



WAIRARAPA COMBINED DISTRICT PLAN JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING

Agenda for the Meeting to be held in
the Hurunui o Rangi Meeting Room,
50 Holloway Street, Carterton

THURSDAY 14 March 2024 at 10.00am

MEMBERSHIP

David McMahon (Chairperson, Independent Commissioner)

Cr Craig Bowyer (MDC)

Frazer Mailman (MDC)

Cr Brian Deller (CDC)

Cr Robyn Cherry-Campbell (CDC)

Cr Alistair Plimmer (SWDC)

Brian Jephson (SWDC)

Rangitāne o Wairarapa Representative

Ngāti Kahungunu Representative

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES
2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST (MEMBERS TO DECLARE CONFLICTS, IF ANY) Pages 1-7
 - Conflict of Interests Register is attached
3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING - 5 OCTOBER 2023 Pages 8-10
4. ACCEPTANCE OF LATE SUBMISSIONS AND APPROVAL OF SUMMARY OF DECISIONS REQUESTED ON PROPOSED WAIRARAPA COMBINED DISTRICT PLAN Pages 11-952
5. APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY CHAIR Pages 953-956

1

Wairarapa Combined District Plan Review - Conflict of Interest Register of the Wairarapa Combined District Plan Review Joint Committee Members – As at 14 March 2024

Conflicts of interest exist when a person's duties or responsibilities to Council could be, or could be perceived to be, affected by some other separate interest or duty.

Conflicts of interest can arise from a wide range of circumstances including but not limited to:

- Being an advisor, director, partner, trustee, or beneficiary of another business or organisation;
- Being a member of a club, society, or association;
- Holding or expressing strong political or personal views that might indicate prejudice or predetermination for or against a person or issue;
- Being a close friend or relative of someone who holds these interests (or who could otherwise be personally affected by a decision of the Council).

The register below is a record of potential conflicts of interest and the mitigation measures for managing this conflict or record of no conflict.

| Committee Member | Potential Conflict | Discussion | Mitigation/Outcome |
|-----------------------------|--|---|---|
| Brian Jephson | Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori – Chapter, Schedule and Mapping | A property owner where a Site/Area of Significance to Māori has been identified on this property. | Brian will not participate in any discussions or hearings relating to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Chapter, Schedule or Mapping. |
| Brian Jephson | Coastal Environment and General Rural Zone | A property owner (Palliser Bay Farming Ltd – pastoral farming) where land is within the Coastal Environment and General Rural Zone identified in the District Plan. | Interest noted. No further action required as the Coastal Environment provisions and General Rural Zone provisions apply district-wide with no location specific provisions or specifically identified areas. |
| Brian Jephson | Various provisions | Memberships: Martinborough Golf Club Ngawi Ratepayers Assn | If the Martinborough Golf Club or the Ngawi Ratepayers Assn make a submission, Brian will not participate in hearing or deliberating on submissions on matters raised in this submission. |
| Councillor Alistair Plimmer | General Rural Zone | Owner of a family property in the South Wairarapa located in the General Rural Zone. | Interest noted. No further action required as the General Rural Zone provisions apply district- |

2

| Committee Member | Potential Conflict | Discussion | Mitigation/Outcome |
|-----------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | wide with no location specific provisions or specifically identified areas. |
| Councillor Alistair Plimmer | General Residential Zone, General Rural Zone and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | Chair of Board of Trustees for St Matthews School. Includes link with Trinity Schools and Rathkeale College. | Interest noted. No further action required as the General Residential Zone and General Rural Zone provisions apply district-wide with no location specific provisions or specifically identified areas. Regarding the Site and Area of Significance to Māori, if Rathkeale College make a submission, Alistair will not participate in hearing or deliberating on submissions on matters raised in this submission. |
| Councillor Alistair Plimmer | Various provisions | District Licensing Committee – Chair of South Wairarapa DLC, Wairarapa list member | If the DLC make a submission, Alistair will not participate in hearing or deliberating on submissions on matters raised in this submission. |
| Councillor Alistair Plimmer | Various provisions | Shareholdings - Fisher and Paykel Healthcare; Infratil Ltd; Mercury NZ Ltd; Smartshare group NZ Top 50 (actual companies unknown); International shares - BHP Group Ltd; Westpac Banking Group | Interest noted. If any of these companies make a submission, Alistair will not participate in hearing or deliberating on submissions on matters raised in this submission. |
| Jo Hayes | Rangitane Tu Mai Ra Trust PSGE (RTMRT) | Custodian Trustee of RTMRT the post settlement governance entity for Rangitane Iwi Wairarapa and Tamaki Nui A Rua. Through its Deed of Settlement the Trust received a number of land areas identified in the Deed in the Wairarapa and Tararua Regions including sites of | If RTMRT make a submission, Jo will not participate in hearing or deliberating on submissions on matters raised in this submission. |

3

| Committee Member | Potential Conflict | Discussion | Mitigation/Outcome |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | significance of which most have been declared and published. | |
| Jo Hayes | Various provisions | Membership: Wairarapa Chamber of Commerce | If the Wairarapa Chamber make a submission, Jo will not participate in hearing or deliberating on submissions on matters raised in this submission. |
| Councillor Craig Bowyer | General Residential Zone | Owner of two residential properties in urban Masterton | Interest noted. No further action required as the General Residential Zone provisions apply district-wide with no location specific provisions or specifically identified areas. |
| Councillor Craig Bowyer | Various provisions | Memberships: Automobile Association Wairarapa | Interest noted. If AA Wairarapa Chamber make a submission, Craig will not participate in hearing or deliberating on submissions on matters raised in this submission. |
| Councillor Craig Bowyer | Hood Aerodrome provisions, including Air Noise Boundaries | Owner of a hangar at Hood Aerodrome, Masterton | Interest noted. If any submissions made in relation to Hood Aerodrome, Craig will not participate in hearing or deliberating on submissions on matters raised in this submission. |
| Councillor Craig Bowyer | Various provisions | Masterton District Licensing Committee Deputy Chair and Wairarapa List Member | If the DLC make a submission, Craig will not participate in hearing or deliberating on submissions on matters raised in this submission. |
| Frazer Mailman | Change of Zone (Rural to Urban) | Friends with a landowner who wants to subdivide | Interest noted. If the landowner makes a submission, Frazer will not participate in hearing or deliberating on submissions on matters raised in this submission. |
| Frazer Mailman | Various provisions | District Licensing Committee – Chair of Masterton DLC, Wairarapa list member | If the DLC make a submission, Frazer will not participate in hearing or deliberating on submissions on matters raised in this submission. |

4

| Committee Member | Potential Conflict | Discussion | Mitigation/Outcome |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| Frazer Mailman | Various provisions | Memberships: Mahunga Golf Club, Masterton Masterton Racing Club | If the Mahunga Golf Club, or Masterton Racing Club, make a submission, Frazer will not participate in hearing or deliberating on submissions on matters raised in this submission. |
| Frazer Mailman | Various provisions | Other memberships Wairarapa Road Safety Council, Board member Interim Chair Netball Wairarapa | If the Wairarapa Road Safety Council, or Netball Wairarapa, make a submission, Frazer will not participate in hearing or deliberating on submissions on matters raised in this submission. |
| Frazer Mailman | General Residential Zone | Residential property owner in Masterton | Interest noted. No further action required as the General Residential Zone provisions apply district-wide with no location specific provisions or specifically identified areas. |
| Councillor Robyn Cherry Campbell | General Residential Zone | Property owner in Carterton | Interest noted. No further action required as the General Residential Zone provisions apply district-wide with no location specific provisions or specifically identified areas. |
| Councillor Robyn Cherry Campbell | Various provisions | Chair Life Ed Trust Wairarapa, Tararua & Central Hawkes Bay | If the Life Ed Trust Wairarapa, make a submission, Robyn will not participate in hearing or deliberating on submissions on matters raised in this submission. |
| Councillor Robyn Cherry Campbell | Various provisions | Committee member, Wairarapa Wahine Toa Rugby Club Inc | If the Wairarapa Wahine Toa Rugby Club, make a submission, Robyn will not participate in hearing or deliberating on submissions on matters raised in this submission. |
| Councillor Robyn Cherry Campbell | Various provision | Board Member Wairarapa Bush Rugby Football Union | If the Wairarapa Bush Rugby Football Union, make a submission, Robyn will not participate in hearing or deliberating on submissions on matters raised in this submission. |
| Councillor Robyn Cherry Campbell | Various provisions | Board Member, Rotary Club of Carterton | If the Rotary Club of Carterton, make a submission, Robyn will not participate in |

5

| Committee Member | Potential Conflict | Discussion | Mitigation/Outcome |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | hearing or deliberating on submissions on matters raised in this submission. |
| Councillor Robyn Cherry Campbell | Various provisions | Shareholdings – Port of Tauranga; Smartpay | Interest noted. If any of these companies make a submission, Robyn will not participate in hearing or deliberating on submissions on matters raised in this submission. |
| Councillor Brian Deller | General Rural Zone | Property Owner – Lifestyle block Carterton | Interest noted. No further action required as the General Rural Zone provisions apply district-wide with no location specific provisions or specifically identified areas. |
| Councillor Brian Deller | Settlement Zone | Property Owner - Ngawi | Interest noted. No further action required as the Settlement Zone provisions apply district-wide with no location specific provisions or specifically identified areas. |
| Councillor Brian Deller | Various provisions | Memberships: Ngawi Sports Fishing Club Ngawi Ratepayers and Residents Association Carterton Lions Club (Past President) | If the any of these clubs or associations make a submission, Brian will not participate in hearing or deliberating on submissions on matters raised in this submission. |
| Councillor Brian Deller | Various provisions | Wairarapa District Licensing Committee List Member | If the DLC make a submission, Brian will not participate in hearing or deliberating on submissions on matters raised in this submission. |
| David McMahon | No property ownership within the Wairarapa region | NA | NA |
| David McMahon | District wide | David is on the register of independent RMA commissioners for WDC, MDC and SWDC and GWRC on plans, plan changes, resource consents and designations. Previous examples – | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No specific upcoming appointments 2. Will screen/manage future appointments during Combined plan submission , hearings and deliberations to ensure to ensure no perceived conflicts. |

6

| Committee Member | Potential Conflict | Discussion | Mitigation/Outcome |
|------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Martinborough and Greytown wastewater consents from GWRC, Private Plan 1 for MDC (Welhom Developments Limited retirement village) • March 2023, GWRC NRRP hearings 2016 -18) | |
| David McMahon | District wide | David's firm (RMG) has clients who have previously, and may from time to time in the future, seek consents from MDC, CDC and SWDC e.g. NPD Ltd, SoHo Group . | No specific projects of relevance. Any such future projects during the plan hearing process will be recorded on the register and an appropriate strategy adopted including no involvement in relevant Plan deliberations and decision making. |
| Kereana Sims | General Rural Zone | Owner of a family property in the South Wairarapa located in the General Rural Zone. | Interest noted. No further action required as the General Rural Zone provisions apply district-wide with no location specific provisions or specifically identified areas. |
| Kereana Sims | Māori Purpose Zone | Shareholder in a number of Ahu Whenua trusts in the districts of Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa - some the trust land is in the proposed Māori Purpose zone. | If any submissions are made by any of these Ahu Whenua Trusts, Kereana will not participate in hearing or deliberating on submissions on matters raised in these submissions. |

| Committee Member | Potential Conflict | Discussion | Mitigation/Outcome |
|------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| Kereana Sims | General Residential Zone | Residential property owner in Masterton | Interest noted. No further action required as the General Residential Zone provisions apply district-wide with no location specific provisions or specifically identified areas. |
| Kereana Sims | General Rural Zone | Property owner Lifestyle block in Masterton | Interest noted. No further action required as the General Rural Zone provisions apply district-wide with no location specific provisions or specifically identified areas. |

WAIRARAPA COMBINED DISTRICT PLAN JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD AT THE HURUNUI O RANGI MEETING ROOM, CARTERTON DISTRICT COUNCIL, ON
THURSDAY 5 OCTOBER 2023 AT 10.00am

PRESENT

David McMahon (Chair), Councillors Craig Bowyer (MDC), Robyn Cherry-Campbell (CDC), Brian Deller (CDC), Alistair Plimmer (SWDC)(by Teams) and Brian Jephson (SWDC), Frazer Mailman (MDC) and Ngati Kahungunu iwi representative Ra Smith.

IN ATTENDANCE

South Wairarapa District Council: Planning Manager (Kendyll Hammond), Group Manager Planning and Environment (Russell O'Leary),

Carterton District Council: Planner (Becca Adams)

Masterton District Council: Planning and Consents Manager (Christine Chong), Planner (Alice Falloon), Consultant Planner (Sue Southey) Cat White (Communications Advisor)

Boffa Miskell: Hamish Wesley, on Teams - Alia Cederman, Charles Horrell, Sinead Lynch, and Erica Wheatley.

