

Mackenzie District Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 3

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

SID:	Submitter	RID	S/O	Request	Reason
1	Rosemary Anderson	1	O	Have no further development in Village Centre 1 and 2.	It is senseless to create an environmental city cityscape ribbon development in such a beautiful place.
		2		Look at the feasibility of developing commercial activity away from the Lakeshore and south/west of present area.	Why does the Council not consider moving the commercial activities to the an area like the sale yards.
2	A.W Design	1	O	VC 1 shall include all of the existing village centre from Godley Hotel in the east to Tekapo Hotel in the west. Also the new area as it extends from the existing village towards the squash courts. (Refer attached plan)	We support the creation of the two individual zones.
		2		Extend VC 1 zone area over the access road and along to the junction of Special Tourist Accommodation Zone and Building restriction area. (Refer attached plan)	We do not support the present layout of the zones within the existing Village centre being VC1 and the proposed extension of the west being VC 2 zone.
		3		Building height shall be 12 metres in the VC 1 zone.	The zone changes create far too much control and regulation over the design and planning of potential buildings and infrastructure.
		4		VC 2 zone shall include the area of existing domain along the entire frontage of the existing and proposed Village Centre 1 zone. (Refer attached plan)	There are adequate controls on design and appearance within the existing District Plan.
		5		Building height shall be 8 metres in the VC 2 zone.	
		6		Spatial corridors created by outdoor areas and accessways to be preserved along with more definition on the extent of other viewing corridors and the like.	

Mackenzie District Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 3

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

		7		Traffic corridor between VC 1 and VC 2 shall be 10 metres minimum (No parking areas) plus a minimum of 5m setback to building in which this area shall be predominantly landscaping.	
		8		Extend Village Centre zone past squash courts along the lake front to existing building restriction zone. (Refer attached plan)	
3	John Bain			If Zone 1 change goes ahead, I would prefer the existing landlord has first option to buy the land	<p>Business and customers will be lost from the Lake Tekapo Tavern and Reflections Restaurant if all customers can look out on is more buildings rather than lake views.</p> <p>The Lake Tekapo Tavern and Reflections Restaurant have a view protection in the current lease.</p>
4	Brian Banks	1	O	To make the whole Village Centre VC 1 zone.	The total area would best suit VC 1 to allow for future development, which complies with VC 1 zoning. To make an adjacent area VC 2 is not making provision for long term growth of a village shopping area.
5	Brian Banks	1	O	Not to use the domain area for shops, accommodation. Leave all the area north of the shops as domain.	<p>Any movement of the VC north boundary is against all views of earlier public meetings.</p> <p>The domain must remain Rec A.</p> <p>The 60 metre strip is an infringement on this area and is contrary to public and tourist views.</p>

Mackenzie District Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 3

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

6	Dearwin and Lloyd Bonniface	1	O	VC 1 Architecturally it would be maintain the fingered concept which is currently in place, rather than long block with access road running through the centre.	This keeps the area open to the lake and the sunshine which is very important in the winter months. This concept lends itself to outdoor living for cafes and restaurants.
		2		VC 2 One building only to be built to the maximum height stipulated, which incorporates shops and accommodation for more green area.	Concerns over more than one high rise building with proposed see through areas. This would have the potential to darken and cheapen the outlook. Questions whether there would sufficient parking.
7	Anne and Gottlieb Braun-Elwert	1	O	The deletion of the vertical emphasis regarding windows in the design guidelines.	The vertical component of windows is misplaced in the Mackenzie Country. The Church of the Good Shepherd and Kohan Restaurant both have more horizontal windows allowing views to take in the expansive panoramas across the lake.
8	Rosemary and Grant Brown	1	O	Decrease the maximum height to 4 metres.	To prevent existing buildings expanding upwards.
		2		Retain to domain in its current definition.	The domain should not be sold or developed as it is a wonderful asset and is used daily. It should be kept in its entirety for future generations to use and enjoy as a recreational facility.
9	William Callow	1	O	Readdress the encroachment of the domain.	Too much of the domain will be encroached on by the VC 1.

