

### APPENDIX 3: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED

Name	Agree with preferred option?	Comments
Susan Stevens, Gibbston Community Association	Yes	The Plan Change is vital to the success of the Gibbston River Trail and others throughout the District. The Plan Change will lead to enhanced public access by granting some consideration to those landowners that sacrifice the private enjoyment of their land to share it with the public.
John Aspinall, Wanaka	Yes	The Plan Change should extend to trails established prior to 2007. The Plan Change should also apply to access across private land where there is no legal basis. Oppose suggestion that the Plan Change should only apply where there is no compensation to the landowner.
Lakes Landcare Group	Yes	The Plan Change should extend to trails established prior to 2007. The Plan Change should also apply to access across private land where there is no legal basis. Oppose suggestion that the Plan Change should only apply where there is no compensation to the landowner.
Federated Farmers	No	<p>Welcome the intent of the Plan Change, but believe it is an ad hoc response to a wider problem of the publics' desires for council to try and maintain an "idyllic" rural landscape primarily at the cost of private landowners. While council has a mandate to seek enduring public access, it is unlikely that landowners will be encouraged to enter into access easements and covenants simply to avoid the implications and possible effects of public place. The more likely result is that any voluntary access provided now will be closed as more landowners understand the consequences to their ongoing land use or intensification of that land. While council has a mandate to seek enduring public access, it is unlikely that landowners will be encouraged to enter into access easements and covenants simply to avoid the implications and possible effects of public place. The more likely result is that any voluntary access provided now will be closed as more landowners understand the consequences to their ongoing land use or intensification of that land.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to removing the time bound clause where voluntary access is provided across private land so that areas where access has been granted and private walking tracks formed will no longer have the implication of public place provisions providing the potential to restrict future land use.</p> <p>Amendments to provisions for visual amenity landscapes are welcomed, but need to reflect suggested changes in this submission.</p>
Trevor and Vivienne Kerr	Yes	
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	No	<p>This is a backward step in managing the landscape resource of the District. Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prevents establishment of any new trails and places with secure enjoyment of quality landscapes. As from 2007 only those trails and places legally protected before that date would have some certainty over protection of the landscape values enjoyed from it. We should be focussing on providing quality trails with certainty over their values into the future.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Do not accept the argument that it's better to have a second rate trail than no trail at all.</li> <li>- The exclusion would defeat the purpose of creating some trails and places, as the very reason for their establishment could be undermined by insensitive development permitted.</li> <li>- If the Plan Change became operative a situation of unacceptable development would certainly arise.</li> <li>- The proposal is anathema to sustainable and integrated use and management of the landscape.</li> </ul> <p>Possible solutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The solution might lie more in managing effects than outright refusal for development consent. For example, employment of wide setbacks, planted buffer zones, avoidance of ridgelines and high hills as development sites and focus on more discrete development.</li> <li>- The purpose of any new trail should be taken into account</li> <li>- Consider ways to facilitate and assist good design.</li> </ul> <p>A distinction should be made between privately owned places made available to the public and public trails and places where public have free access at all times as of right, because it is public land.</p>
Warren Skerrit	Yes	Well thought out compromise. No dogs off leads.
Meadow 3 Limited	In part	Limiting the scope of the Plan Change to trails formed post December 2007 disadvantages landowners who have volunteered land prior to this date. There is also a risk that the limitation will discourage the extension or consolidation of trails where this might increase numbers of visitors to trails formed prior to December 2007.
Anne Relling	Yes	Totally support
John Pawson	Yes	'Gifting' of land is a misnomer. Public access does not just affect the landowner in terms of assessment matters under the District Plan. Also may include loss of privacy, potential damage to property. The loss of private property rights should be compensated for. The Plan Change should not be discriminatory in terms of how it looks at these new public access easements on private land, whether they be gifted, arise out of tenure review.
Upper Clutha Environmental Society	In part	The Plan Change appears over complicated. Suggests inserting definitions so that the Plan Change only applies to 'gifted tracks'. Gifted tracks are those that provide access with no personal gain to the landowner. Tracks created under tenure review, and any portion of a track on private land, are excluded.
William Bailey	Yes	Council's position is consistent with Central Governments. Access to outdoors important. Council should support community groups and protect private landowners. Act now to protect access to conservation lands.
Michael Harris	Yes	Council's position is consistent with Central Governments. Access to outdoors important. Council should support community groups and protect private landowners. Act now to protect access to conservation lands.
Andre Prassinos	Yes	The definition of trail should clarify that it does not provide for access by trail bikes etc. Sincerely hope that the Plan Change results in a number of walking, cycling and horse riding paths.
Alan Nelson	Yes	
Geoff Hunt	Yes	
Tim Edney	Yes	Support the Plan Change and consider that it will enable us to add a number of trails (Waitiri and Eastburn Stations)

Jeff and Corne Bryant	Yes	Access roads and car parks should be similarly treated.
John Hollows Fish and Game	Yes	Suggest the definition include 'the Crown and its entities'
Ben Wilson	Yes	Suggest any private tracks on private land opened to members of the public at the discretion of the landowner also be excluded. Tracks volunteered and formally created through tenure review be treated the same as other trails.
Robert Wilson Dublin Downs	Yes	Dublin Downs will consider reopening their private walkway to the public if this issue is remedied.
Malcolm Ramsay	Yes	Support any change that stops landowners being penalised for providing public access
Southern Planning Group	Yes	
Morven Ferry Limited	Yes	
Upper Clutha Tracks Trust	Yes	Further discussion is needed as to whether trails formed as a result of tenure review should be included within the Plan Change