



**STRATFORD
DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Stratford District Plan

ROLLING REVIEW PART I

INDIGENOUS FOREST & BIODIVERSITY

VARIATION 1

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

2010

ALL SUBMISSIONS (BY SUBMITTER)

Submitter	Submission Number	Variation Reference	Summary of Submission	Summary of Relief Sought
Taranaki Regional Council	10/01-01	General	<u>Support</u> overall aims	
	10/01-02	B1.2.1.4	<u>Support</u> inclusion of discretionary rule addressing vegetation disturbance within 20m of all water bodies	
	10/01-03	B1.2.1.5	<u>Support</u> inclusion of non-complying rule addressing vegetation disturbance within 20m of all water bodies	
	10/01-04	A1.4.10	<u>Support</u> method allowing Wetland Schedule	
	10/01-05	A2.4.3	<u>Support</u> method allowing Habitats Schedule	
	10/01-06	Appendix 9	Limitations due to relying totally on surveys by Regional Councils of significant wetlands	<u>Amend</u> Appendix 9 by adding further (unspecified) sites
	10/01-07	General	<u>Support</u> improvements to vegetation clearance rules	
	10/01-08	B1.2.1.1	Farm Management Plans are not designed to be regulatory instruments	<u>Amend</u> by deleting reference to Farm Management Plans
	10/01-09	A2.4.2	<u>Support</u> process of allowing Appendix 9 to be built up over time	
Allan Rinaldi	10/02-10	Appendix 5	Requests that two totara and two rimu trees be protected	<u>Amend</u> Appendix 5 by adding the three trees requested to be protected
Ngati Ruanui Group Management Ltd	10/03-11	General	Variation is overly complex without adequate analysis of iwi concerns	<u>Amend</u> Variation through independent peer review
	10/03-12	Part E	Height reference in definition of “ <i>Clearance</i> ” is unclear	<u>Amend</u> definition of “ <i>Clearance</i> ” by deleting 3m height reference.
	10/03-13	Part E	<u>Support</u> definition of “ <i>Indigenous Vegetation</i> ”	
	10/03-14	Part E	Allowing for the upgrading of utilities undermines the proposed vegetation controls	<u>Amend</u> definition by deleting reference to “ <i>upgrading of utilities</i> ”
	10/03-15	A2	<u>Support</u> AER and objectives except that subtitles should not refer to indigenous forest and AER should be stated after objectives and policies	<u>Amend</u> by replacing “ <i>forest</i> ” with “ <i>vegetation</i> ” in subtitles
	10/03-16	A2	<u>Support</u> policies except that subtitles should not refer to indigenous forest	<u>Amend</u> by replacing “ <i>forest</i> ” with “ <i>vegetation</i> ” in subtitle
	10/03-17	A2.3.2	The term forest in regard to the ring plain is unclear	<u>Amend</u> by replacing “ <i>forest</i> ” with “ <i>vegetation</i> ”
	10/03-18	A2.3.4	Policy is redundant as it is covered by the enforcement mechanisms in the Act	<u>Amend</u> by deleting or minimising the policy
	10/03-19	A1.4.10	Unclear why the schedule method only includes wetlands	<u>Amend</u> method to include all significant water bodies and to reference Appendix 9