Mackenzie District Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 3

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

		2		Readdress height restrictions should be lowered to single storey.	The height restriction is too high.
10	Canterbury Regional Council	1	S	The changes as proposed should be incorporated into the Mackenzie District Plan.	The amended are broadly consistent with the Lake Tekapo Development Plan, a non-statutory document that is the product of extensive community consultation. Provide greater certainty and direction of nature and scale of anticipated development.
11	Maryrose Fowlie	1	O	Keep the maximum building height to 8m.	Tall buildings would intrude into the flat nature of the village. Buildings should be built to fit into the landscape and dominate it. 12.5m building would block views and the viewing corridors would create wind tunnels.
12	Lynne, Nigel, Kate Emily and Amy Frost	1	O	No building on the area north of the walkway and shops around the domain that are already in place.	This area should be kept natural as it cannot be gained back once it is built on.
		2		Keep the whole area Open Space Heritage.	Do not want to end up like Queenstown or Wanaka.
				If the zone change goes ahead the following changes should occur: The maximum building height should be 4 metres and there should be viewing corridors every 5 metres	
13	Brian Gardner	1	O	The area in question should be developed for recreational area.	Real estate developers coming to town should fund this process. The Council should look at the sale yards for low rise development.

Mackenzie District Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 3

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

14	C Hockley	1	O	Keep Tekapo as it is. Do not spoil it by buildings so-called village-centre with shops, cafes and so on.	Landscape and scenery is what tourists come here for. It would be an irreversible mistake to spoil this by building a village-centre. Do not want another buzzing shopping town.
15	Charles Hunt	1	O	No buildings of any description between the existing commercial buildings and the lake. This area should only be landscaped.	We would like to maintain our space and beautiful views, not sacrifice them for one-night and one-in-a-lifetime visitors.
16	Stephen Hunter	1	O	Maximum building height should be 8 metres.	The ugliest parts of town in Queenstown and Wanaka are where the buildings are higher than 2 storey. These are the gettos of otherwise attractive tourist towns. Do not want Tekapo filled with high-rise buildings like this.
17	Lorna Inch	1	O	Do not realign VC Zone boundary	Do not support another row of buildings on the north side of the existing footpath.
		2		Rezone all of Town Centre as VC 1.	All new visitor accommodation should be along Lakeside Drive.
		3		The land currently used as Police/Post Office etc should be used for shops and restaurants.	This would mean the waterfront land could remain as Rec P or Rec A.
18	Russell Jeffries	1	O	That Council retains the status quo with the existing Green Area remaining.	The clean, green, alpine vistas are what people come to Tekapo for. It would be a backward step for the town to adopt this proposal.
19	Penelop Kay	1	O	Keep all of the village zoned VC 1.	VC 2 restricts future growth of the commercial sector.
		2		Maximum building height should be 8 metres	There is no reason to have heavily built up area in the heart of such a small town.
		3		Reduce the VC 1 area proposed to be taken from	60 metres encroaches into the Domain area

Mackenzie District Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 3

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

				the domain area from 60 metres to 20-30 metres.	too much.
		4		Have quadrangles instead of viewing corridors.	2-3 metre viewing corridors will not be good for anything. Areas of space like the quadrangles outside the Observatory Caf are more useful and used often by locals and visitors
20	Lake Tekapo Community Board	1	S	Buildings should have a 10 metres setback from the northern boundary of VC 1 and VC 2.	This will provide both room for outside dining and provide for landscaping to blend the zone into the domain.
		2		The village-green between Air Safaris office and the toilets through to the domain should be retained and extended through the new VC zone. This corridor should also be flared at the northern boundary.	The wide user-friendly viewing corridors are important.
		3		At least 2 smaller, reasonably sized viewing corridors should be included in any development plan, east and west of the current village-green corridor.	
		4		The maximum building height in the VC 1 zone should be 8 metres.	The current alpine small village character of Tekapo will be lost if the 12.5 metre building height is permitted, and will also impact on the views of buildings located on the south side of SH 8.
		5		VC 2 should permit accommodation and retail.	Concern that the development of this block into predominantly tourist accommodation may be shortsighted when viewed against the potential growth of the town and the demand for a business/retail centre.