APOLOGIES

The Chair advised that he had received an apology from iwi representative Jo Hayes.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The Register of Interests was provided. No additions were recorded.

The Chair noted that the item would be a standing item on the agenda for all subsequent meetings.

APPROVAL OF PROPOSED WAIRARAPA COMBINED DISTRICT PLAN FOR PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

The report seeking Joint Committee approval to publicly notify the Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan (the Proposed District Plan)(see Attachment 1) under Clause 5 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 ('RMA' or 'the Act') was presented by the Masterton District Council Planning and Consents Manager.

The input of Sue Southey in the process was acknowledged.

Members discussed the report and thanked council staff and Boffa Miskell for producing a clear, readable and user-friendly Plan.

Members also acknowledged the Chair for his knowledge and experience throughout the process.

The Chair gave a statement – he believed that the Plan was fit for purpose as it met the national planning standards and recognised the direction the government had set in various policy statements. There had been robust analysis as outlined in the Section 32 reports and robust consultation through a number of forums, including stakeholder involvement and the draft plan submission process, the feedback from which had informed and changed the provisions in the Plan. He felt that the Committee could endorse the Plan with confidence and noted that the next step in the process was generous in terms of the timeframes allowed for the wider public to provide feedback.

Moved Frazer Mailman

Seconded by Brian Jephson

That the Joint Committee:

- 1) Receives the information.**

CARRIED

Moved Councillor Craig Bowyer

Seconded Councillor Robyn Cherry-Campbell

That the Joint Committee

- 2) Approves the Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan (the Proposed District Plan) (Attachment 1) for public notification pursuant to Clause 5 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.**

CARRIED

Moved Councillor Brian Deller

Seconded Frazer Mailman

That the Joint Committee

- 3) Endorses the content of the Section 32 Evaluation Reports (Attachment 2) for the Proposed District Plan.**

CARRIED

Moved Councillor Robyn Cherry-Campbell

Seconded Councillor Craig Bowyer

That the Joint Committee

- 4) Agrees that the date for public notification of the Proposed District Plan is 11 October 2023 and the date for close of submissions on the Proposed District Plan is 19 December 2023.**

CARRIED

Moved Brian Jephson

Seconded Councillor Brian Deller

That the Joint Committee

- 5) Approves the Chair of the Joint Committee to be able to make any minor changes and edits to the Proposed District Plan and associated Section 32 Evaluation Reports, as required, prior to public notification of the Proposed District Plan.**

CARRIED

Moved Councillor Alistair Plimmer

Seconded Ra Smith

That the Joint Committee

- 6) **Notes that under Section 86B of the Resource Management Act 1991, rules relating to the following matters have immediate legal effect on public notification of the Proposed District Plan: Any rule that: protects or relates to water, air or soil; protects areas of significant indigenous vegetation; protects areas of significant habitats of indigenous fauna; or protects historic heritage.**

CARRIED

Moved Councillor Robyn Cherry-Campbell

Seconded Councillor Alistair Plimmer

That the Joint Committee

- 7) **Notes that under Section 86D of the Resource Management Act 1991, the Environment Court has granted an order that rules relating to subdivision and associated land use activities in the General Rural Zone and Rural Lifestyle Zone will have legal effect from the date the Proposed District Plan is publicly notified (Attachment 3).**

CARRIED

The meeting closed at 10.43am

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| To: | Joint Committee for the Wairarapa Combined District Plan |
| From: | Nick Eagle, Acting Planning Manager, South Wairarapa District Council Solitaire Robertson, Manager, Planning and Regulatory, Carterton District Council Christine Chong, Planning Manager, Masterton District Council |
| Endorsed by: | Russell O’Leary, Group Manager Planning and Environment, South Wairarapa District Council Geoff Hamilton, Chief Executive, Carterton District Council Karen Yates, General Manager – Strategy and Development, Masterton District Council |
| Date: | 6 March 2024 |
| Subject: | Acceptance of Late Submissions and Approval of Summary of Decisions Requested on Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan |

DECISION

Recommendation:

That the Wairarapa Combined District Plan Joint Committee:

- 1) Receives the information.
- 2) Accepts the late submissions as listed in Attachment 1 of this report into the Proposed District Plan process.
- 3) Approves the Summary of Decisions Requested on the Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan as contained in Attachment 2 for public notification pursuant to Clause 7 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.
- 4) Approves the Chair of the Joint Committee to be able to make any minor changes and edits to the Summary of Decisions Requested, as required, prior to public notification of the Summary.
- 5) Agrees that the date for public notification of the Summary of Decisions Requested is 22 March 2024 and the date for close of further submissions on the Proposed District Plan is 23 April 2024.

Purpose

This report:

1. Identifies the late submissions (received after the closing date and time) and assesses and recommends whether these late submissions should be accepted as submissions on the Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan (the ‘Proposed District Plan’), including inclusion of them in the Summary of Decisions Requested; and
2. Seeks the Joint Committee approval to publicly notify the Summary of Decisions Requested (submissions received) on the Proposed District Plan under Clause 7 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (‘RMA’ or ‘the Act’).

Context

The statutory process for preparing a District Plan is set out in Schedule 1 of the RMA.

The Councils have delegated to the Wairarapa Combined District Plan Joint Committee all functions, powers, and duties under Schedule 1 of the RMA. The Terms of Reference for the Joint Committee states the responsibilities of the Joint Committee include (emphasis added with underline):

The Committee will act as the governance advisory through the review period of the District Plan project and in preparing a new plan and act as the hearings panel for the submissions to the formal notification process.

The Proposed District Plan was publicly notified on 11 October 2023 and open for submissions. Submissions closed on 19 December 2023.

241 submissions were received on the Proposed District Plan. Of these submissions, nine were received after the closing date and time.

Having received submissions, the Councils are required to summarise the decisions requested in the submissions (referred to as a Summary of Decisions Requested) and then to publicly notify the availability of the summary. This notification also commences the further submission process.

Legal Requirement – Late Submissions

The Joint Committee has delegation to determine whether late submissions should be accepted into the Proposed District Plan process and be included in the Summary of Decisions Requested.

When publicly notifying a Proposed District Plan under Clause 5 of Schedule 1 of the RMA, Councils are required to state the closing date for submissions in the public notice. Clause 5 also includes the minimum time for the submission period. The Joint Committee determined 19 December 2023 as the closing date for submissions on the Proposed District Plan which was slightly longer the minimum submission period under clause 5.

Sections 37 and 37A of the RMA provide Councils with the power to waive or extend timeframes set in the RMA. In this case, this power relates to waiving the requirement to make submissions by the closing date of 19 December 2023. In making its decision to waive this requirement, Section 37A of the RMA requires the Councils to take into account:

- The interests of any person who, in its opinion, may be directly affected by the extension or waiver; and
- The interests of the community in achieving adequate assessment of the effects of the Proposed District Plan; and
- Its duty under section 21 to avoid unreasonable delay.

Analysis and Advice – Late Submissions

The next step in the Schedule 1 process for the Proposed District Plan is to publicly notify a summary of decisions requested in submissions (discussed further in the next section of this report). The

summary is provided in Attachment 2. The summary comprises all submissions lodged, including those received late.

Nine submissions listed in Attachment 1 were received late and can be split into two groups:

1. Submissions received immediately after closing of submissions: Submission numbered (S233, S240, S259, S281, S282, S283, S286, S288) were received within 24 hours of the closing date and time (5pm 19th December 2023).
2. One submission (numbered s67) was received 1 working day after the closing date and time. The reason given for this late submission was difficulty in using the online submission portal – the submitter tried to make the submission before the closing date via the online portal but was unsuccessful. The submitter subsequently lodged their submission via email.

Taking into account the matters in Section 37A of the RMA (listed above) to waive the requirement to comply with the submission closing date timeframe, it is considered:

- The only persons directly affected by waiving the compliance with this requirement are the late submitters themselves. If this requirement is not waived, then these late submitters would be excluded from the Proposed District Plan process, meaning their submissions would not be considered, they could not speak to their submission at the hearing, and could not appeal the decision on their submission to the Environment Court. If this requirement is waived, then these late submissions would be included in the Proposed District Plan process and be treated the same as all other submissions. No other persons have been identified as directly affected by waiving the requirement to comply with the timeframe, particularly as these submissions would be included in the Summary of Decisions Requested and available for further submissions;
- The late submissions can be included in the Summary of Decisions Requested and available for further submissions, which would enable the community to be aware of and understand the matters raised in the late submissions in relation to the effects of the Proposed District Plan;
- As the late submissions can be included in the Summary of Decisions Requested it does not cause any delay in the process.

Recommendation – Late Submissions

For these reasons, it is recommended that all late submissions listed in Attachment 1 be accepted as submissions on the Proposed District Plan.

Legal Requirement – Notifying Summary of Decisions Requested and inviting Further Submissions

Following the closing of submissions on the Proposed District Plan, the next step in the process under Schedule 1 of the RMA is to summarise the decisions requested in the submissions, and to publicly notify the availability of this summary and invite further submissions.

The public notice for advertising the availability of the decisions requested must include:

- Where the summary of the decisions requested and the submissions themselves can be inspected;
- The fact that no later than 10 working days after the day on which the public notice is given, certain persons may make a further submission on the Proposed District Plan; and
- The date of the last day for making further submissions (as calculated under the above point); and
- The limitations on the content and form of a further submission.

The public notice must also be sent to all persons who made a submission on the Proposed District Plan.

On notification of the Summary of Decisions Requested, there is then an opportunity for the following persons to make further submissions (in accordance with Clause 8 of Schedule 1 of the RMA 1991):

- a) Any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest;
- b) Any person that has an interest in the Proposed District Plan greater than the interest that the general public has;
- c) The Wairarapa District Councils.

Further submissions must be limited to supporting or opposing matters raised in a submission made on the Proposed District Plan. A further submission cannot raise or address any new matters not covered in submissions. The further submission must be made in a form prescribed in the RMA (referred to as Form 6).

The person making the further submission must send a copy to the Councils and also the person who made the submission their further submission relates to.

As set out above, the period for making further submissions is no more than 10 working days. Similar to waiving the timeframe for late submissions above, the Councils have discretion under Section 37 of the RMA to extend the period for making further submissions. In applying this discretion, the Councils must take into account the matters listed above for late submissions.

Analysis and Advice – Notifying Summary of Decisions Requested and inviting Further Submissions

A summary of decisions requested, as the name suggests, summarises the decisions requested by persons who have made a submission on the Proposed District Plan. The submission form (Form 5),

that is prescribed in the RMA for a submission, includes a section for the decision sought from the Council. Generally, this text is used to complete the main content for the summary. In some instances additional wording from the submission is added to provide context. In instances where the submission is unclear, the Councils may also have had to infer a decision requested by the submitter when preparing the summary.

The Summary of Decisions Requested for the Proposed District Plan is attached in Attachment 2. The Summary of Decisions Requested attached to this report is ordered by submitter name (in alphabetical order).

A second version of the Summary of Decisions Requested ordered by District Plan chapter will also be released. Readers of the summaries can find two versions helpful as they can see other submissions made on the same provisions (version 2), as well as seeing all submission points made by specific submissions (version 1). It is noted final checking of the two versions of the Summaries is still underway, such as correcting formatting and numbering. A resolution is recommended for the Chair of the Joint Committee be delegated authority to make minor edits and confirm the final versions of the Summaries.

To progress the Proposed District Plan, the Councils are required to publicly notify the summary along with the submissions themselves and invite further submissions.

As outlined in the previous section of this report, the RMA prescribes the process and requirements for publicly notifying the summary and inviting further submissions.

All submitters on the Proposed District Plan will be sent an email notifying them of the availability of the summary. In addition, the public notice will be placed in the local newspaper (Wairarapa Times-Age), and posts will be made on the three Council websites and social media.

The summary documents and submissions themselves will be made available on the District Plan Review website (www.wairarapaplan.co.nz) and a hard copy of the summary and submissions will be available for viewing at the three Council offices and libraries.

In terms of the date for public notification of the summary and closing of further submissions, the only statutory requirement is the maximum period of 10 working days between the notification and further submissions closing. The Council has discretion under Section 37 of the RMA to extend the period for making further submissions but must take into account the same matters listed above for late submissions. The timeframe can be extended by no more than twice the period (i.e. no more than 20 working days in total for the further submission period).

Given the number of submissions received, as well as the detailed nature of some submissions, Council officers consider a longer further submission period is appropriate. This longer further submission period would provide persons who can make further submissions additional time to read the submissions received and determine if they will make a further submission, and if so, the content of the further submission.

The earliest the summary could be notified following the Committee meeting is one week after the meeting to confirm placement of the public notice in the local newspaper. It is suggested 22 March 2024 is the earliest notification date for the summary. It is also noted Easter is the following week

(29 March is Good Friday, 31 March is Easter Sunday). While the definition of ‘working days’ under the RMA excludes statutory holidays, some people may consider it inappropriate or unhelpful for the further submission period to cover Easter. If the Committee does not consider a longer further submission period is appropriate, it is suggested the public notification of the summary occurs after Easter.