Submitter	Submission Number	Variation Reference	Summary of Submission	Summary of Relief Sought
Ngati Ruanui Group Management Ltd	10/03-20	A2.4.7	Monitoring method is redundant	<u>Amend</u> by deleting method or by including supporting actions
	10/03-21	Appendix 9	No new sites have been added through the Variation	<u>Amend</u> by instituting active programme for assessing new sites for inclusion in Schedule
	10/03-22	B1.2.1.1	Allowing for the upgrading of utilities undermines the proposed vegetation controls	<u>Amend</u> permitted activity rule by deleting reference to “ <i>upgrading of utilities</i> ”
	10/03-23	B1.2.1.1	Allowing for the clearing of vegetation under 3m in height is inappropriate	<u>Amend</u> permitted activity rule by deleting allowance for vegetation under 3m in height
	10/03-24	B1.2.1.3	<u>Support</u> limited discretionary rule	
	10/03-25	B1.2.1.4	<u>Support</u> discretionary rule	
	10/03-26	B1.2.1.5	<u>Support</u> non-complying rule except that there is no reason to treat manuka and kanuka differently from other indigenous vegetation	<u>Amend</u> non-complying activity rule by deleting requirement relating to manuka and kanuka
Mark & Suzanne Ford	10/04-27	B1.2.1.3	Harvesting of indigenous timber should not require a consent as it is administered by MAF	<u>Amend</u> limited discretionary rule by deleting requirement regarding SFMPs and reinstate them as permitted activities
Department of Conservation	10/05-28	A2	<u>Support</u> change to indigenous vegetation	
	10/05-29	Part E	The 3m height reference repeats what is in Rule B1.2.1.5 and therefore adds uncertainty	<u>Amend</u> definition of “ <i>Clearance</i> ” by deleting 3m height reference.
	10/05-30	Part E	The word “ <i>forest</i> ” in the definition of “ <i>Indigenous vegetation disturbance</i> ” appears to be a drafting error	<u>Amend</u> definition by replacing “ <i>forest</i> ” with “ <i>vegetation</i> ”
	10/05-31	Part E	The term “ <i>disturbance of vegetation</i> ” as used in Rule B1.2.1.4 is not defined and is therefore unclear	<u>Amend</u> Part E by adding a proposed definition of “ <i>Disturbance of vegetation</i> ”
	10/05-32	Part E	The proposals are unclear as to who may carry out ecological assessments	<u>Amend</u> Part E by adding a proposed definition of “ <i>Approved Ecologist</i> ”
	10/05-33	A2.2	<u>Support</u> other objectives	
	10/05-34	A2.3.2	The policy regarding the ring plain is unclear	<u>Amend</u> to read the protection of significant indigenous vegetation including all indigenous forest remnants on the ring plain
	10/05-35	A2.3	<u>Support</u> other policies	

Submitter	Submission Number	Variation Reference	Summary of Submission	Summary of Relief Sought
Department of Conservation	10/05-36	A2.4.3	Significant indigenous vegetation should be included in Appendix 9	<u>Amend</u> the method for Appendix 9 to also include significant indigenous vegetation
	10/05-37	A2.4	There is no method within the plan which confirms the regular review of Appendix 9	<u>Amend</u> by adding a new method relating to reviewing Appendix 9
	10/05-38	A2.4	<u>Support</u> other changes to methods	
	10/05-39	B1.2.1.1	Farm Management Plans are not statutory instruments	<u>Amend</u> by deleting reference to Farm Management Plans
	10/05-40	B1.2.1.3.1(g)	It is inappropriate to assess SFMPs as a limited discretionary activity	<u>Amend</u> the limited discretionary activity rule regarding SFMPs so that they are then assessed as discretionary by way of the discretionary activity rule
	10/05-41	B1.2	<u>Support</u> other changes to rules	
	10/05-42	B2.7(b)	<u>Support</u> changes to standards	
	10/05-43	B5.5	The wording of the assessment criteria is not consistent with other proposed wording and could therefore be unclear	<u>Amend</u> the assessment criteria by incorporating wording used elsewhere in the proposals
	10/05-44	B5.5	<u>Support</u> other changes to assessment criteria	
	10/05-45	B6.1.2	It is inappropriate to assess SFMPs as a limited discretionary activity	<u>Amend</u> information requirements for SFMPs by deleting
	10/05-46	B6.3	<u>Support</u> other information requirements	
	10/05-47	B6.3	The proposals are unclear as to who may carry out ecological assessments	<u>Amend</u> by adding a new information requirement specifying an approved ecologist
	10/05-48	Appendix 9	Significant indigenous vegetation should be included in Appendix 9	<u>Amend</u> Appendix 9 to also include significant indigenous vegetation
	10/05-49	Appendix 9	There is no confirmation within the plan of the regular review of Appendix 9	<u>Amend</u> Appendix 9 by adding a footnote concerning future additions to the Appendix
	10/05-50	B1.2.1.1	The term “ <i>disturbance of vegetation</i> ” is unclear	<u>Amend</u> by replacing the words “ <i>indigenous vegetation disturbance</i> ” in the last bullet point
10/05-51	General	<u>Support</u> change to indigenous vegetation		
Tree Ferns NZ Ltd	10/06-52	B1.2.1.5	Scrub areas should be able to be cleared as a permitted activity	<u>Amend</u> by deleting manuka/kanuka rule and reinstate as a permitted activity