Mackenzie District Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 3

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

		6		That consideration should be given to the relocation of the petrol station.	The southeast corner of the VC 2 block may be a suitable site in the medium term for a petrol station.
21	Lake Tekapo Enterprises Limited	1	O	The maximum building height should remain 8 metres.	The 12.5 metre height is too high.
		2		Area A is removed from the Village Centre zone.	The village should not extend further to the north than the current zone. It will negatively impact esthetic values including view shafts.
		3		Area A be included as Rec A area.	Increasing development into this area would negatively impact on community events.
22	Peter and Gillian Maxwell	1	O	The maximum building height should remain 8 metres in Area A and 10.5 metres in Area B.	The 12.5 metre proposed height could have adverse effects on views from existing property owners on the top of the south bank of SH8 and the new Blue Water development. Could also create ice problems from shadowing.
		2		That a 10 metre building setback be created from the northern boundary.	This area is ideally suited for cafes and restaurants. The setback would allow for outdoor dining areas and landscaping.
23	Zilla McCready	1	O	Rezone all area marked VC 1, Area A to Rec P. If development of Area A unavailable then it should be limited to a depth of 30m, one storey only with low pitch roof lines, No accommodation, maximum height of 4m and high proportion of open space.	Oppose any development of any sort in the VC 1, Area A. The area between the village and the church and lake is a truly unique feature of Tekapo Village and this must be protected. Increased lighting from development in this area would affect the operation of the Observatory.

Mackenzie District Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 3

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

24	Zilla McCready	1	O	That a maximum building height in the VC 2, Area A should be 8 metre.	New constructions should be low level as possible to minimise impacting on the unique visas.
25	Michael Midgley	1	O	Investigate re-siting SH8 and building town centre on existing SH8 rather than in front of the buildings that are there already.	Development in front of the existing shops, motels and restaurants will block off all views they were built for.
		2		The maximum building height be two storey only.	
26	Jennifer Mitchell	1	O	Not to realign the Village Centre Boundary.	Object to any buildings on existing green areas as this was agreed at previous meetings.
		2		Not allow buildings to be built in front of existing buildings.	
		3		Not allow more tourist accommodation in VC 1.	Tourist accommodation should be built in VC 2.
		4		Not to use any of the existing green area for building.	We need the area between the shops and the lake for recreational purposes.
		5		Not to build out any existing vistas	The VC 1 should be single storey only.
27	Claire and Alan Munro	1	O	That the Council look at the sale yard area and develop this a business area.	The large area proposed could be an over supply of business and retail areas empty shops are not a good look.
		2		Area A should remain as it, maintained and landscaped.	Keep the open space.
		3		The Domain Area should be retained as Recreational P.	
		4		Buildings should not be more than single storey.	
28	Margaret Munro	1	O	A maximum of 10 metres extension into the reserve.	The village green is a special area and needs to be preserved.
		2		Keep the height restriction in both Village Centre zones to 8 metres.	The high restriction change from 8m-12.5m is unneeded. It will effect present dwellings, view from the road for visitors. The east