Options Considered – Notifying Summary of Decisions Requested and inviting Further Submissions

A summary of the options considered is included in the table below.

| Option | Advantages | Disadvantages |
|--|---|---|
| <p>1 10 Working Day Further Submission Period (no time extension)</p> <p>- Notified: Wednesday 3rd April</p> <p>- Further Submissions Closed: Wednesday 17th April</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follows the standard time period under the RMA. Avoids further submission period extending over Easter. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some persons may consider the 10 working day period too short to read submissions and prepare further submissions. |
| <p>2 20 Working Day Further Submission Period (use time extension)</p> <p>- Notified: Friday 22nd March</p> <p>- Further Submissions Closed: Tuesday 23rd April</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Longer further submission period provides more time for people to read submissions and prepare further submissions. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slightly later closing date for further submissions may influence the timing for the commencement of the hearings. However, this delay is likely to be low risk and potentially inconsequential in the context of the entire plan-making process. Suggested further submission period includes Easter. Potential implications of Easter when some people may be unavailable is reduced with the extended period. Notifying after Easter with an extended further submission would likely result in delaying the commencement of the hearings (i.e. further submissions would close on 2nd May). |

Recommended Option – Notifying Summary of Decisions Requested and inviting Further Submissions

Option 2 is recommended. The extended further submission period provides greater opportunity for persons who are able to make further submissions to have sufficient time to provide feedback.

Summary of Considerations – all matters

Strategic, Policy and Legislative Implications

The District Plan Review is a statutory requirement and the RMA requires that the District Plan is reviewed every 10 years.

The Proposed District Plan broadly supports the objectives of Masterton District Council's Parks & Open Space Strategy, Climate Action Plan, He Hiringa Tangata, He Hiringa Whenua, and the South Wairarapa Spatial Plan. It also supports the objectives of the Wairarapa Economic Development Strategy, and GWRC's Regional Policy Statement and Natural Resources Plan.

Significance, Engagement and Consultation

Developing the Proposed District Plan has been assessed as Significant under the Councils' Significance and Engagement Policies.

If the Committee accepts the recommendations set out in this report, the persons who are able to make further submissions will be invited to make further submissions on the original submissions on the Proposed District Plan from 22 March to 23 April 2024.

A summary of the public notification and communication methods are described earlier in this report.

Communications/Engagement

Refer above.

Financial Considerations

Public notification of the summary of decisions requested and invitation for further submissions involves staff time in preparing the publicity material and responding to enquiries. Other costs include placing the public notice in local newspaper and printing the summary and submissions. Funding for the Proposed District Plan phase is budgeted for in the Councils' Long Term Plans as part of the District Plan Review.

Implications for Māori

The District Plan Review and Proposed District Plan have been developed working collaboratively with representatives from Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa. This includes hui to understand what needs to change in the District Plan and how the provisions can better integrate consideration of mana whenua values.

This supports the Councils' statutory obligations in relation to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the Resource Management Act 1991.

Submitters on the Proposed District Plan include iwi entities and representatives of Māori land.

Environmental/Climate Change Impact and Considerations

The Proposed District Plan recognises climate change in its strategic objectives, and plan provisions have been developed in a way that seeks to reduce the impacts of climate change and the effects of activities on climate change.

Next Steps

If the Joint Committee agree with the options recommended, the Summary of decisions requested and invitation for further submissions on the Proposed District Plan will be publicly notified on 22 March 2024. The further submission period is recommended to close on 23 April 2024. Following closing of further submissions, the Joint Committee will issue directions for hearings to enable submitters to speak to their submissions.

Appendix 1: Late Submissions

| Submitter Number | Submitter Name | Date Submission Received | Reasoning |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| S67 | Alistair and Jenny Boyne | 22/12/2023 | Issue with the online portal |
| S233 | Scott Anstis | 19/12/2023 (after 5pm) | |
| S240 | Ryan Malone | 19/12/2023 (after 5pm) | |
| S259 | Russell Hooper | 20/12/2023 | |
| S281 | Richard Schofield | 19/12/2023 (after 5pm) | |
| S282 | Frank van Steensel | 19/12/2023 (after 5pm) | |
| S283 | Josje Neerincx | 19/12/2023 (after 5pm) | |
| S286 | Vida McDonald | 20/12/2023 | |
| S288 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | 20/12/2023 | |



Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan

Summary of Decisions Requested Ordered by Submitter

MARCH 2024

Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan

Summary of Decisions Requested Report Ordered by Submitter

Reader's guide to the Summary of Decisions Requested

The Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan ('Proposed District Plan') was publicly notified on 11 October 2023. The period for making submissions on the Proposed District Plan closed on 19 December 2023. In total, 241 submissions were received, some seeking specific provisions be retained while others sought a wide range of amendments to the Proposed District Plan.

Clause 7(1)(a) of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 ('RMA') requires the Wairarapa District Councils to make available a summary of decisions requested by persons who made submissions on the Proposed District Plan. This report is that summary.

Purpose of the Summary of Decisions Requested report

The purpose of this report is to provide concise summaries of the decisions requested by submitters in their submissions. **This report is not intended to be a summary of submissions in their entirety, and the original submission should always be referred to if you are seeking to make a further submission, or fully understand the matters raised by a submitter.**

This report also includes a list of submitters who made a submission on the Proposed District Plan and provides their address for service. This means that, if you make a further submission you are required to provide this further submission to both the Council and the submitter on whose submission you are making a further submission (under clause 8A of Schedule 1 of the RMA). The address for service for each submitter identified in this report can be used for this purpose.

Content of the Summary of Decisions Requested report

There are two versions of the Summary of Decisions Requested report which contain the same information. The difference between the two versions is the order of the summarised decisions requested as below:

1. Summary of Decisions Requested Ordered by Submitter (this version)
2. Summary of Decisions Requested Ordered by Plan Chapter

This version of the Summary of Decisions Requested is ordered based on submitters name in alphabetical order.

The Summary of Decisions Requested is presented as a table, where each row in the table (also referred to as a 'submission point') represents a decision requested by a submitter. The table includes the following information:

Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan

Summary of Decisions Requested Report Ordered by Submitter

| Column heading | Description |
|--|---|
| Submission Point Number | Identifies a unique number given to each submission. Submission numbers have been randomly assigned. The order in which submissions have been presented in this report follows the submission numbering. |
| Plan provision | Provides a description of the matter to which the submission point relates. If the submission refers to a specific Proposed District Plan provision, or this can be reasonably inferred, then the provision reference is noted in this column. |
| Support/Oppose | Notes the position on the relevant matter or specific provision stated in the submission. Generally, this will be noted as “support”, “support in part”, “oppose in part”, “oppose”, or “amend”. Where a position is not stated in the submission, the position will generally be noted as “not stated”. |
| Reasons (may be summary only, refer to original submission) | Provides a summary of the reasons stated in the submission for the decision requested. This is intended to provide context to the reader about the decision requested only. It is not an exhaustive statement of the reasons given in the submission. The original submission must always be referred to for the full reasoning provided by the submitter. |
| Decision Requested | Provides a summary of the decision requested by the submitter in their submission. |

Where a submission requests amendments to the text of the Proposed District Plan, this report identifies the requested amendments using the following text formatting conventions:

| Convention | Description |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Text | Existing text in the Proposed District Plan |
| Text | Text sought to be added to the Proposed District Plan by a submitter |
| Text struck through | Text sought to be deleted from the Proposed District Plan by a submitter |

