	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	701	Paul Kane			701.2		NO	Not Stated	Relief Sought 34. Clarify the status of irrigation infrastructure under the definitions. It may be preferable to specifically define it as the normal controls for buildings and structures are not a good fit.	Reject		Indigenous Vegetation S42A
439	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1162	James Wilson Cooper		GTODD Law	701.2	FS1162.37	NO	Support	Believes that the relief sought in the submission will result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be allowed.	Reject		Indigenous Vegetation S42A
445	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	706	Sue Maturin	Forest and Bird NZ		706.2		NO	Not Stated	Exotic Amend as follows: In relation to trees and plants means species which are not indigenous to that part of the New Zealand Non native plant and tree species introduced into an area where they do not occur naturally.	Reject		Indigenous Vegetation S42A
446	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1162	James Wilson Cooper		GTODD Law	706.2	FS1162.56	NO	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		Indigenous Vegetation S42A
447	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	706	Sue Maturin	Forest and Bird NZ		706.3		NO	Not Stated	Indigenous Vegetation Amend as Follows: Means vegetation that occurs naturally in New Zealand, or arrived in New Zealand through natural processes without human assistance. Intervention.	Accept in part		Indigenous Vegetation S42A
448	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1162	James Wilson Cooper		GTODD Law	706.3	FS1162.57	NO	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		Indigenous Vegetation S42A
449	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	706	Sue Maturin	Forest and Bird NZ		706.4		NO	Support	Nature Conservation Values	Accept		Indigenous Vegetation S42A
450	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1162	James Wilson Cooper		GTODD Law	706.4	FS1162.58	NO	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		Indigenous Vegetation S42A

RE-Sort	Category	Lowest Clause	Submitt	Name	Organisati on	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Late	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
451	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	706	Sue Maturin	Forest and Bird NZ		706.5		NO	Not Stated	Add new definition: 'Margin' Land immediately adjacent to the bed of a river, wetland, lake or estuary which is likely to be affected by a high water table, flooding, fluvial erosion, or sediment deposition, and often contains distinctive vegetation. The size of the margin will vary according to local site factors but may extend to the limits demarcated by natural river terraces and constructed stop banks.	Reject		Indigenous Vegetation S42A
452	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1132	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		706.5	FS1132.51	NO	Oppose	There is no need for the district plan to include a definition for margins. In addition, the definition is so vague as to be of no practical use to plan users.	Accept in part		Indigenous Vegetation S42A
453	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1162	James Wilson Cooper		GTODD Law	706.5	FS1162.59	NO	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept		Indigenous Vegetation S42A
468	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	791	Tim Burdon			791.1		NO	Oppose	Exclude the deliberate application of water in the definition of Clearance of Vegetation.	Reject		Indigenous Vegetation S42A
469	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1091	Campbell Hodgson	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	Galloway Cook Allan	791.1	FS1091.29	NO	Support	Allow.	Reject		Indigenous Vegetation S42A
470	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	791	Tim Burdon			791.2		NO	Oppose	Indigenous vegetation: Means vegetation that occurs naturally in NZ or arrived in NZ without human assistance. Amend to: Plant communities dominated by species that occur naturally in NZ or arrived in NZ without human assistance.	Reject		Indigenous Vegetation S42A
471	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	791	Tim Burdon			791.3		NO	Other	Building: Oppose in part. Exclude irrigation infrastructure from building definition.	Reject		Rural
472	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	794	Tim Burdon	Lakes Land Care		794.1		NO	Oppose	Exclude the deliberate application of water in the definition of Clearance of Vegetation.	Reject		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
473	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1091	Campbell Hodgson	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	Galloway Cook Allan	794.1	FS1091.30	NO	Support	Allow.	Reject		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
474	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	794	Tim Burdon	Lakes Land Care		794.2		NO	Oppose	Indigenous vegetation: Means vegetation that occurs naturally in NZ or arrived in NZ without human assistance. Amend to: Plant communities dominated by species that occur naturally in NZ or arrived in NZ without human assistance.	Reject		Refer to Indigenous Vegetation S42A
475	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	794	Tim Burdon	Lakes Land Care		794.3		NO	Other	Building: Oppose in part. Exclude irrigation infrastructure from building definition.	Reject		Rural S42A
480	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	805	Aileen Crow	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Beca Limited	805.8		NO	Support	Retain definition of 'Factory Farming'	Accept		Rural S42A
481	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	805	Aileen Crow	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Beca Limited	805.9		NO	Support	Retain definition of 'Farming Activity'	Accept		Rural S42A
482	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	805	Aileen Crow	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Beca Limited	805.10		NO	Support	Retain definition of 'Farm Building'	Accept		Rural S42A
504	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.6		NO	Oppose	Amend the definition of building so that it excludes gondolas and associated structures.	Reject	District Wide implications. Deferred to definition hearing.	
514	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	836	Warwick Goldsmith	Arcadian Triangle Limited	Anderson Lloyd	836.8		YES	Not Stated	Definitions - Minor Alterations and Additions to a Building Issue: (a) This submission point is lodged to enable this definition to be reconsidered. The following points are made: (i) Are there any other kinds of timber apart from "natural...timber", and if there are, why are they excluded? (ii) Why is there any concern about the material (or colour) of an exterior deck? (iii) Many natural timbered decks start a dark colour but then bleach very pale over time. There are clear stains intended to maintain a darker colour. Why does the definition allow dark stains but not allow clear stains? (iv) Why does the definition exclude modern products which are not timber but are designed and intended to look like timber (and last longer, without warping)? (v) Why is it necessary to say that a deck must comply with applicable rules and standards for activities and not apply the same comment to other external alterations referred to in the other two bullet points? (the point being that the second sentence of the first bullet point is unnecessary). (vi) In the third bullet point, the third use of the word "materials" makes a nonsense of the bullet point.	Reject	Relates to Arrowtown Residential Historic Management Zone. Deferred to the District Wide hearing, or hearing on that matter.	
516	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	836	Warwick Goldsmith	Arcadian Triangle Limited	Anderson Lloyd	836.10		YES	Not Stated	Amend the definition of "Nature Conservation Values" as follows: "means the preservation and protection of the natural resources of the District having regard to their intrinsic values, and having special regard to indigenous flora and fauna, and natural ecosystems, and landscape."	Accept in Part		Refer to recommendation in Strategic Direction Reply dated 7 April 2016.
517	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1341	Ben Farrell	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds & Associates Ltd	836.10	FS1341.28	NO	Support	Allow relief sought to the extent that it does not undermine or prevent the relief originally sought by Real Journeys (unless otherwise agreed through the submission process)	Accept in Part		Refer to recommendation in Strategic Direction Reply dated 7 April 2016.
518	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1342	Ben Farrell	Te Anau Developments Limited	John Edmonds & Associates Ltd	836.10	FS1342.18	NO	Support	Allow relief sought to the extent that it does not undermine or prevent the relief originally sought by Te Anau Developments (unless otherwise agreed through the submission process)	Accept in Part		Refer to recommendation in Strategic Direction Reply dated 7 April 2016.
519	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		836.10	FS1097.722	NO	Support	Support the intent of the submission for the reasons provided in QPL's original submission.	Accept in Part		Refer to recommendation in Strategic Direction Reply dated 7 April 2016.
520	2 Definitions	2.2 Definitions	1117	Jenny Carter	Remarkables Park Limited		836.10	FS1117.284	NO	Support	Supports the intent of the submission for the reasons provided in RPL's original submission.	Accept in Part		Refer to recommendation in Strategic Direction Reply dated 7 April 2016.