Mackenzie District Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 3

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

					entrance view needs to be preserved.
29	Peter Munro	1	O	Reduce the 60 metre extension in the Village Centre zone onto the reserve to 10 metres or less.	This still allows for plenty of development. This area need to be preserved.
		2		Maintain status quo for height restriction of buildings to 8 metres in both VC 1 and VC 2.	Residents and ratepayers have purchased land knowing the present height restrictions. The proposed height increase will change the view potential of existing house and land owners.
30	Jim and Anne Murray	1	S	That the implementation of the increase of the VC 1 zone by the proposed 60 metres into the Rec A area.	<p>A straight boundary is more practical for aligning commercial/retail buildings and recreational activities such as playing fields.</p> <p>Increasing the VC 1 area allow for expansion and retention of the village commercial area in that one area.</p> <p>A small reduction in size of the domain is more conducive to pedestrians as a large open space can be intimidating.</p> <p>Important to keep the village centre centered.</p> <p>Extension allows for commercial property owners scope to facilitate viewing corridors.</p>
31	Jim and Anne Murray	1	O	Remove section (b) from standard 1.4.3.	For commercial reasons, a shop must have a maximum internal display area. If a shop was on the corner, 75% of two walls is far too much window space and too architecturally restrictive.

Mackenzie District Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 3

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

32	Erin Norman	1	O	That no more domain areas are encroached in future.	Query how area will be serviced and where will parking be provided.
				The 60 metre strip should be available for everyone to apply for, not just current land owners/business people.	
33	Denise Patterson	1	O	Designate the area known as the domain a no touch area, never to be built on.	The domain should be set aside for future generations.
		2		That the YHA remain in situ	The YHA is in compliance.
		3		Restrict all commercial and travellers accommodation to 8m building height.	There is no valid reason is have more than 2 storey in Tekapo.
		4		Lake views should be unrestricted, not limited to glimpses through viewing corridors.	Viewing corridors are tokenism. The Lake has immense natural beauty and should be seen in its entirety.
34	Biddy Satterthwaite	1	O	Single storey buildings are preferable.	Against any building along the foreshore going higher than 8 metres. Single storey is preferable to maintain vistas.
		2		The domain should not be developed for shops or sold.	Long term residents have always assumed that the reserve and area in front of shops should not be encroached upon. It would destroy the foreshore of Lake Tekapo.
35	Ian Satterthwaite	1	O	There should be no commercial development Lakeside of the present walkway and should not be sold.	Some things must not change.
		2		No further increase in building height, restrict to one storey only in VC 1.	Roto Place residents wish to retain their view.
		3		Commercial development should be on the south side of SH8.	All efforts should go into getting rid of SH8 from the Village Centre. This is urgent.
		4		Turn heavy traffic away from the Lakeside	

Mackenzie District Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 3

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

		5		No signage above roof tops.	
		6		Sale yards should be developed for commercial centre.	
		7		V.C 2 proceed as planned.	
36	Bruce and Elizabeth Scott	1	O	Alter Village Centre Zone back to Boulevard	The land north of boulevard is the centre piece of Tekapo and should not be sold off for short term gain.
		2		Keep buildings to single (5m) below Highway.	Opposed to anything over single storey. Travellers along the state highway must be able to look over and up the Lake.
37	D Scott	1	S	Building guidelines to include adequate coarse texture to footpaths adequate self draining of footpaths.	This will prevent ice conditions, especially with shading from tall buildings. Will reduce potential risks to pedestrians.
38	Amanda Simpson	1	O	Maximum height of buildings in town centre be 8 metres.	
		2		Retain open space near the lake.	Oppose the extend of recreation land being absorbed into the village town centre. Do not let Tekapo follow the same path as other tourist towns.
39	Maisie Simpson	1	O	Building height be restricted to 8 metres.	12.5m height for Area B is too high.
				Area A be rezoned Rec P.	
40	Kath Smith	1	O	Keep green area as it is recreational.	Would hate to see a rabbit warren if shops repeated on the other side of the existing shops.
		2		50 kph speed restriction from bridge through shop area to the pub.	There are a lot of traffic pulling out in their area and would be safer.
41	Transit New Zealand	1	O	That Policy (c) be deleted and the following	Transit considers that redevelopment or expansion of the Village Centre needs to