DRAFT SUMMARY OF DECISIONS REQUESTED

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Planning Maps | Zones | S48.001 | Aburn Popova Trust | Support | The predominant character of these properties is rural and this character should be recognised and retained. | Retain General Rural Zone where it applies to Vintners Lane, Martinborough. |
| Planning Maps | Natural Environment Values | S48.002 | Aburn Popova Trust | Support | The Vintners Lane properties, which are proven to be suitable for viticulture, are appropriately included within the Martinborough Soils Overlay. The soils covered by the overlay are well suited to viticulture and should be protected and in particular protected from other urban activities including residential activities other than residential activities permitted under GRUZ-R8.1. | Retain the Martinborough Soils Overlay as it applies to the properties in Vintners Lane. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O1 | S48.003 | Aburn Popova Trust | Support in part | Given that the definition of primary production does not cover "viticulture" and viticulture is not "horticulture" (which is covered by the definition of primary production), viticulture should be specifically referred to in the objective. | Amend GRUZ-O1: "... and other activities, including viticulture , which have a ...". |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O2 | S48.004 | Aburn Popova Trust | Support | | Retain GRUZ-O2 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O7 | S48.005 | Aburn Popova Trust | Support | Viticulture and associated activities around 'wine tourism' are essential to Martinborough's future economic and social wellbeing; and soils suitable for viticulture (i.e. "land with special characteristics") should be recognized (as intended by the Martinborough Soils Overlay) and protected. | Retain GRUZ-O7 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P2 | S48.006 | Aburn Popova Trust | Support in part | Clause c should be amended to specifically reference viticulture. | Amend GRUZ-P2(c): "...activities in the General Rural Zone including primary production, viticulture and ancillary activities". |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P3 | S48.007 | Aburn Popova Trust | Support in part | Both clauses should specifically reference viticulture. | Amend GRUZ-P3(c) and (d): c. enabling primary production, viticulture , and ancillary activities; d. structures associated with primary production activities, including viticulture ; |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P4 | S48.008 | Aburn Popova Trust | Support in part | To specifically include reference to viticulture. | Amend GRUZ-P4(a): "a. ...it does not compromise the use of land for primary production activities, including viticulture ; and..." |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P7 | S48.009 | Aburn Popova Trust | Support | Support the specific reference to "including viticulture". | Retain GRUZ-P7 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P8 | S48.010 | Aburn Popova Trust | Support | Support the specific reference to "in particular viticulture". | Retain GRUZ-P8 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R8 | S48.011 | Aburn Popova Trust | Support | Protection of sites within the Martinborough Soils Overlay from intensive residential development is essential to the future viability of viticulture. There is sufficient appropriately zoned land for a full range of residential activities within the General Residential Zone and the Future Urban Zone. | Retain GRUZ-R8 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S4 | S48.012 | Aburn Popova Trust | Support | The General Rural Zone should not be regarded as an opportunity for general and, in particular, intensive residential development, including retirement villages which are separately defined in Part 1 Interpretation - "Definitions". | Retain GRUZ-S4 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P5 | S48.013 | Aburn Popova Trust | Support in part | Include specific reference to viticulture, and a clear delineation between rural and urban areas (clause g) is retained. | Amend SUB-P5: c. enabling primary production and ancillary activities, including viticulturestructures associated with primary production activities, including viticulture |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P6 | S48.014 | Aburn Popova Trust | Support in part | Subdivision of land suitable for viticulture (Martinborough Soils Overlay) into parcels too small to enable viable viticulture should be avoided. | Amend SUB-P6: "...is not located on highly productive land, and it does not comprise the use of land for primary production activities including viticulture; and " |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S48.015 | Aburn Popova Trust | Support | In particular we support the inclusion of Rule SUB-R4.1(b), "b. The allotment is not located in highly productive land or within the Martinborough Soils Overlay". | Retain SUB-R4.1 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S48.016 | Aburn Popova Trust | Support | Supports SUB-R4.4 | Retain SUB-R4.4 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S48.017 | Aburn Popova Trust | Support | Support SUB-R4.5 | Retain SUB-R4.5 as notified |
| SCHED3 - Schedule of Notable Trees | Notable Trees | S3.001 | Adam Lee | Oppose | The tree listings at 9 Mole Street were voluntarily added to the register in 2019, and the new owner would like to see them removed. The tree roots are impacting the driveway and lifting up concrete, creating a trip hazard from uneven surface. Needles from the trees block gutters (requiring weekly cleaning), and water during heavy rainfall events is not discharged off the roof effectively. The trees are located close to the house, resulting in concerns they will fall. Limbs have previously fallen during windy periods. The trees restrict natural light from entering the house, resulting in it being much cooler and requiring more energy to keep warm. An arborist has assessed two of the three trees, and raised concerns regarding poor form, minor decay, limbs pressing and rubbing, side branches being overextended, and rubbing branches resulting in loss of strength and decay. The water line to the house has already been replaced, after impact from the roots of these trees. These trees are exotic species, and are a health and safety risk to the residents of the house. | Delete TSG48a from SCHED3 Notable Trees |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|---|---|
| SCHED3 - Schedule of Notable Trees | Notable Trees | S3.002 | Adam Lee | Oppose | The tree listings at 9 Mole Street were voluntarily added to the register in 2019, and the new owner would like to see them removed. The tree roots are impacting the driveway and lifting up concrete, creating a trip hazard from uneven surface. Needles from the trees block gutters (requiring weekly cleaning), and water during heavy rainfall events is not discharged off the roof effectively. The trees are located close to the house, resulting in concerns they will fall. Limbs have previously fallen during windy periods. The trees restrict natural light from entering the house, resulting in it being much cooler and requiring more energy to keep warm. An arborist has assessed two of the three trees, and raised concerns regarding poor form, minor decay, limbs pressing and rubbing, side branches being overextended, and rubbing branches resulting in loss of strength and decay. The water line to the house has already been replaced, after impact from the roots of these trees. These trees are exotic species, and are a health and safety risk to the residents of the house. | Delete TSG48b from SCHED3 Notable Trees |
| SCHED3 - Schedule of Notable Trees | Notable Trees | S3.003 | Adam Lee | Oppose | The tree listings on 9 Mole Street were voluntarily added to the register in 2019, and the new owner would like to see them removed. The tree roots are impacting the driveway and lifting up concrete, creating a trip hazard from uneven surface. Needles from the trees block gutters (requiring weekly cleaning), and water during heavy rainfall events is not discharged off the roof effectively. The trees are located close to the house, resulting in concerns they will fall. Limbs have previously fallen during windy periods. The trees restrict natural light from entering the house, resulting in it being much cooler and requiring more energy to keep warm. An arborist has assessed two of the three trees, and raised concerns regarding | Delete TSG48c from SCHED3 Notable Trees |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | poor form, minor decay, limbs pressing and rubbing, side branches being overextended, and rubbing branches resulting in loss of strength and decay. The water line to the house has already been replaced, after impact from the roots of these trees. These trees are exotic species, and are a health and safety risk to the residents of the house. | |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S152.001 | AdamsonShaw Ltd | Oppose in part | This definition is internally inconsistent. What is "shown in planning maps" may be different to what is defined in the NPS-HPL. In a situation where land is within the mapped HPL overlay but doesn't meet the NPS-HPL definition, it would be ambiguous whether that land meets the definition. | Delete or Amend the definition of 'Highly Productive Land'. |
| Whole Plan | | S152.002 | AdamsonShaw Ltd | Amend | The Engineering Development Standard should apply to all districts. There is no geographic reason for engineering standards to differ across the region. | Amend Council's Engineering Development Standards. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O2 | S152.003 | AdamsonShaw Ltd | Oppose | Objective is too broad and not necessary given the inclusion of RE-O3. Land with low productive capacity within the GRUZ do not need to remain available for primary production. | Delete or Amend this Objective. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S8 | S152.004 | AdamsonShaw Ltd | Oppose | These standards require a minimum distance of 30m of surfacing from the edge of the road carriageway. This adds unnecessary cost to the process. To reduce tracking from a metal accessway onto a public road the submitter suggests a 10m distance is sufficient to manage any adverse effects. | Amend TR-S8 (2) and (4) from 30m to 10m . |
| TR - Transport | TR-S10 | S152.005 | AdamsonShaw Ltd | Oppose | The submitter considers minimum 9.0m radius plus widening of 6m wide is large and excessive for a single crossing. | Amend TR-S10 (1), Table TR-8 & Figures TR-7 and TR-8, to reduce width of vehicle crossing. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S6 | S152.006 | AdamsonShaw Ltd | Oppose | The transport chapter includes figures/diagrams that are inconsistent/conflict with similar diagrams in the Engineering Development Standards e.g. sight line measurements. The figures should be in one document, either the Plan or the Engineering Development Standards. | Delete Table TR-5 |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|--|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P6 | S152.007 | AdamsonShaw Ltd | Oppose in part | This policy is too broad - specifically (a). While the submitter supports the protection of highly productive land (particularly LUC 1 and 2) - there are areas in the GRUZ, with low productive capacity, that are not fragmented but that are appropriate for small lot subdivision. | Delete or Amend the policy. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R1 | S152.008 | AdamsonShaw Ltd | Amend | This rule needs to be re-formatted so that it is clear. Bullet points ii.-x. should be further bullet pointed separately under i. | Amend ii-x to be separate list under i. Where: a. The minimum lot size of any lot created by the boundary adjustment is 0.5ha; and i. The boundary adjustment complies with, or does not increase any existing or previously approved non-compliance with: a. SUB-S2 b. SUB-S3 c. SUB-S4 d. SUB-S5 e. SUB-S6 f. SUB-S7 g. SUB-S8 h. SUB-S9; and i. SUB-S10; and b. The boundary adjustment complies with, or does not increase any existing or previously approved non-compliance with the relevant standards of the underlying zone. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R2 | S152.009 | AdamsonShaw Ltd | Support in part | Support the minimum lot size standard SUB-S1 referenced in this rule in respect of all Residential Zones as it allows additional infill development. The submitter does not support average lot size requirements for the residential zone when creating 3 or more lots. | Delete average lot size requirements for 3 or more lots in the Residential Zone. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S1 | S152.010 | AdamsonShaw Ltd | Oppose in part | The submitter does not support (b)(i) of SUB-S1 which references lot size standards for the General Rural Zone (GRUZ). The submitter does support the protection of highly productive land in line with the NPS-HPL (particularly LUC 1 and 2), however, there is no justification for 40ha minimum on land not HPL. 40ha is too small for conventional farm | Delete or amend lot size standards. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | and too large for intensive horticultural development and use. | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S1 | S152.011 | AdamsonShaw Ltd | Amend | <p>The submitter supports increased lot size, however they believe there should be provision for smaller lots in the rural zone on non-HPL.</p> <p>Smaller lot subdivision in the rural zone supports the economic and social well-being of rural communities and is an integral part in the further development of farms providing capital, succession planning and housing family members.</p> | <p>Amend to include rules for small lot subdivision.</p> <p>This could be achieved by allowing a limited number of small-clustered lots per title (0.5ha for example with a date provision to also to limit subdivision of new titles) and setting a minimum lot size for the balance lot to protect and maintain rural character and amenity.</p> |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R2 | S152.012 | AdamsonShaw Ltd | Oppose in part | <p>This rule should be re-worded so that it references highly productive land, and only triggers non-complying status where the land is highly productive and does not meet the requirements of the NPS-HPL.</p> | <p>Amend wording to SUB-R2(10) as per below: Activity Status: Discretionary Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance is not achieved with SUB-S1; and b. Where the subdivision is located on highly productive land, the subdivision shall be directly related to land based primary production and evidence should be provided that the subdivision will meet clause 3.8 or 3.10 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land; or c. Where the subdivision is not located on Highly Productive Land, two additional allotments are created and the balance area remaining from the record of title subject to subdivision is no less than 40ha;</p> |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S152.013 | AdamsonShaw Ltd | Oppose in part | <p>Masterton should be included in (a) for consistency across the region and given the characteristics of the Masterton Rural Zone are no different than Carterton and South Wairarapa Districts. The exclusion of</p> | <p>Delete or amend. It is inferred that any amendment to this rule shall include Masterton District.</p> |

30