Submitter	Submission Number	Variation Reference	Summary of Submission	Summary of Relief Sought
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of NZ	10/07-53	A2.3.2	The policy regarding the ring plain is unclear	<u>Amend</u> to read the protection of significant indigenous vegetation including all indigenous forest remnants on the ring plain
	10/07-54	A2.4.3	Significant indigenous vegetation should be included in Appendix 9	<u>Amend</u> the method for Appendix 9 to also include significant indigenous vegetation
	10/07-55	A2.3	There is no method within the plan which confirms the regular review of Appendix 9	<u>Amend</u> by adding a new method relating to reviewing Appendix 9
	10/07-56	B1.2.1.1(d)	The spelling of "maahi" is incorrect	<u>Amend</u> by replacing "mahhi" with "maahi"
	10/07-57	B1.2.1.3.1(g)	The assessment criterion concerning an ecological assessment is unclear	<u>Amend</u> by changing wording to consider the effects on the protection of vegetation and habitats
	10/07-58	B6.1.2	The information requirement wording is unclear	<u>Amend</u> by changing the word "involve" to "include"
	10/07-59	B6.1.2	The information requirement should specify indigenous or threatened species as appropriate	<u>Amend</u> by adding the words "indigenous" and "threatened" in regard to species
	10/07-60	Appendix 9	Significant indigenous vegetation should be included in Appendix 9	<u>Amend</u> Appendix 9 to also include significant indigenous vegetation
	10/07-61	Appendix 9	There is no confirmation within the plan of the regular review of Appendix 9	<u>Amend</u> Appendix 9 by adding a footnote concerning future additions to the Appendix
Fish & Game NZ (Taranaki)	10/08-62	B2.7(b)	The standard makes no allowance for the enhancement of wetland margins	<u>Amend</u> standard to allow for benching and fencing of wetlands
	10/08-63	General	<u>Support</u> change to indigenous vegetation	
	10/08-64	Part E	<u>Support</u> the definitions	
	10/08-65	General	<u>Support</u> the AERs objectives and policies	
	10/08-66	A1.4.10	<u>Support</u> the method for Appendix 9	
	10/08-67	A2.4.2	The ecological assessments should be in proportion to the significance of the area and the scale of effects	<u>Amend</u> method to account for the significance of the area and the scale of effects
	10/08-68	Appendix 9	The list of significant sites is incomplete	<u>Amend</u> Appendix 9 by adding further (unspecified) sites

Submitter	Submission Number	Variation Reference	Summary of Submission	Summary of Relief Sought
Iain & Katherine Sextus	10/09-69	A2.4.5	Rates relief should extend to any wetland, habitat or indigenous vegetation whether or not it is protected	<u>Amend</u> A2.4.5 by including all areas of indigenous vegetation, habitats and wetlands
	10/09-70	Planning Maps	The map depicting the Toko Wetland is incorrect	<u>Amend</u> planning maps by correcting spatial identification of the Toko Wetland
Federated Farmers of NZ	10/10-71	General	Clearance of vegetation which is not assessed as being significant should be permitted and the assessments should be funded by Council	<u>Amend</u> by incorporating a process to achieve this
	10/10-72	Part E	The definition of “ <i>clearance</i> ” requires a trigger level	<u>Amend</u> “ <i>Clearance</i> ” definition by including area limit
	10/10-73	Part E	The definition for “ <i>Indigenous vegetation</i> ” lacks clarity	<u>Amend</u> “ <i>Indigenous vegetation</i> ” definition by quantifying “ <i>predominance</i> ”
	10/10-74	Part E	Vegetation brought about by human activities should be excluded from the definition of “ <i>indigenous vegetation disturbance</i> ”	<u>Amend</u> “ <i>Indigenous Vegetation</i> ” definition by excluding vegetation resulting from human actions
	10/10-75	General	Significance level should alone determine whether or not consent is required	<u>Amend</u> by including significance criteria
	10/10-76	Part E	S6 of the RMA requires only significant vegetation to be protected	<u>Amend</u> by adding a proposed definition of “ <i>Significant indigenous vegetation</i> ”
	10/10-77	Part E	<u>Support</u> definition of “ <i>Sustainable Forest Management Permit</i> ”	
	10/10-78	Part E	<u>Support</u> definition of “ <i>Sustainable Forest Management Plan</i> ”	
	10/10-79	Part E	<u>Support</u> definition of “ <i>Water body</i> ”	
	10/10-80	A2.6.1	<u>Support</u> AER	
	10/10-81	A2.6.2	The AER relating to management of indigenous vegetation should be deleted as S6 of Act requires Council only to protect	<u>Amend</u> by deleting A2.6.2 AER
	10/10-82	A2.6.3	<u>Support</u> AER	
	10/10-83	A2.2.1	<u>Support</u> objective	
	10/10-84	A2.2.2	<u>Support</u> objective	
	10/10-85	A2.3.1	The use of the words “ <i>recognise the significance of</i> ” elevates the matters to S6 of the Act when they are S7 matters	<u>Amend</u> policy by using the words “ <i>give regard to</i> ” instead of significance