Mackenzie District Plan
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 3

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

			<p>policy inserted</p> <p><i>To recognise and protect the primary function of SH8, as a strategic through-route, while also recognising that the secondary function of SH8 is to provide access to the Lake Tekapo Village Centre and must be managed appropriately.</i></p>	<p>ensure that there will be no adverse effects on the state highway and its through function. The state highways function as a through route must be recognised, maintained and protected.</p>
		2	Delete Lake Tekapo Village Centre Policy (i)	This policy appears to be inconsistent with other parts of the Plan where Implementation Methods are provided.
		3	Insert Implementation Methods that state how the new Lake Tekapo Village Centre Policies will be achieved.	
		4	<p>Insert a new assessment matter to ensure that appropriate internal service road requirements for the Village Centre Zone in Lake Tekapo are considered as follows</p> <p><i>Whether provision has been made for an internal service road associated with new development in the Village Centre 1 or 2 Zones of Lake Tekapo which will not preclude access to other new development within the zones.</i></p>	Internal road access should be identified prior to the development of the new park of the village centre rather than on an ad hoc basis as development occurs.
		5	<p>Amend Rule 1.3.2 as follows</p> <p><i>Extensions to premises as at 1 June 2004 providing the extensions meet the standards for permitted activities in clause 1.4.3 below and do</i></p>	There is potential for the rule to be misinterpreted and for existing premises to continue to be repeatedly extended by up to 15% as a permitted activity.

Mackenzie District Plan
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 3

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

			<i>not increase the existing premise (as at 1 June 2004) by more than 15%."</i>	
		6	<p>Insert the following new policy in the Lake Tekapo Village Centre Policies</p> <p><i>To require provision of parking to meet the demand generated by new activities or redevelopment or expansion of existing facilities, prior to the activity or development commencing operation.</i></p>	Transit is concerned that consent for a new development may be granted with a cash payment made in lieu of parking prior to the actual physical car parks required being constructed and available for use.
		7	<p>Delete Rule 1.4.3j and replace with the following</p> <p><i>Parking Shall be provided for activities in the Village Centre 1 and 2 Zones in accordance with Table 1 of Transportation Rule 2d. A cash payment in lieu of parking, made in accordance with Transportation Rule 2e, will only be accepted by the Council if the required car parking spaces are already available in existing public car parks.</i></p>	<p>Transit is concerned that the amount of parking provided will be insufficient for the level of development proposed within the village centre, particularly given the types of parking requirements of Lake Tekapo including, boats, caravans, trailers, camper vans, buses, tour coaches.</p> <p>It is important that sufficient internal parking and access provisions are provided to ensure that a desire to park on the highway is not created.</p>
		8	<p>Amend Section 1.7 Non-Notified Activities as follows:</p> <p>Resource consents in relation to the following matter shall not need to be publicly notified:</p>	Transit considers that it needs to be made clear to the Plan users that affected party approvals will still be required and if these cannot be obtained then limited notification will occur.

Mackenzie District Plan
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 3

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

				<p><i>Restricted Discretionary Activities 1.4.1 and 1.4.2</i></p> <p><i>However, written approval will be required from all persons, who in the opinion of the consent authority, may be adversely affected by the activity. If this written approval cannot be obtained, then notification will occur pursuant to section 94(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991.</i></p>	
42	John and Lynda van Beek	1	O	Area A should not be development.	Do not destroy the small town atmosphere of Lake Tekapo.
		2		High rise buildings should not be allowed in Area B 5m maximum height.	Wonderful views will be destroyed if high rises are developed.
		3		Shell Service station should be relocated and free up the area where Shell is for shops/restaurants.	The Lake is a big place spread out low rise if needed.
43	Wilhelmina van den Bosch	1	O	Reduce rezoning area to 30m strip.	
		2		Reduce building height limit to one storey.	
44	Mary-Anne Williamson	1	O	That the building height in VC 1 zone remain as status quo.	Concerns that the viewing corridor will be further obstructed if height is increased.
45	Craig Willis	1 2		<p>Either reduce the land to be available on the domain to 30 metres with a 10 metres no build zone in front (lakeside)</p> <p>or</p> <p>Adopt VC 2 but lower the building height to 8 metres and make no changes to the current VC 1.</p>	<p>The full usage of the domain is against the view of the Visions document of Tekapo.</p> <p>The 12.5 me height will affect the view of established properties.</p>

