

Report: Summary of Submissions by Submitter Number/Name

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	268	<b>Submitter:</b>	Warwick Cheyne
<b>Point Number</b>	268.1		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete Rule 22.3.3.3 Earthworks- Significant Natural Areas.</b>		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter proposes if they were to have an access track through an Significant Natural Area proposed area it will be problematic to maintain, which becomes a health and safety issue.</li> <li>• Under the proposal, on a track approximately 3.5m wide, the submitter will only be allowed to do maintenance on around 80m in length per year.</li> <li>• The track is around 200m long and submitter questions whether they will have to do maintenance over a 3 year period.</li> </ul>		
<b>Point Number</b>	268.2		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete Rule 22.2.3.4 Earthworks- within Landscape and Natural Character Areas.</b>		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limit of 1000m2 has been arbitrarily assigned for earthworks in a Hill Country Significant Amenity Landscape.</li> <li>• This limit will be problematic for track maintenance where large areas of the farm (60%) are proposed as a Significant Amenity Landscape.</li> <li>• Inability to maintain tracks is a health and safety issue.</li> <li>• Rules render land incapable of reasonable use.</li> </ul>		
<b>Point Number</b>	268.3		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete Rule 22.2.7 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.</b>		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total of 1000m2 seems overly restrictive.</li> <li>• Could result in land outside an Significant Natural Area becoming incapable of reasonable use as persistent invasive weeds (e.g. Manuka, Totara and Tutu) encroach on the pasture.</li> <li>• Not clear to submitter what 'outside an Significant Natural Area' means.</li> <li>• Submission questions how the Waikato District Council seeks to place restrictions what can be done on their land, beyond specific Significant Natural Area land they are interested in.</li> </ul>		
<b>Point Number</b>	268.4		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Delete the Significant Natural Area from property number 1003679 until there are clear benefits to the landowner in having this on their property. The submitter outlines options which Council could have explored before notifying the proposed plan:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Petition the government using the local government association to restore tradeable carbon credits on stands of native timber of 2 hectares or more.</b></li> <li>• <b>Transferable titles, with not less than one transferable title per hectare of land taken</b></li> <li>• <b>100% rates relief from those areas affected by designations</b></li> <li>• <b>Council to lease the Significant Natural Area</b></li> <li>• <b>Council to pay landowners per year based on the area of Significant Natural Area to preserve it</b></li> </ul>		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No wish to have this designation on the property.</li> <li>• <b>The submitter wishes to have a free title on their property with all their entitlement's privileges</b></li> <li>• <b>Having native timber as carbon credits would do more to preserve these stands than any threats and/or theft by zoning.</b></li> <li>• <b>Submitter questioned the use of the word "significant" and whether this word adds value to their land.</b></li> <li>• <b>Submitter questioned who benefits from a Significant Natural Area</b></li> <li>• <b>Council appears to be penalising farmers who early on decided to keep the bush on their property rather than applying for a subsidy from the government to remove it.</b></li> <li>• <b>Patches of bush are useful as shelter for stock in rough and hot weather, and are a source of firewood or building materials.</b></li> <li>• <b>There are risks, as in all businesses, in choosing the right use for the land in question. How to utilise the resource so it is beneficial to the landowner and his family, as well as to the land, so that with minimal inputs it will continue to produce a stable income and be around for future generations to have a go.</b></li> <li>• <b>Forestry requires waiting 25 years or more to generate income after harvest which is not an incentive.</b></li> <li>• <b>There is no mention of who or what will benefit from these proposals. It does not appear to benefit the landowner, whose income is dependent on utilising the land to its maximum economic potential. To affect economic potential and restrict income does not benefit the country. Questions why have all these rules and regulations if nobody benefits.</b></li> </ul>		
<b>Point Number</b>	268.5		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete the Significant Amenity Landscape from property number 1003679. The submitter suggested leasing the amenity landscapes.</b>		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No wish to have this designation on the property.</li> <li>• <b>Leasing the amenity landscapes would stop them from changing and help protect them</b></li> <li>• <b>The rules are naive and ill-informed.</b></li> </ul>		

---

**Point Number** 268.6

**Summary of Decision Requested:** Delete the walkway/ cycleway / bridleway from property number 1003679 until proper consultation and benefits have been discussed and terms agreed to. The submission suggests a lease option and/or transferable title per kilometre of track.

**Decision Reasons:**

- The submitter has not been provided with any or enough information regarding this proposal
- Apart from a line on a map, there is no information at all.

---

**Point Number** 268.7

**Summary of Decision Requested:** Delete Rule 22.2.8 PI (a)(ii) Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area.

**Decision Reasons:**

- A total of 1000m<sup>2</sup> seems overly restrictive and could result in the land outside a Significant Natural Area being incapable of reasonable use as persistent invasive weeds (such as manuka, totara and tutu) encroach on pasture.
  - It is not clear what "outside a Significant Natural Area" means and questions is it theb whole farm or some defined area adjacent to the Significant Natural Area
  - Questioned how the Waikato District Council can see to place restrictions on what can be done on the submitter's land beyond the specific Significant Natural Area
  - No benefit economically and is likely to cause undue financial hardship
  - Considers it theft when a plan, objective, policy or rule is out to remove the rights of ownership, or right of use as the landowner sees fit
  - Does not believe the NZ Government promotes theft
  - Uncertain who benefits from these designations
  - Seeks to pursue a course of action through the NZ Police if the designations remain on the submitter's property due to restricting use of the property as a place of business and potentially lowering its value.
-