Submitter	Submission Number	Variation Reference	Summary of Submission	Summary of Relief Sought
Federated Farmers of NZ	10/10-86	A2.3.2	S6 of the RMA requires only significant vegetation to be protected	<u>Amend</u> policy by removing reference to the ring plain
	10/10-87	A2.3.3	<u>Support</u> policy	
	10/10-88	A2.3.4	S6 of the RMA requires only significant vegetation to be protected	<u>Amend</u> policy by including the word “ <i>significant</i> ”
	10/10-89	A1.2.10	<u>Support</u> method	
	10/10-90	A2.4.1	S6 of the RMA requires only significant vegetation to be protected	<u>Amend</u> method by including the word “ <i>significant</i> ”
	10/10-91	A2.4.2	Council should fund ecological assessments	Amend method to require Council to fund ecological assessments
	10/10-92	A2.4.3	<u>Support</u> method	
	10/10-93	A2.4.4	<u>Support</u> method	
	10/10-94	A2.4.5	Rates relief should extend to any wetland, habitat or indigenous vegetation whether or not it is protected	<u>Amend</u> A2.4.5 by including all areas of indigenous vegetation, habitats and wetlands
	10/10-95	A2.4.6	Liason should be on significance and with a range of agencies	Amend method to require liason with agencies to determine the significance of a site
	10/10-96	A2.4.7	<u>Support</u> method	
	10/10-97	A2.4.8	S6 of the RMA requires only significant vegetation to be protected	<u>Amend</u> method by including the word “ <i>significant</i> ”
	10/10-98	B1.2.1.1	<u>Support</u> rule allowing harvesting of planted indigenous forest	
	10/10-99	B1.2.1.1		<u>Amend</u> permitted activity rule by reinstating SFMPs as permitted
	10/10-100	B1.2.1.1	Permitted activity rule should include an allowance for when stock are endangered	<u>Amend</u> permitted activity rule by including an allowance for when stock are endangered and removing the word “ <i>imminent</i> ”
	10/10-101	B1.2.1.1	Permitted activity rule should include an allowance for maintenance of farm tracks and new/maintaining drains and culverts	<u>Amend</u> permitted activity rule bp3(b) by adding the words “ <i>farm track, drain or culvert</i> ”
	10/10-102	B1.2.1.1	<u>Support</u> bp3(c)	
	10/10-103	B1.2.1.1	<u>Support</u> bp3(d)	
	10/10-104	B1.2.1.1	S6 of the RMA requires only significant vegetation to be protected	<u>Amend</u> permitted activity rule by adding allowance for disturbing and clearing vegetation which has not been assessed as being significant
	10/10-105	B1.2.1.1	<u>Support</u> bp3(e)	