Mackenzie District Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 3

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

46	Wilsons Mill Limited	1	O	The maximum height in the VC 2 zone, Area B, not exceed 5 metres.	Bluewater Resort has planned and relying on existing height restrictions and views to the Lake.
		2		That the VC 2 be changed to Rec P and that no buildings be permitted.	
		3		That landscaping and planting be compatible with the Mackenzie Theme	
		4		That Visitor Accommodation be deleted from Restricted Discretionary Activities Commercial Activities.	There is no need to cater for commercial activities in the VC 2 zone as it is well catered for in the Tourist and Residential 2 Zone and STAZ zones cater for future visitor accommodation.
		5		That retail sales be removed from Restricted Discretionary Activities Commercial Activities	
		6		VC 2 area should be rezoned Passive Recreational Reserve	Preserving forever the views of the Lake. The proposed VC 1 can cater for the commercial needs.
47	Lake Tekapo Scenic Resort (DI and CM Young)	1	O	That development beyond Area B of VC 1 and VC 2 be restricted to landscaping and passive recreation.	The loss of a 60 metres from the domain will greatly reduce the open space and views that is Lake Tekapos attraction.
				If the above is not accepted the following changes should be made: (i) Building height restriction in Area A of VC 1 and VC 2 be 5 metres. (ii) Building density in Area A of VC 1 and VC 2	The seasonal nature of Lake Tekapo means that for long periods many existing facilities area under-utilised and therefore questions the need for additional commercial area. The 12.5 metres height restriction will obscure views.

Mackenzie District Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 3

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmnt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

				<p>be 20% and landscaped to preserve spaciousness.</p> <p>(iii) Viewing corridors to be a minimum of 30 metres, with consideration for existing businesses.</p> <p>(iv) Building height restriction of 8 metres for Area B of VC 1 and VC 2</p> <p>(v) The issue of building consents to be dependent of signed tenancy agreements for all proposed buildings.</p>	
48	Zamtek Trust Ltd, Zambhala Holdings Ltd, Golden Bell Investments Ltd, Beverly Dianne Ferguson, Baron Hotels and Resorts Ltd.	1	S	Confirm Plan Change 3 as proposed.	The proposed plan change constitutes sustainable management of resources. Will enable the development of an enlarged village centre.
49	Emma Collins and Paul Thompson	1	O	Keep the domain area.	Too much in NZ is being developed.
50	Trisha and Len Simpson	1	O	By all means grow your village if that is needed but do it sensitively in a way that does not destroy the domain.	Do not change the natural amenity of the domain.
51	Judy Merchant	1	O	Do not develop in front of the village.	Do not destroy your environment for the mighty dollar.
52	Mary Buscombe	1	O	It would be a disgrace to destroy the natural eco nature of the foreshore of this beautiful lake.	
53	Patricia Rudkin	1	O	Leave Lake Tekapo as it is.	Over development will lead to over commercialization which will ruin the

Mackenzie District Plan
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 3

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

					ambiance of this beautiful area.
54	D and Y.B Wickham	1	O	Do not develop the foreshore.	The 60 metre reserve is an integral part of the view and this are should not be developed.
55	Weyland	1	O	By all means extend local facilities but do not crowd out.	It would be extremely unfair for businesses to build in front of them [scenic resort]
56	Karen Eberhardt	1	O	Do not allow commercial development close to the shore.	Do not destroy you beautiful lake for money.