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | Masterton will have significant effect on property values. | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R5 | S152.014 | AdamsonShaw Ltd | Oppose | It is not clear what the term 'vacant' means in respect of (e). Given this rule addresses surplus residential units, is a lot that contains any building considered to meet this rule? Or is the term vacant used in reference to any lot that doesn't contain a residential unit? Further clarity is required. | Amend to clarify the meaning of vacant. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R5 | S152.015 | AdamsonShaw Ltd | Oppose | Many farms do not need a house, in which case the house is better utilized by someone else, releasing the capital and allowing it to be re-invested into the farm. | Insert a rule to subdivide an existing house from a farm even if the balance lot is vacant. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R10 | S152.016 | AdamsonShaw Ltd | Amend | The submitter sees no justification for any subdivision that creates new vested roads needs to be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity. Given appropriate standards can be met around standard, formation etc., it should be assessed as a Controlled activity as matters of discretion can address these matters appropriately. | Amend activity status from Restricted Discretionary to a Controlled Activity. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R12 | S152.017 | AdamsonShaw Ltd | Oppose in part | <p>Submitter does not support a minimum lot size of 40ha for subdivision within the coastal environment, including the non-complying status for any subdivision that does not comply with SUB-R12. Submitter supports a provision for limited small lot subdivision with larger balance lots but with additional matters of consideration around design/development in the coastal environment.</p> <p>The matters of discretion don't recognise the Wairarapa Coastal Strategy or the 'Caring for your Coast' guidelines which are existing non-statutory documents that guide development in the Coastal Environment. The submitter would support a Coastal Design Guide.</p> | Delete/Amend and insert rules for small lot subdivision in Coastal Environment with additional matters of consideration around design/development in the coastal environment. |
| Appendix 3 - Centres Design Guide | Centres Design Guide | S152.018 | AdamsonShaw Ltd | Support | Supports the Multi-Unit Design Guide which will improve design outcomes for multi-unit developments. | Retain the Multi-Unit Design Guide |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|-------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--|---|
| Appendix 4 - Residential Design Guide | Residential Design Guide | S152.019 | AdamsonShaw Ltd | Support | Supports the Multi-Unit Design Guide which will improve design outcomes for multi-unit developments. | Retain the Multi-Unit Design Guide |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | | S152.020 | AdamsonShaw Ltd | Oppose | The submitter has concerns around identification of Rural Lifestyle Zone in Masterton and in particular current and future capacity of storm/wastewater disposal. As well as lack of consistency with no such zones identified in Carterton and South Wairarapa. | Amend for clarification and further investigations required. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S152.021 | AdamsonShaw Ltd | Amend | The term "planning maps" are not defined. It is not clear whether this means the WCDP planning maps or other planning maps in other (non-statutory) documents. | Amend to include definition of 'planning maps'. |
| Planning Maps | General District-Wide Matters | S210.001 | Adrian and Julie Denniston | Oppose in part | <p>The Coastal Environment goes over the Settlement Zones near the coast such as Riversdale and Castlepoint. It is believed that this is an oversight. The consequence of the Settlement Zone and the Coastal Environment overlapping is that development complies with the Settlement Zone permitted standards is captured as needing resource consent by the more onerous Coastal Environment rules (which apply to all zones).</p> <p>Similarly, the Special Amenity Landscape layer falls on the Settlement Zones near the coast. This is also believed to be unintended as the Settlement Zones have a residential amenity.</p> | Amend the planning maps to remove Coastal Environment and Special Amenity Landscape overlays from the areas within a Settlement Zone. |
| SCHED3 - Schedule of Notable Trees | Notable Trees | S147.001 | Adrienne Young-Cooper | Amend | Notes the Martinborough Golf Club (MGC) is a Recreation Reserve under the Reserve Management Act. MGC holds a lease for the land and public access is permitted. The land has been held in trust for over 100 years for various community uses and the tree planting therefore reflects community effort over that time. Considers the stand of large gum trees, oak groves, and other mature specimens in the interior of the site reflect community effort | Amend SCHED3 - Schedule of Notable Trees to include groups of large gums, groups of large oak trees and other trees located on the Recreation Reserve on Todds Road (also known as the Martinborough Golf Course), subject to an assessment of the trees. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | and values. Considers an assessment of the trees is warranted to determine whether they should be listed on the Notable Tree Schedule. | |
| Strategic Direction | New provision request | S182.001 | Aggregate and Quarry Association | Support | Considers quarrying is important and should be better supported. Notes that RE-O2 and RE-O3 and Rural Environment objectives should be referring to quarrying, but considers references elsewhere in the Plan suggests this is not the case. Seeks a new or amended Strategic Direction Objective - Rural Environment to this effect. | Insert a new Strategic Direction Objective in the RE - Rural Environment section to support quarrying activities. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P5 | S182.002 | Aggregate and Quarry Association | Amend | Considers that the provisions in GRUZ-P5 (b) are reasonable when read individually, as an overall package the submitter believes they fail to project a positive impression of quarrying. | Amend GRUZ-P5 to recognise the benefits of quarrying activities. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R12 | S182.003 | Aggregate and Quarry Association | Oppose in part | Considers GRUZ-R12(2) currently discriminates against land-based quarrying where processing activities usually occur on site. Notes that available supply of river-based aggregates are likely to reduce over time, requiring more land-based quarrying. With river extraction, gravel is usually transported away for processing elsewhere, which is not the case with land-based quarrying where processing occurs at the same site. This provision is a barrier to land-based quarrying as it becomes more necessary in the Wairarapa. Considers it is also inconsistent with the definition of quarrying and quarrying activities in the Proposed Plan, as well as the National Planning Standards. These nationally consistent definitions include ancillary activities associated with extraction including processing. Other instruments and court decisions also recognise processing as an ancillary activity with a functional and operational need to be located where the extraction occurs (although recognises co-location is not appropriate in the case of river extraction). This needs to be remedied to | Amend GRUZ-R12 to better provide for land-based quarrying and on-site processing activities |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|------------|--|--|
| | | | | | avoid uncertainty and to allow land-based quarrying, particularly as the Wairarapa is likely to move towards land-based quarrying. | |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R15 | S182.004 | Aggregate and Quarry Association | Not Stated | Considers MPZ-R15(2) currently discriminates against land-based quarrying where processing activities usually occur on site. Notes that available supply of river-based aggregates are likely to reduce over time, requiring more land-based quarrying. With river extraction, gravel is usually transported away for processing elsewhere, which is not the case with land-based quarrying where processing occurs at the same site. This provision is a barrier to land-based quarrying as it becomes more necessary in the Wairarapa. Considers it is also inconsistent with the definition of quarrying and quarrying activities in the Proposed Plan, as well as the National Planning Standards. These nationally consistent definitions include ancillary activities associated with extraction including processing. Other instruments and court decisions also recognise processing as an ancillary activity with a functional and operational need to be located where the extraction occurs (although recognises co-location is not appropriate in the case of river extraction). This needs to be remedied to avoid uncertainty and to allow land-based quarrying, particularly as the Wairarapa is likely to move towards land-based quarrying. | Amend MPZ-R15 to better provide for land-based quarrying and on-site processing activities |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S182.006 | Aggregate and Quarry Association | Amend | Considers that like highly productive soils, aggregate deposits can only be sourced from where they are physically located and where the industry is able to access them. The original intent of the NPS-HPL was to protect highly productive land for future primary production. Considers this would include quarrying, recognising that other factors in addition to soil determine the productive capacity of land. Notes that land containing quarry materials is also highly productive, and | Amend the Plan where it refers to highly productive land, to recognise that land containing quarrying materials is also highly productive. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | considers it is significantly more productive than soils used for agriculture because of the value and scarcity of the aggregates produced relative to the value of agricultural commodities. | |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S182.007 | Aggregate and Quarry Association | Support | Supports the definition of "primary production" as it aligns with the National Planning Standards, as the definition incorporates quarrying as a primary industry. | Retain the definition of "Primary Production" as notified. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S182.008 | Aggregate and Quarry Association | Amend | Notes that provisions relating to primary production throughout the Plan exclude quarrying, and therefore support for primary production throughout the plan does not extend to quarrying activities. | Amend the Plan where it refers to 'primary production', to recognise that quarrying activities are also a primary industry. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S182.009 | Aggregate and Quarry Association | Oppose in part | Notes the definition of 'highly productive land' comes from the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land rather than the National Planning Standards. Notes the NPS-HPL focuses on land-based agriculture and reliance on use of the soil resource. Considers land-based quarrying is also highly productive, considering the value and scarcity of aggregates relative to the value of agricultural commodities. | No specific relief sought. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-S8 | S188.001 | Aidan Ellims | Amend | The submitter does not support requirement for 5000 litre rainwater collection tank on each new residential dwelling . Will make little difference in water conservation or decreasing the demand for potable water from Council network. | Amend provision require a minimum 25,000 litre water tank be installed on all new dwellings in residential zones with 2 stage UV and membrane filtration units so that the rainwater is potable. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S188.002 | Aidan Ellims | Not Stated | Targeting and promoting water conservation. Councils face increasing costs for water infrastructure networks, with a growing population and demand for treated potable water. | Amend Plan to implement a District wide Water Conservation Plan. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S188.003 | Aidan Ellims | Not Stated | Kapiti Coast District Council published a "Rainwater and Greywater Code of Practice Guidelines which records that in 2008 in their District Plan, they required that all new residential dwellings connected to the town water supply system must reduce peak reticulated water used by households by 30%. | Amend to create a Combined Wairarapa District wide Rainwater and Greywater Code of Practice. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|------------|--|---|
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | New provision request | S188.004 | Aidan Ellims | Not Stated | Retention/detention systems for grey water household systems that treated potable water from reticulated water supply is not being used for flushing toilets or irrigation, again reducing demand on treated, potable water supply. | Amend to require that all new residential dwellings within the Wairarapa District be required to install Waste Water Retention/Detention systems. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | New provision request | S188.005 | Aidan Ellims | Not Stated | Reduce reliance on the struggling reticulated town water supply network. | Amend to require all new residential dwellings within the Wairarapa District, that are already connected to the towns water supply networks be required to reduce peak reticulated water use by 30%. |
| ENG - Energy | | S276.001 | Ainsley Kelly | Oppose | Supports the submission made by the South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group (SWWAG). | Amend provisions as requested in the submission by SWWAG (Submission number 207). |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | New provision request | S131.001 | Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association NZ | Amend | There is no provision within the General Rural Zone for non-commercial rural airstrips not associated with Primary Production/Agricultural Aviation. Compliance is required through NOISE-R1 and NOISE-S1, which would severely limit the ability of a rural airstrip to be used by aircraft, especially were multiple aircraft were to visit a rural airstrip on a 'fly-in'. District Councils are required to uphold the long standing and existing use of private airstrips pre-existing in the General Rural Zone, under Section 139A. | Insert new provision within GRUZ for the permitted use of rural airstrips for non-commercial general aviation: GRUZ-RX: Use of rural airstrips for non-commercial general aviation1. Activity status: Permitted. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-S1 | S131.002 | Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association NZ | Amend | LAeq (15min) Noise controls applied in District Plan Noise Chapters are not an appropriate assessment criteria for aircraft, given the very short period of noise (< 30 seconds) an aircraft generates and if that was to occur within the 15 minutes a noise sample was taken. Ldn is the metric applied to aircraft landing areas i.e. airports, and if LAeq is used, LAeq (day), LAeq (>8hrs) is more appropriate. | <p>Amend NOISE-S1 to use LAeq (day) or LAeq (>8hrs) rather than LAeq(15min) as it relates to non-commercial rural airstrips. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-R1 | S131.003 | Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association NZ | Amend | LAeq (15min) Noise controls applied in District Plan Noise Chapters are not an appropriate assessment criteria for aircraft, given the very short period of noise (< 30 seconds) an aircraft generates and if that was | <p>Amend NOISE-S1 to use LAeq (day) or LAeq (>8hrs) rather than LAeq(15min) as it relates to non-commercial rural airstrips. |