Submitter	Submission Number	Variation Reference	Summary of Submission	Summary of Relief Sought
Federated Farmers of NZ	10/10-106	B1.2.1.1	Permitted activity rule should include an allowance for new farm tracks	<u>Amend</u> permitted activity rule bp3 by adding an allowance for new tracks up to 10m in width
	10/10-107	B1.2.1.1	Scrub areas should be able to be cleared as a permitted activity	<u>Amend</u> by deleting manuka/kanuka rule and reinstate as a permitted activity
	10/10-108	B1.2.1.1	The proportion of an area with a canopy height of 3m should be quantified	<u>Amend</u> permitted activity rule bp5 by including “clearance and quantifying a proportion of 80%
	10/10-109	B1.2.1.3	Harvesting of indigenous timber should not require a consent as it is administered by MAF	<u>Amend</u> limited discretionary activity rule by deleting and reinstating SFMPs as permitted
	10/10-110	B1.2.1.3.1(g)	Harvesting of indigenous timber should not require a consent as it is administered by MAF	<u>Amend</u> limited discretionary activity rule by deleting and reinstating SFMPs as permitted
	10/10-111	B1.2.1.4	S6 of the RMA requires only significant vegetation to be protected	<u>Amend</u> rule by including the word “ <i>significant</i> ”
	10/10-112	B1.2.1.5	S6 of the RMA requires only significant vegetation to be protected	<u>Amend</u> rule by including the word “ <i>significant</i> ”
	10/10-113	B1.2.1.5	Scrub areas should be able to be cleared as a permitted activity unless significant and the proportion of an area with a canopy height of 3m should be quantified	<u>Amend</u> rule by including significance and a lower limit of 20% as a trigger level for the 3m height
	10/10-114	B1.6.2	Protection of Protected Areas should be within the Protected Area Zone rules alone	<u>Amend</u> by deleting the rule
	10/10-115	B2.7	<u>Support</u> the standard (subject to other reliefs sought)	
	10/10-116	B2.7	S6 of the RMA requires only significant vegetation to be protected	<u>Amend</u> standard by including the word “ <i>significant</i> ”
	10/10-117	B5.5	S6 of the RMA requires only significant vegetation to be protected	<u>Amend</u> assessment criteria by including the word “ <i>significant</i> ”
	10/10-118	B6.1.2	S6 of the RMA requires only significant vegetation to be protected	<u>Amend</u> information requirement by including the word “ <i>significant</i> ”
	10/10-119	B6.3	S6 of the RMA requires only significant vegetation to be protected	<u>Amend</u> information requirement by including the word “ <i>significant</i> ”

Submitter	Submission Number	Variation Reference	Summary of Submission	Summary of Relief Sought
Transpower NZ Ltd	10/11-120	Part E	<u>Support</u> “ <i>indigenous vegetation disturbance</i> ”	
	10/11-121	B1.2.1.1	The variation could potentially be interpreted as being in conflict with the National Environmental Standard in regard to natural areas	<u>Amend</u> the permitted activity rule by adding an advice note that the rural zone is not a “ <i>natural area</i> ” in terms of the NES
Powerco Limited	10/12-122	Part E	<u>Support</u> “ <i>indigenous vegetation disturbance</i> ”	
	10/12-123	B1.2.1.1	<u>Support</u> rule	
Ministry of Agriculture & Forestry	10/13-124	Part E	Limited harvesting should be permitted without needing an ecological assessment	<u>Amend</u> definition of “ <i>Indigenous vegetation disturbance</i> ” to allow for limited harvesting
	10/13-125	B1.2.1.3	There does not appear to be evidence that that the SFMPs are not an adequate permitted activity threshold	<u>Amend</u> Variation by further reviewing role of SFMPs
	10/13-126	A2.3	Harvesting of indigenous timber outside of significant areas should not require a consent as it is administered by MAF	<u>Amend</u> policies to allow for SFMPs as permitted activities outside of significant areas
	10/13-127	A2.4.2	The proposals are unclear as to who may carry out ecological assessments and to how the evaluations will be done	<u>Amend</u> method to provide certainty as to who carries out ecological assessments and the criteria for those assessments
	10/13-128	A2.4.3	Significant indigenous vegetation should be included in Appendix 9	<u>Amend</u> method for Appendix 9 to also include significant indigenous vegetation
	10/13-129	B1.2.1.1	Sustainable harvesting is not relevant when considering planted forest and there should be no distinction between indigenous and exotic planted forest	<u>Amend</u> permitted activity rule by removing the words “sustainable” and “indigenous” from the planted forest rule
	10/13-130	B1.2.1.3	Harvesting of indigenous timber outside of significant areas should not require a consent as it is administered by MAF but if assessments are required they should be before the consideration of an SFMP application	<u>Amend</u> limited discretionary rule to only require consent for harvesting in significant areas and for those assessments to be before the consideration of an SFMP
	10/13-131	B1.2.1.3.1	Assessments should be required before the consideration of an SFMP application	<u>Amend</u> matters for discretion to allow for ecological assessments to be before the consideration of an SFMP

Submitter	Submission Number	Variation Reference	Summary of Submission	Summary of Relief Sought
Ministry of Agriculture & Forestry	10/13-132	B5.5	The proposals are unclear as to who may carry out ecological assessments	<u>Amend</u> the assessment criteria by providing a clear standard for “ <i>suitably qualified</i> ”
	10/13-133	B6.1.2	The proportion of a habitat which is already protected should be considered and the relationship with natural hazards is unclear	<u>Amend</u> the assessment criteria by including the proportion of a habitat which is already in the Protect Area Zone and relating natural hazards back to actions required to prevent natural hazards
	10/13-134	B6.3	The term “ <i>selective harvesting</i> ” is not defined and is unclear	<u>Amend</u> the information requirement by replacing “ <i>selective harvesting</i> ” with “ <i>sustainable forest management</i> ”
Horizons Regional Council	10/14-135	General	<u>Support</u> the proposals and request a co-operative approach between the Councils to implement the proposals	
NZ Forest Managers Ltd	10/15-136	Part E	The provisions make no allowance for minor collateral damage from harvesting operations	<u>Amend</u> the definition of “ <i>Indigenous vegetation disturbance</i> ” to include minor damage resulting from forest harvesting on adjacent land
	10/15-137	B1.2.1.4	No justification for the 20m buffer distance from wetlands	<u>Amend</u> the buffer distance in the rule to 5m
	10/15-138	B1.2.1.4	Vegetation disturbance should be a limited discretionary activity	<u>Amend</u> the discretionary rule by deleting the vegetation rules and including them as limited discretionary rules
	10/15-139	B6.1.2	The proposals are unclear as to what criteria are to be measured by an assessment	<u>Amend</u> the assessment criteria providing clear expectations of ecological assessments
	10/15-140	B6.1.2	Ecological assessments should only be required where the area is significant or the risks of the activity are high	<u>Amend</u> the assessment criteria by including a significance test
	10/15-141	Planning Maps	The map depicting the Te Wera Wetlands is incorrect	<u>Amend</u> planning maps by correcting spatial identification of the Te Wera Wetlands

Submitter	Submission Number	Variation Reference	Summary of Submission	Summary of Relief Sought
Genesis Energy	10/16-142	B1.2.1.4	There should be an area qualification to distinguish between discretionary and non-complying activities	<u>Amend</u> the discretionary rules by adding equivalents to the non-complying rules but with an area limit of 500m ²
	10/16-143	B1.2.1.5	There should be an area qualification to distinguish between discretionary and non-complying activities	<u>Amend</u> the non-complying rules by adding an area trigger of 500m ²
	10/16-144	B1.6.2	The Protected Area buffer rule should be qualified by a distance rather than by way of allotment due to the large sizes of the relevant allotments	<u>Amend</u> the rule by referring to a distance of 500m from the boundary
	10/16-145	A2.4.2	An ecological assessment can only be sought as a part of a consent application rather than prior to it	<u>Amend</u> the method by deleting the reference relating to “ <i>prior to the consideration of...</i> ”
Stratford District Council	10/17-146	B1.6.2	The Protected Area rule conflicts with the policies by not allowing for activities on conservation land to be assessed and any activity is therefore discretionary.	<u>Amend</u> the rule by adding a sub clause for activities on Department of Conservation land

SUBMISSIONS SEEKING AMENDMENTS (BY ISSUE)

Broad Issue	Submitter	Submission Number
Significance issues	Federated Farmers of NZ	10/10-71 10/10-75 10/10-76 10/10-85 10/10-86 10/10-88 10/10-90 10/10-95 10/10-97 10/10-104 10/10-111 10/10-112 10/10-113 10/10-116 10/10-117 10/10-118 10/10-119
	NZ Forest Managers Ltd	10/15-140
Requirements for Ecologists and expectations/criteria for ecological assessments	Department of Conservation	10/05-32 10/05-47
	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of NZ	10/07-57
	Fish & Game NZ (Taranaki)	10/08-67
	Ministry of Agriculture & Forestry	10/13-127 10/13-132
	NZ Forest Managers Ltd	10/15-139
Cost or timing of ecological assessments	Federated Farmers of NZ	10/10-71 10/10-91
	Ministry of Agriculture & Forestry	10/13-130 10/13-131
	Genesis Energy	10/16-145