36

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | to occur within the 15 minutes a noise sample was taken. Ldn is the metric applied to aircraft landing areas i.e. airports, and if LAeq is used, LAeq (day), LAeq (>8hrs) is more appropriate. | |
| Planning Maps | General District-Wide Matters | S243.001 | Alan Flynn | Oppose | Considers the variance from the New Zealand standards adds unnecessary controls and cost to an additional 668ha of rural and urban land, including 69 residential dwellings in the Masterton and Carterton districts. Considers these properties should not have reverse sensitivity controls applied as they are outside the area specified in NZS 6805:1992 Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning Standard. The requested amendments align with this New Zealand Standard. | Amend the planning maps: Amend the Outer Air Noise Boundaries be set to 55Ldn, and the Air Noise Boundaries be set at 65 Ldn for Chester Road Helicopters and Hood Aerodrome Amend the Outer Air Noise and Air Noise Boundaries to factor in additional modelling based on reasonable forecasted growth of fixed wing and helicopter movements. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | | S243.002 | Alan Flynn | Oppose | Opposes Rural Lifestyle Zone in the Masterton District. Notes the location and size of the zone has fault lines, high natural water seepage, and is subject to liquefaction risk. Considers there are different areas around the Masterton urban boundary that are more suitable. Considers restricting rural lifestyle subdivision to one zone limits Masterton's growth. Considers rural lifestyle sections under 4ha in size are desirable and an efficient way of creating a green belt buffer around the more densely populated urban areas, while still providing access to urban amenities to those wishing to live on a rural lifestyle section. Note Masterton urban boundary is already fragmented and considers there is nothing to be gained from limiting further rural lifestyle subdivision to one zone. Considers there is no reason why rural lifestyle subdivision should be treated differently in Masterton compared to Carterton or South Wairarapa in a Combined District Plan. | Delete the Rural Lifestyle Zone, enable rural lifestyle subdivision in the same manner as that proposed for Carterton and South Wairarapa districts. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-S4 | S243.003 | Alan Flynn | Amend | Considers the variance from the New Zealand standards adds unnecessary controls and cost to an additional 668ha of rural and urban | Amend NOISE-S4 (consequential amendments for the following): Amend the Outer Air Noise Boundaries be set |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | land, including 69 residential dwellings in the Masterton and Carterton districts. Considers these properties should not have reverse sensitivity controls applied as they are outside the area specified in NZS 6805:1992 Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning Standard. The requested amendments align with this New Zealand Standard. | to 55Ldn, and the Air Noise Boundaries be set at 65 Ldn for Chester Road Helicopters and Hood Aerodrome Amend the Outer Air Noise and Air Noise Boundaries to factor in additional modelling based on reasonable forecasted growth of fixed wing and helicopter movements. Insert a noise management plan for Chester Road Helicopters and Hood Aerodrome enabling measurements of aircraft noise be undertaken in accordance with NZS 6805:1992. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S89.001 | Alastair MacKenzie | Oppose in part | Submitter seeks to allow the subdivision of a 2-3ha block of land that contains a highly productive soil overlay, to be able to subdivide land into 2 lots and separate off the larger dwelling and build an appropriately sized dwelling and shed for own use. Submitter is opposed to the current proposal, specifically the Rule 4 variation, and believes that subdividing this property will not significantly enhance agricultural productivity. Instead, the submitter proposes that the rates generated from the subdivision would be more beneficial to the council and contribute to the overall development of the local area. | Delete reference to highly productive land in SUB-R4(1)(b) as follows: "b. the allotment is not located on highly productive land or within the Martinborough Soils Overlay;" |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R9 | S67.001 | Alistair and Jenny Boyne | Amend | Telecommunications providers are critical to the wellbeing of the local community and remote rural users. | Amend NU-R9 to remove any restrictions on telecommunication companies and their sources being able to upgrade their systems. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | Introduction | S67.002 | Alistair and Jenny Boyne | Oppose in part | Concerns around the blanketing of large areas of land with multiple landowners and the subsequent restrictions placed on property. Subdivision has been occurring on land identified as SASM, and the Rangitane website does not identify significant sites where the District Plan has. | Delete the blanket covering on properties, define specific sites. |
| Planning Maps | Natural Environment Values | S67.003 | Alistair and Jenny Boyne | Amend | Map naming/ labels are inaccurate. The Tora Coastal bush is referred to as Waimoana wetland and the wetland on Te Oroi to the south is called Glen burn Coastal strip. There | Amend map references and naming. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | are several others that also appear to be incorrect. | |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S200.001 | Allan Fahey | Oppose | Considers the opt-in/opt-out process for the Māori Purpose Zone was contentious, speculative, and unclear as to the involvement of the Māori Land Court (MLC) in relation to opting in of all lands under their jurisdiction. Considers that representatives of MLC should have been involved in consultation and needed to seek permission with Māori o Wairarapa. Considers that the Councils breached Te Tiriti (i.e. Article 2 - not enabling tangata whenua to participate in decision making and solely relying on advice of MLC & Article 3 equitable opportunity to opt-in or out of Māori Purpose Zone opposed to determining just the opt-in advice from MLC). | Amend submissions deadline to afford tangata whenua o Wairarapa time to consult wider with their whānau and beneficiaries that reside within and outside of Wairarapa, engage with both the Māori Land Court o Takitimu, and the Combined Wairarapa District Council representatives. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-R9 | S38.001 | Amalgamated Helicopters NZ LTD | Support | Update of information to the current rapid number | Amend the specified address from the old rapid number of 145 to the new rapid number 625 Chester road RD1 Carterton 5791 for Amalgamated helicopters base of operations in NOISE-R9 |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-R15 | S38.002 | Amalgamated Helicopters NZ LTD | Support | To update the rapid number to the new number. | Amend the specified address from the old rapid number 145 to the new rapid number 625 Chester road RD1 Carterton 5791 for Amalgamated helicopters operations base. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-S2 | S38.003 | Amalgamated Helicopters NZ LTD | Support | To update information on addressing specified. | In NOISE-S2 (6) Amend the specified address from the old rapid number 145 to the new rapid number 625 Chester road RD1 Carterton 5791 for Amalgamated helicopters operations base. |
| Planning Maps | | S59.001 | Andrew Duncan | Oppose in part | Submitter notes their professional experience with liquefaction studies and reporting and suggests the data used for liquefaction and fault hazards can be inaccurate. Considers all data should be certified on the ground before correlating to District Plan rules. Notes that the maps could alternatively be used as an advisory layer while this work is undertaken. | Delete liquefaction and fault risk maps until they have all been validated. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|---|------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | | S179.001 | Anne Jessie Te Aroha Carter | Support in part | The Māori Purpose Zone has merit, however, the logic of its application to all Māori land under the Māori Land Court, and the implications of this approach has not been clearly analysed by Council staff. The proposal for a Māori Purpose Zone has not been sufficiently consulted on with a large number of Māori landowners. | Amend MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone Provisions to remove the default opt-in status for all Māori Land it is applied to. Furthermore, amend MPZ to be the choice of the landowners whether or not to opt in on their land being zoned as MPZ. |
| Tangata Whenua | | S179.002 | Anne Jessie Te Aroha Carter | Support in part | The Tangata Whenua section of the WCDP should be amended to be more inclusive of all Māori with rights and interests at place e.g., marae and Māori landowners. Iwi are not mandated to speak on behalf of Māori landowners, Ahuwhenua Trusts and Incorporations. Owners of Māori land exercise kaitiakitanga in relation to the sites and areas of cultural significance. The WCDP should include a specific requirement to engage with Māori landowners in this respect. | Amend to reflect the full range of Māori rights and interest holders at place; acknowledgement of the role of Māori land owners as kaitiaki in relation to sites and areas of cultural significance on their whenua. |
| Designations | SWDC - South Wairarapa District Council | S168.001 | Anne-Marie and David Clements | Oppose | The submission details concerns with the designation change for Pain Farm including health and wellbeing, property damage from overflow, noise, traffic, and property value. | Amend the designation for the Pain Farm Martinborough Wastewater Treatment facility, and reconsider the use of this site. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S148.001 | Antilles Ltd | Amend | Considers that the property at 34 Vintners Lane and surrounding properties that are smaller than 40ha are already fragmented, which limits viable rural production. | Amend the planning maps to rezone the land at 34 Vintners Lane and nearby sites less than 40ha from General Rural Zone to General Residential Zone. |
| Planning Maps | Specific Controls | S148.002 | Antilles Ltd | Oppose | Submits that a recent soil analysis confirms the absence of any Class 3 soils at 24 Vintners Lane, and also found the soil type is not suitable for viticulture. | Amend the planning maps to remove 34 Vintners Lane from the Martinborough Soils Overlay. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S148.003 | Antilles Ltd | Amend | Considers that the property at 34 Vintners Lane and surrounding properties that are smaller than 40ha are already fragmented, which limits viable rural production. The Future Urban Zone is a transitional zone and any future subdivision and development would require further rezoning and consideration of specific matters. This would | Amend the planning maps to rezone the land at 34 Vintners Lane and nearby sites less than 40ha from General Rural Zone to Future Urban Zone (alternative relief). |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|--|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | allow for further assessments and ensure development at an appropriate level. | |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S167.001 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections | Amend | The PDP currently does not include a definition for "community corrections activity". The submitter seeks that a new definition be added in line with the National Planning Standards. It is important the National Planning standards definition is implemented so that non-custodial community corrections sites / facilities are appropriately provided for. | Insert a definition of "community corrections activity" as follows: "Community corrections activity - Has the same meaning as in the National Planning Standards (as set out below): Means the use of land and buildings for noncustodial services for safety, welfare and community purposes, including probation, rehabilitation and reintegration services, assessments, reporting, workshops and programmes, administration, and a meeting point for community works groups. " |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S167.002 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections | Amend | The National Planning Standards include a definition for residential activity and residential unit. The PDP has both of these. However the definition of residential unit refers to a household which is not defined in the PDP and should be added to provide clarity, that a household is not necessarily limited to a family unit or a flatting arrangement. | Insert new definition for Household as follows: Household: Means a person or group of people who live together as a unit whether or not: a. any or all of them are members of the same family; or b. one or more members of the group receives care, support and/or supervision (whether or not that care, support and/or supervision is provided by someone paid to do so). |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S167.003 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections | Support | The definition is consistent with the wording provided for in the National Planning Standards. This definition applies to supported and transitional accommodation activities including people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision. Providing | Retain the definition of "residential activity" as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | reintegration and rehabilitation support is an important component of the reintegration process for people under supervision. It enables people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. | |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S167.004 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections | Support | The definition is consistent with National Planning Standards. It also applies to units used for supported and transitional accommodation activities. | Retain the definition of "residential unit" as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S167.005 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections | Amend | The definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision. That is, supported and transitional accommodation activities use "land and building(s) for people's living accommodation" (as per the definition of "residential activity"). As such, there is no need for a separate and standalone definition of "supported residential care facility" and the associated provisions applying to such throughout the PDP. However, should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care facility", and the associated provisions throughout the PDP, then the wording of the definition should be retained as notified. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delete the definition of "supported residential care facility" and the associated provisions applying to such throughout the PDP; but 2. If Council are to retain the "supported residential care facility" definition and the associated PDP provisions, then the wording of the definition should be retained as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O2 | S167.006 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections | Support | This objective enables housing types that respond to the needs of the South Wairarapa, Masterton, and Carterton communities, such as supported and transitional residential activities. | Retain UFD-O2 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | New provision request | S167.007 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections | Oppose in part | There is no strategic objective which enables social and community facilities, which are essential for the health, social and cultural wellbeing of the community. Social and community facilities encompass community corrections facilities. These are important as they enable people and communities to provide for their wellbeing, health and safety. | Insert new Strategic Direction Objective UFD-OX as follows: UFD-OX - Social and community facilities Social and community facilities are enabled to support the wellbeing of all members of |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | | the community. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R4 | S167.008 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections | Support | Permitted activity rules applying to "residential units" and "residential activities" are appropriate in the context of establishing and operating supported and transitional accommodation activities i.e. people living in a residential situation within a unit, who are subject to support and/or supervision. | Retain GRZ-R4 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R9 | S167.009 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections | Neutral | The definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, no need for a separate definition for "supported residential care facility". | 1. Delete rule GRZ-R9 relating to "supported residential care facility" from the General Residential Zone; but 2. If Council are to retain the "supported residential care facility" definition, then retain as notified the land use activity rule applying to "supported residential care facility" in the General Residential Zone (rule GRZ-R9). |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R4 | S167.010 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections | Support | The permitted activity status is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, i.e. people living in a residential situation within a unit, who are subject to support and/or supervision. | Retain SETZ-R4 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | New provision request | S167.011 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections | Amend | <p>The definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities.</p> <p>However, should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care facility", then the submitter requests that the rules applying to supported and transitional accommodation activities in the Settlement Zone are amended.</p> <p>The zone framework would not otherwise enable supported residential care facilities and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in accordance with the default "Any activity not otherwise listed in this chapter" rule (SETZ-R15). It is considered</p> | 1. Retain the zone rule framework as notified if the definition of "supported residential care facility" is deleted from the PDP; but 2. If the definition is retained, then insert a new permitted activity rule SETZ-RX as follows: SETZ-RX: Supported Residential care facility 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with: i. SETZ-S1;ii. SETZ-S2;iii. SETZ-S3;iv. SETZ-S4;v. SETZ-S5;vi. SETZ-S6;vii. SETZ-S7;viii. SETZ-S8;ix. SETZ-S9;x. SETZ-S10;xi. SETZ-S11;xii. SETZ-S12; and b. The maximum occupancy does not exceed 10 residents |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|-----------------------|------------------|--|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | transitional accommodation activities are compatible and appropriate in the settlement zone and any effects can be managed through restrictions on the number of residents (as is the case in the General Residential Zone). | 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with SETZ-RX(1).Matters of discretion:1. The effect of non-compliance with the relevant standard that and the matters of discretion of any standard that is not met.2. Whether the activity is compatible with the character of the surrounding neighbourhood.3. The intensity and scale of the activity and adverse effects on the amenity of neighbouring properties and the surrounding neighbourhood, particularly visual, noise, and privacy effects.4. The effects on the safe, effective, and efficient functioning of the transport network, site access, parking, servicing, and traffic generation, including safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and other road users.5. Whether the activity is appropriately located in the Settlement Zone or other more appropriate zone. |
| NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone | NCZ-R4 | S167.012 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections | Support | The permitted activity status is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, i.e. people living in a residential situation within a unit, who are subject to support and/or supervision. | Retain permitted activity Rule NCZ-R4 applying to "residential activities" and "residential units" as notified. |
| NCZ - Neighbourhood | New provision request | S167.013 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the | Neutral | The submitters position is that the definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation | 1. Retain the zone rule framework as notified if the definition of "supported residential care facility" is removed from the PDP; but |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------|---|--|