Broad issue	Submitter	Submission Number
3m height limit or other trigger limits	Ngati Ruanui Group Management Ltd	10/03-12 10/03-23
	Department of Conservation	10/05-29
	Federated Farmers of NZ	10/10-113
	Genesis Energy	10/16-142
		10/16-143
Exemptions for consent requirements or from inclusion as disturbance	Taranaki Regional Council	10/01-08
	Ngati Ruanui Group Management Ltd	10/03-14
		10/03-22
	Department of Conservation	10/05-39
	Federated Farmers of NZ	10/10-72
		10/10-73
		10/10-74
10/10-100		
	10/10-101	
	10/10-106	
NZ Forest Managers Ltd	10/15-136	
Sustainable Forest Management Plans & Permits	Mark & Suzanne Ford	10/04-27
	Department of Conservation	10/05-40
		10/05-45
	Federated Farmers of NZ	10/10-99
		10/10-109
10/10-110		
Ministry of Agriculture & Forestry	10/13-124	
	10/13-125	
	10/13-126	
Wetland margins	Fish & Game NZ (Taranaki)	10/08-62
	NZ Forest Managers Ltd	10/15-137
Manuka/Kanuka/scrub	Ngati Ruanui Group Management Ltd	10/03-26
	Tree Ferns NZ Ltd	10/06-52
	Federated Farmers of NZ	10/10-107
10/10-113		
Ring plain forest	Ngati Ruanui Group Management Ltd	10/03-17
	Department of Conservation	10/05-34
	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of NZ	10/07-53
Rates relief	Iain & Katherine Sextus	10/09-69
	Federated Farmers of NZ	10/10-94

Broad issue	Submitter	Submission Number
Review of, content of or additions to Appendix 9	Taranaki Regional Council	10/01-06
	Ngati Ruanui Group Management Ltd	10/03-19 10/03-21
	Department of Conservation	10/05-36 10/05-37 10/05-48 10/05-49
	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of NZ	10/07-54 10/07-55 10/07-60 10/07-61
	Fish & Game NZ (Taranaki)	10/08-68
	Ministry of Agriculture & Forestry	10/13-128
	Planning Maps	Iain & Katherine Sextus
NZ Forest Managers Ltd		10/15-141
Protected Area Zone	Federated Farmers of NZ	10/10-114
	Genesis Energy	10/16-144
	Stratford District Council	10/17-146
Other matters	Allan Rinaldi	10/102-10
	Ngati Ruanui Group Management Ltd	10/03-11 10/03-18 10/03-20
	Department of Conservation	10/05-30 10/05-31 10/05-43 10/05-50
	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of NZ	10/07-56 10/07-58 10/07-59
	Federated Farmers of NZ	10/10-81
	Transpower NZ Ltd	10/11-121
	Ministry of Agriculture & Forestry	10/13-129 10/13-133 10/13-134
	NZ Forest Managers Ltd	10/15-138

Mike Avery
PLANNING & REGULATORY MANAGER

FURTHER SUBMISSION IN SUPPORT OF, OR IN OPPOSITION TO, SUBMISSION ON PUBLICLY NOTIFIED PROPOSED POLICY STATEMENT OR PLAN

STRATFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL

Resource Management Act 1991

To: Stratford District Council

Name: _____
[Full name]

Address: _____

[Full postal address]

This is a further submission in support of / in opposition *[Delete as appropriate]* to the submission by:

on Variation 1 of the Proposed Stratford District Plan.

1. The particular parts of the submission I support / oppose *[Delete as appropriate]* are:

Submission #: _____

2. The reasons for my support / opposition *[Delete as appropriate]* are:

3. I seek that the whole / a part *[Delete as appropriate]* of the submission be allowed / disallowed *[Delete as appropriate]*:
[Give precise details]

4. I do or do not wish to be heard in support of my submission.
[Delete as appropriate]

5. If others make a similar submission I would / would not *[Delete as appropriate]* be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at any hearing.

Title and address for service of
person making submission:

*[Signature of person making submission
or person authorised to sign on behalf
of person making submission]*

Telephone No: _____

Fax No: _____

Date

CONTACT DETAILS

Please address all correspondence to:

Mike Avery
Planning & Regulatory Manager
Stratford District Council
PO Box 320
STRATFORD 3452

mavery@stratford.govt.nz

or contact

Phone: 06 765 6099
Fax: 06 765 7500

CLOSING DATE

4:30pm 05 November 2010

NOTE:

Please note Clause 8 of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991 on persons able to make further submissions:

Certain persons may make further submissions:

- (1) *The following persons may make a further submission, in the prescribed form, on a proposed policy statement or plan to the relevant local authority:*
 - (a) *any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; and*
 - (b) *any person that has an interest in the proposed policy statement or plan greater than the interest that the general public has; and*
 - (c) *the local authority itself.*
- (2) *A further submission must be limited to a matter in support of or in opposition to the relevant submission made under clause 6*