| Centre Zone | | | Department of Corrections | | <p>activities.</p> <p>However, should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care facility", then the submitter requests that the rules applying to supported and transitional accommodation activities in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone are amended. The zone framework would not otherwise enable supported residential care facilities and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in accordance with the default "Any activity not otherwise listed in this chapter" rule (NCZ-R16).</p> <p>Supported and transitional accommodation activities are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under supervision and the effects of such can be managed through the imposition of a restriction on the maximum number of residents (10), as is the case in the General Residential Zone</p> | <p>2. If the definition is retained, then insert a new permitted activity rule SETZ-RX as follows:NCZ-RX - Supported residential care facility1. Activity status: PermittedWhere:a. Compliance is achieved with:i. NCZ-S1;ii. NCZ-S2;iii. NCZ-S3;iv. NCZ-S4;v. NCZ-S5;vi. NCZ-S6;vii. NCZ-S7;viii. NCZ-S8;ix. NCZ-S9;x. NCZ-S10; andb. The maximum occupancy does not exceed 10 residents.2. Activity status: Restricted discretionaryWhere:a. Compliance is not achieved with NCZ-RX(1).Matters of discretion:1.The effect of non-compliance with the relevant standard that and the matters of discretion of any standard that is not met.2. Whether the activity is compatible with the character of the surrounding neighbourhood.3. The intensity and scale of the activity and adverse effects on the amenity of neighbouring properties and the surrounding neighbourhood, particularly visual, noise, and privacy effects.4. The effects on the safe, effective, and efficient functioning of the transport network, site access, parking, servicing, and traffic generation, including safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and other road users.5. Whether the activity is appropriately located in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone or other</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | | more appropriate zone. |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-R4 | S167.014 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections | Support | The permitted activity status is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, i.e. people living in a residential situation within a unit, who are subject to support and/or supervision. | Retain MUZ-R4 as notified, as it applies to "residential activities" and "residential units". |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | New provision request | S167.015 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections | Oppose | <p>The submitters position is that the definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities. A separate definition for "supported residential care facility" is unnecessary.</p> <p>However, should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care facility", then the submitter requests that the rules applying to supported and transitional accommodation activities in the Mixed Use Zone are amended. The activity would otherwise be discretionary under MUZ-R17.</p> <p>Supported and transitional accommodation activities are important for the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under supervision. They are consistent with the character and amenity of such zone, and the effects of such can be managed through the imposition of a restriction on the maximum number of residents (10), as is the case in the General Residential Zone.</p> | <p>1. Retain the zone framework as notified if the definition of "supported residential care facility" is removed from the PDP; but</p> <p>2. If the definition is retained, then insert a new permitted activity rule MUZ-RX as follows:MUZ-RX - Supported residential care facility1. Activity status: PermittedWhere:a. The supported residential care facility is within a residential unit that complies with MUZ-R1(1) or MUZ-R3; andb. The maximum occupancy does not exceed 10 residents.2. Activity status: DiscretionaryWhere:a. Compliance is not achieved with MUZ-RX(1).</p> |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | New provision request | S167.016 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections | Oppose | The submitter requests that the activity rules, as they would apply to community corrections activity in the Mixed Use Zone, are amended. The zone rules do not enable community corrections activities, and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in the zone, in accordance with the default "Any activity not otherwise listed in this chapter" rule (MUZR17). Community | <p>1. Insert a new permitted activity rule for "community corrections activity" in the Mixed Use Zone, as follows:MUZ-RX - Community corrections activity not including buildings and structures1. Activity status: PermittedWhere:a. Compliance is achieved with:i. MUZ-</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending.</p> <p>The Mixed Use Zone provides appropriate locations within which to establish community corrections sites. The proposed rule adopts a similar framework to that for community facilities in the Mixed use Zone (rule MUZ-R8).</p> | S6.2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with MUZ-RX(1).Matters of discretion:1. The effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard and the matters of discretion of any standard that is not met. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-R12 | S167.017 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections | Support | The permitted activity status is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, i.e. people living in a residential situation within a unit, who are subject to support and/or supervision. | Retain the permitted activity rule TCZ-R12 applying to "residential activities" and "residential units" in the Town Centre Zone. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | New provision request | S167.018 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections | Oppose | <p>The definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities. If the rule for "supported residential care facility" is to remain then supported and transitional accommodation activities would then be by default discretionary activity.</p> <p>Supported and transitional accommodation activities are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under supervision. Supported and transitional accommodation activities are compatible and appropriate in the Town Centre Zone, noting that residential activities are enabled as of right in the zone. They are consistent with the character and amenity of such zones, and the effects of such can be managed through the imposition of a restriction on the maximum number of residents (10), as is the case in the General Residential Zone.</p> | <p>1. Retain the zone framework as notified if the definition of "supported residential care facility" is removed from the PDP; but</p> <p>2. If the definition is retained, then insert a new permitted activity rule TCZ-RX as follows:TCZ-RX - Supported residential care facility1. Activity status: PermittedWhere:a. The supported residential care facility is within a residential unit that complies with TCZ-R1 or TCZ-R3; andb. The maximum occupancy does not exceed 10 residents.2. Activity status: DiscretionaryWhere:a. Compliance is not achieved with TCZ-RX(1).</p> |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | New provision request | S167.019 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections | Oppose | The zone rules do not enable community corrections activities, and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in the zone, in accordance with the default | 1. Insert a new permitted activity rule for "community corrections activity" in the Town Centre Zone, as follows: TCZ-RX - |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>"Any activity not otherwise listed in this chapter" rule (TCZ-R16). Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending.</p> <p>The Town Centre Zone provides appropriate locations within which to establish community corrections sites, in that the zones are in areas that are easily accessible to individuals, and is a zone within which community facilities, business and other similar activities are enabled as of right.</p> | <p>Community corrections activity1. Activity status: PermittedWhere:a. Compliance is achieved with:i. TCZ-S6.2. Activity status: Restricted discretionaryWhere:a. Compliance is not achieved with TCZ-RX(1).Matters of discretion:1. The effect of non-compliance with the relevant standard and the matters of discretion for any infringed standard(s).</p> |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | New provision request | S167.020 | Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections | Oppose in part | <p>The submitter requests that the activity rules, as they would apply to "community corrections activity" in the General Industrial Zone, are amended. The zone rules do not enable community corrections activities and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in the zone, in accordance with the default "Any activity not otherwise listed in this chapter" rule (GIZ-R14). Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. Industrial areas provide suitable sites for community corrections activities (like community work components, yard based activities etc.)</p> <p>Community corrections activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in industrial zones. They are consistent with the character and amenity of such zones. Furthermore, as community corrections facilities are not sensitive to the effects of commercial and industrial environments (e.g. noise, high traffic movements, etc), they are not prone to reverse sensitivity.</p> | <p>1. Insert a new permitted activity rule for "community corrections activity" in the General Industrial Zone, as follows:GIZ-RX - Community corrections activity1. Activity status: PermittedWhere:a. Compliance is achieved with:i. GIZ-S5;ii. GIZ-S6; andiii. GIZ-S7.2. Activity status: DiscretionaryWhere:a. Compliance is not achieved with GIZ-RX(1).</p> |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S16.001 | Arya Franklyn | Support | Considers Councils should explore provisions for using recycled aggregates from a local | Amend the District Plan to enable use of recycled aggregates from local sources |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | source which will cut down on carbon emissions. | |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S16.002 | Arya Franklyn | Support | Generally supports the Proposed District Plan | None requested |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S52.001 | Audrey Rendle | Oppose | Properties to the west of Chamberlain Road are lifestyle blocks that meet criteria for Rural Lifestyle Zone. | Amend zoning of properties west of Chamberlain Road, Upper Plain, Masterton from General Rural Zone to Rural Lifestyle Zone. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB - Table 1 | S257.002 | Audrey Sebire | Oppose in part | Considers 40ha blocks will only be affordable to existing, large-scale farmers and large corporations. Consequently, existing small blocks will become more scarce will become less affordable. Considers the rules need to better distinguish between rural residential use and small-block farms, considering different productive uses are possible on smaller blocks such as gardens, horses, sheep, cattle, orchards, native nurseries. Considers more research is needed to understand productivity of small blocks. Considers large lot size does not necessarily correlate with productivity. Considers there are alternative ways to reduce land fragmentation other than a large minimum lot size. Notes smaller farms can contribute to food resilience and provide economic benefits, encourages diversity of productive land use, enable smaller-scale farmers equitable access to land, burden of rural land rates. | Amend SUB-Table 1 to change the minimum lot size in the General Rural Zone to 3ha. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R2 | S257.003 | Audrey Sebire | Oppose in part | Seeks to make rural subdivision a restricted discretionary activity in which discretion can be exercised and should be limited to satisfying clause 3.8 of NPS-HPL) and all subdivision applicants (under and over the minimum lot size) are required to demonstrate that the proposed lots and the remaining lot will retain the overall productive capacity of the subject land over the long term (satisfy clause 3.8/3.10 of the NPS-HPL). Considers other measures can avoid or discourage | Amend SUB-R2 to make all subdivision in the General Rural Zone a Restricted Discretionary activity with matters of discretion relating to clauses 3.8 and 3.10 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | cumulative fragmentation and loss of productivity, such as limiting the number of lots in a single subdivision, only allowing frontage of new lots on existing roads, requiring all houses on new lots relocatable, restricting new hard infrastructure e.g. roads, footpaths, streets, and encouraging unsealed driveways. | |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R8 | S257.004 | Audrey Sebire | Amend | Considers the rules need to better distinguish between rural residential use and small-block farms | Amend GRUZ-R8 to limit dwelling size to 180m2 |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | New provision request | S257.005 | Audrey Sebire | Support | Considers pine plantations affect the visual character of the rural environment, adverse effects of monoculture | Insert a new provision to limit pine plantation forestry in the district. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S72.001 | Aviation New Zealand - New Zealand Helicopter Association | Neutral | Helicopter Aviation is often combined into one category, but considers this is better split into recreational and commercial. NZHA supports most of the provisions in this plan for recreational aviation. However Commercial Helicopter Aviation has many positive benefits which if the single category is applied are restricted, substantially reducing their effectiveness and significantly reducing the ability to positively benefit the social, economic and culture of the public in the District. Commercial helicopter operations are used in a wide range of public good activities such as (but not limited to), aerial spotting, asset management, construction and maintenance (including powerlines and telecommunications), disaster relief work, flight training, frost protection, gravelling tracks, infrastructure repairs and development, science and research, search and rescue, surveillance, survey operations, tourism, transportation of people, TV and film. | Insert a new definition for "Commercial Helicopter Aviation" (specific wording not provided) |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S72.002 | Aviation New Zealand - New Zealand Helicopter Association | Support in part | Commercial Helicopter Aviation operations are often required for a small timeframe and then that site is often not used again or used infrequently. This definition would allow the Plan to allow the operation of Commercial Helicopter Aviation Operations. | Insert an additional Definition for "Temporary Commercial Helicopter Aviation Landing Area" (specific wording not provided) |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-P1 | S72.003 | Aviation New Zealand - New Zealand Helicopter Association | Support | Commercial Helicopter Aviation provides access for activities that happen on and in waterways in New Zealand for recreation (by people) and for scientific, research and monitoring activities as often access by helicopter is the only means of safe transport to and from these areas. | Retain ASW-P1 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | Introduction | S72.004 | Aviation New Zealand - New Zealand Helicopter Association | Support in part | Seeks that Council recognises that the rule does not consider the full range of temporary and infrequent commercial operations necessary for positive social, economic, and cultural outcomes for the district. Commercial helicopter operations are used in a wide range of public good activities such as (but not limited to), aerial spotting, asset management, construction and maintenance (including powerlines and telecommunications), disaster relief work, flight training, frost protection, gravelling tracks, infrastructure repairs and development, science and research, search and rescue, surveillance, survey operations, tourism, transportation of people, TV and film. If these activities are restricted, considers there would be job and economic losses in the region. Some simple operations such as moving plant and equipment onto sites would require large setbacks often rendering them non-compliant with either R3 or R3a and therefore unable to be completed. The two return flights per day would also be exceeded (example of three return flights needed to lift a water tank into place, or frost protection requiring 15). | Amend the introductory text under the 'Rules' heading to except commercial helicopter aviation from the rules and standards of the NOISE chapter: "d. Agriculture, horticulture, pastoral farming, and conservation, activities undertaken for a limited duration, including using agricultural vehicles, agricultural aviation, commercial helicopter aviation , helicopter landing areas..." |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-R2 | S72.005 | Aviation New Zealand - New Zealand Helicopter Association | Support in part | The NZHA supports this rule as a variety of construction, maintenance and demolition activities are relied on through the use of helicopters where cranes are not suitable for a variety of reasons. Construction noise | Amend NOISE-R2 to exempt aircraft noise while conducting construction activities. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | therefore should be the limiting factor for aircraft noise in this instance. Considers aircraft noise should be exempt from NOISE-R2 due to the temporary and infrequent take offs and landings. | |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-R8 | S72.006 | Aviation New Zealand - New Zealand Helicopter Association | Oppose in part | The NZHA supports the rule above in respect to providing for Private Operations from a fixed location Heliport such as at a private residence. However, considers this rule does not consider the full range of temporary and infrequent commercial operations necessary for positive social, economic, and cultural outcomes for the district. | Amend NOISE-R8 to allow for Commercial Aviation as a permitted activity where the activity is no more than 315 hours or 30 days, whichever is greater in a calendar year of helicopter operations on the same site. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-S2 | S72.007 | Aviation New Zealand - New Zealand Helicopter Association | Support in part | Considers it is correct for other Emergency Helicopter Activities to be separated into its own subsection of NOISE-S2. Considers as written, it could be confusing if other activities would or would not be acceptable in NOISE-S2 as it is defined in relation to 145 Chester Road. | Amend NOISE-S2 to separate section 6d (under Helicopters at Chester Road) into its own standard for the operation of helicopter activities that are exempt from complying with NOISE-S2. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-S2 | S72.008 | Aviation New Zealand - New Zealand Helicopter Association | Support | Placing this limitation into this section could be a suitable place for commercial aviation to become permitted leaving NOISE-R8 mostly intact with the addition similar to NOISE-R9 that the activity is Permitted providing compliance is achieved with NOISE-S2 (and proposed decision limitation above) | Amend NOISE-S2 to provide for Commercial Helicopter Aviation Activities subject to the standard that "no more than 315 flight hours or 30 days which ever is greater in a calendar year of helicopter operations on the same site." |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P7 | S72.009 | Aviation New Zealand - New Zealand Helicopter Association | Support in part | Commercial aviation varies in its activity, and is a noisy activity which is of limited duration and frequency. | Amend NOISE-P7 to include reference to Commercial Aviation. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P8 | S72.010 | Aviation New Zealand - New Zealand Helicopter Association | Support in part | Helicopters are widely used for Frost Protection as not all sites are able to use other frost devices. These activities are time-limited, and limits produce lost to frost which provides economic benefits to the region. Seeks that helicopters are provided for in | Amend NOISE-P8 to provide for helicopters used for frost protection purposes. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|---|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | NOISE-P8 providing the other noise requirements on temperature and use are met. | |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P1 | S72.011 | Aviation New Zealand - New Zealand Helicopter Association | Support | Many helicopter operations are essential to the wellbeing of the public in the district and if restricted would remove jobs, economic benefits and could seriously affect Helicopter operators ability to thrive in the region. NZHA generally supports this Policy providing existing Commercial Helicopter Activities are permitted. | Retain NOISE-P1 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P2 | S72.012 | Aviation New Zealand - New Zealand Helicopter Association | Support | Many helicopter operations are essential to the wellbeing of the public in the district and if restricted would remove jobs, economic benefits and could seriously affect Helicopter operators ability to thrive in the region. NZHA supports in part the Policy where it allows for the use of Helicopters to positively benefit the region. | Retain NOISE-P2 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P3 | S72.013 | Aviation New Zealand - New Zealand Helicopter Association | Support | NZHA supports NOISE-P3. | Retain NOISE-P3 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P5 | S72.014 | Aviation New Zealand - New Zealand Helicopter Association | Support | NZHA supports P5 | Retain NOISE-P5 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-R8 | S72.015 | Aviation New Zealand - New Zealand Helicopter Association | Oppose in part | Seeks that Council recognises that the rule does not consider the full range of temporary and infrequent commercial operations necessary for positive social, economic, and cultural outcomes for the district. | Amend NOISE-R8 to remove setback limitations for Commercial Helicopter operations that are temporary and infrequent and abide by the permitted activity standard. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S208.001 | Ballance Agri-Nutrients | Support | The definition covers the appropriate scope of agricultural aviation activities. | Retain the definition for agricultural aviation |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S208.002 | Ballance Agri-Nutrients | Support | Ballance supports the use of the NPS definition of primary production. | Retain the definition of primary production |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Interpretation | Definitions | S208.003 | Ballance Agri-Nutrients | Support | The definition clearly defines rural airstrips and their use in support of primary production | Retain the definition for rural airstrip. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O2 | S208.004 | Ballance Agri-Nutrients | Support | This objective highlights the importance of primary production to the economic and social wellbeing of the region and the need for primary production to be protected | Retain the objective RE-O2 |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P5 | S208.005 | Ballance Agri-Nutrients | Support | The policy provides protection for primary production and ancillary activities, and provides for protection from reverse sensitivity effects | Retain the policy SUB-P5 |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-O1 | S208.006 | Ballance Agri-Nutrients | Support | It is important for the benefits of noise generating activities that align with the character and amenity values of a zone, to be recognized as being important for the economy of the region. Agricultural aviation is one such noise generating activity. | Retain the objective NOISE-O1 |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-O2 | S208.007 | Ballance Agri-Nutrients | Support | It is important for noise generating activities, such as agricultural aviation, which support the regional economy, are protected from reverse sensitivity effects. | Retain the objective NOISE-O2 |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P8 | S208.008 | Ballance Agri-Nutrients | Support in part | It is important to recognize that noisy equipment should include agricultural aviation as an ancillary activity supporting primary production | Amend NOISE-P8: The use of noisy equipment that has a limited duration and frequency (in particular, audible bird scaring devices, agricultural aviation activities and frost protection devices, and harvesters) that supports agricultural primary production in the rural environment is enabled by exempting these activities from noise limits, subject to reasonable use. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O1 | S208.009 | Ballance Agri-Nutrients | Support | It is important to recognize the importance of primary production and ancillary activities to the region, and that activities that support primary production and have a functional need to be located in the GRUZ are provided for. | Retain the objective GRUZ-O1 |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|---|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O5 | S208.010 | Ballance Agri-Nutrients | Support | It is important for primary production to be protected against the effects of reverse sensitivity. | Retain the objective GRUZ-O5 |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P1 | S208.011 | Ballance Agri-Nutrients | Support in part | It is important for ancillary activities that support primary production to be recognized. | Amend GRUZ-P1 a. Enable primary production activities and ancillary activities to primary production , that are compatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P6 | S208.012 | Ballance Agri-Nutrients | Support | The policy provides protection for primary production and ancillary activities and provides for protection from reverse sensitivity effects. | Retain the policy GRUZ-P6 |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R6 | S208.013 | Ballance Agri-Nutrients | Support | A rule providing for agricultural aviation activities in the GRUZ chapter provides clarity. | Retain the rule GRUZ-R6 |
| Planning Maps | Natural Environment Values | S37.001 | Barbie Barton | Oppose in part | The site 156 Underhill Road has QEII covenants and the owners have invested in maintaining this area. The submitter believes it is unnecessary to have an ONFL overlay on the property when existing covenants protect it. | Amend the extent of ONFL1 Tararua/Rimutaka Forest Parks to exclude the property at 156 Underhill Road. |
| Designations | SWDC - South Wairarapa District Council | S133.001 | Beverley Clark | Oppose | Oppose use of Pains Farm for wastewater disposal purposes, as it would preclude the land being used and/or rented out for livestock or crops, and will degrade the soil for any future productive use. | Amend designation SWDC-S-26 Martinborough wastewater land based disposal - Pains Farm to change its use from wastewater disposal to productive use. |
| Planning Maps | Hazards and Risks | S217.001 | Bob Tosswill | Oppose in part | Submitter does not believe that a LIDAR based assessment with a desktop interpretation is sufficient data to create a hazard in this area and the subsequent issues for current and prospective landowners. The map aligns with the known river terraces which are boulder strewn with well rounded rocks, hence waterborne in their opinion. | Amend the planning maps to remove the Woodside fault, subject to further testing to determine whether the mapping is accurate or not. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|--------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| SCHED2 - Schedule of Heritage Precincts | Heritage Precincts | S33.001 | Bosch Property Management Co Ltd | Support in part | Seeks further clarification surrounding a Queen Street Heritage Precinct. Clarification as to if there is to be one, what this would mean for building owners and what restrictions would be in place regarding changes to the façade/ whole building. | Amend provisions to provide clarity as to whether or not there will be a Queen Street Heritage Precinct. |
| SCHED2 - Schedule of Heritage Precincts | Heritage Precincts | S33.002 | Bosch Property Management Co Ltd | Support | Supports SCHED2 - Heritage Precincts in the Proposed District Plan. | Retain SCHED2. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S238.001 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | The 'accessory building' definition is supported, on the basis that includes detached buildings that are ancillary to buildings or activities that are or could be lawfully established (e.g., permitted activities or via resource consent) on the site. | Retain the 'accessory building' definition as proposed. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S238.002 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | The 'addition' definition is supported. | Retain the 'addition' definition as proposed. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S238.003 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | The 'alteration' definition is supported. | Retain the 'alteration' definition as proposed. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S238.004 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | The 'commercial activity' definition is supported. | Retain the 'commercial activity' definition as proposed. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S238.005 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited | Support | The 'contaminated land' definition is supported. | Retain the 'contaminated land' definition as proposed. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | | | |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S238.006 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | The 'drive-through activities' definition is supported. | Retain the 'drive-through activities' definition as proposed. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S238.007 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | The 'earthworks' definition is supported. | Retain the 'earthworks' definition as proposed. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S238.008 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | The 'hazard sensitive activities' definition is supported on the basis that it does not include service stations or truck stops. This submission is related to the Fuel Companies submissions on the 'potentially hazardous sensitive activities' definition and Natural Hazards chapter. | Retain the 'hazard sensitive activities' definition as proposed. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S238.009 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | The 'hazardous substance' definition is supported. | Retain the 'hazardous substance' definition as proposed. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S238.010 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | The 'land disturbance' definition is supported. | Retain the 'land disturbance' definition as proposed. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S238.011 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited | Support in part | The 'less hazard sensitive activities' definition is supported in principle and its inclusion of accessory buildings used for non-habitable purposes. It is, however, unclear as to the | Amend the 'less hazard sensitive activities' definition as follows: Less hazard sensitive activities: Means activities that are less sensitive to natural |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | | classification of activities that are not listed under this definition, the 'hazard sensitive activities' definition or the 'potentially hazard sensitive activities' definition. However, the natural hazards chapter introduction does state that all other activities not listed as being hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive is considered less hazard sensitive. Adopting this approach, an amendment is sought to classify that activities not otherwise defined as being hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive are less hazard sensitive. | hazards, which are: a. Accessory buildings used for non-habitable purposes; b. Park management activity; and c. Buildings and structures associated with temporary activities-; and d. Any other activities which are not hazard sensitive activities or potentially hazard sensitive activities. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S238.012 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | The 'potentially hazard sensitive activities' definition is supported on the basis that service stations and truck stops are captured by this definition as they are 'commercial activities'. This submission is related to the Fuel Companies submissions on the 'potentially hazard sensitive activities' definition and Natural Hazards chapter. | Retain the 'potentially hazard sensitive activities' definition as proposed. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S238.013 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | The 'retail activities' definition is supported. | Retain the 'retail activities' definition as proposed. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S238.014 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | The 'service station' definition is supported on the basis that it applies to service stations and truck stops. | Retain 'service station' definition as proposed. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S238.015 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support in part | The significant hazardous facility definition is supported in principle however, there appears to be a formatting error that has resulted in all other activities being nested under (a). An amendment is sought to correct this apparent error. | Amend the 'significant hazardous facility' definition as follows: "Means the use of land and/or buildings for one or more of the following activities: a. Manufacturing of hazardous substances and associated storage (including |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------|--|
| | | | | | | <p>industries manufacturing agrochemicals, fertilisers, acids/ alkalis, or paints);b. i. Oil and gas exploration and extraction facilities;c. ii. Purpose built bulk storage facilities for the storage of hazardous substances (other than petrol, diesel, or LPG);d. iii. The storage. use of more than 100,000L of petrol;e. iv. The storage/use of 100,000L of diesel;f. v. The storage/use of more than 6 tonnes of LPG; g. vi. Galvanising plants; h. vii. Electroplating and metal treatment facilities;i. viii. Tanneries;j. ix. Timber treatment k. x. Freezing works and rendering plants;l. xi. Wastewater treatment plants;m. xii. Metal smelting and refining (including batter refining or recycling);n. xiii. Milk treatment plants;o. xiv. Fibreglass manufacturing;p. xv. Polymer foam manufacturing; and q. xvi. Landfills.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, the following activities are not considered to be significant hazardous facilities:</p> <p>a. the incidental use and storage of hazardous...</p> <p>...</p> <p>f. †The underground storage of petrol and diesel at service stations undertaken in accordance with HSNOCOP 44 Below Ground Stationary Container Systems for</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | Petroleum - Design and Installation and HSNOCOP 45 Below Ground Container Systems for Petroleum - Operation; ..." |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R10 | S238.016 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support in part | The Fuel Companies support a permitted activity pathway for electric vehicle charging stations (EVCS). The permitted activity pathway for EVCS under Rule NU-R10 in all zones is supported but it is unclear if this rule also applies to EVCS installed and operated by those who are not network utility operators (as defined under the RMA and PDP), such as service station operators. This is due to the rule's location in the Network Utility chapter, the rule's matters of discretion referring to network utilities, and the absence of an EVCS rule in the Transport chapter. | Amend Rule NU-R10 as follows: NU-R10 Communications kiosk or minor utility structures and cabinets, and electric vehicle charging stations All zones 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. the structure does not exceed : i. A height of 3.5m and an area of 1.5m ² ; or ii. A height of 2m and an area of 5m ² ; and b. Compliance is achieved with i NU-S4; and ii. NU-S5. Note: For the purpose of this rule, electric vehicle charging station installers and/ or operators do not need to be a Network Utility Operator. 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with NU-R10(1)(a). Matters of discretion: 1. The functional need and operational need of, and benefits from, the network utility activity , including the potential impact on the levels of service or health and safety if the work is not undertaken. 2. The bulk, height, location, and design of the network utility activity, including any associated buildings or structures. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------|---|
| | | | | | | <p>3. The amenity values of the respective zone and the extent to which any adverse amenity effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p> <p>4. The effects of non-compliance with any relevant Network Utilities Standards.</p> <p>5. The location of the network utilities activity, including the need for connections to existing networks and services.</p> <p>6. Effects on areas of outstanding natural features and landscapes, waterbodies, indigenous vegetation, historic heritage, and sites and areas of significance to Māori.</p> <p>All zones</p> <p>3. Activity status: Non-complying</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance is not achieved with NU-S4 or NU-S5.</p> <p>AND/ OR</p> <p>Insert a new Rule TR-RXX under the Transport chapter as follows:</p> <p>TR-RXX Electric charging stations</p> <p>All zones</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. The structure does not exceed:</p> <p>i. A height of 3.5m and an area of 1.5m²:</p> <p>orii. A height of 2m and an area of 5m²</p> <p>All zones</p> <p>2. Activity status:</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>Restricted discretionaryWhere: a. Compliance is not achieved with TR-RXX(1)(a).Matters of discretion: 1. The functional need and operational need of, and benefits from, the activity. 2. The extent and effect of non-compliance on the streetscape, pedestrian safety and the amenity of the area. 3. The effects on areas of outstanding natural features and landscapes, waterbodies, indigenous vegetation, historic heritage, and sites and areas of significance to Māori.</p> |
| TR - Transport | TR-O3 | S238.017 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Objective TR-O3 is supported | Retain Objective TR-O3 as proposed. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P7 | S238.018 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support in part | <p>Policy TR-P7 is supported in principle however, an amendment is sought to apply the Policy to new high traffic generation activities or existing high traffic generating activities exceeding the specified traffic generation thresholds. This is so the Policy does not curtail or require an Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) for upgrades or development to existing high traffic generating activities, such as existing service stations, that does not change the overall character and intensity of use nor results in additional traffic volumes which the PDP seeks to manage.</p> <p>This submission relates to the submission on Rule TR-R5.</p> | <p>Amend Policy TR-P7 as follows: TR-P7 High Traffic Generating Activities</p> <p>Require new high traffic generating activities, or expansions of existing high traffic generating activities that exceed traffic generation thresholds, which propose to access and utilise the districts' roads to be assessed in an integrated Transport Assessment prepared by a suitably qualified traffic specialist that demonstrates how any adverse effects on the road transport</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>network will be avoided, remedied, mitigated, and assesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the road's capacity and the likely effect of the proposed use on the road and its users; b. effects on the amenity values and the need for road maintenance agreements; c. the effect on ongoing maintenance of the road and the need for road maintenance agreements; d. whether opportunities for alternative access and/ or routes exist; e. appropriate traffic management and travel demand management mechanisms; f. whether it is appropriate to stage the activity and/or undertake improvements to the transport network; and g. cumulative effects. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R5 | S238.019 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support in part | <p>As it reads, Rule TR-R5 requires restricted discretionary activity resource consent for activities which exceed the thresholds in Table TR-16 of Standard TR-S29. This rule also requires the application to be supported by an Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA), the comprehensiveness of which is determined by Table TR-18 based on the highest activity status of the resource consent application. The Fuel Companies supports this approach in principle; however, they seek clarification that the thresholds (and therefore Rule TR-R5 and Standard TR-S29) only apply to a new activity or the expansion of an existing activity that increases its character and intensity. For example, the establishment</p> | <p>Amend Rule TR-R5 as follows: TR-R5 High Traffic Generating Activities All zones 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Any new activity or expansion of an exiting activity that generates an average daily traffic volume or peak hour traffic volume that exceeds the thresholds in Standard TR-S29. [...]</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | of a new service station or the expansion of an existing service station where that expansion exceeds the thresholds of Table TR-16. The Fuel Companies seek this to ensure that the rule and standard are not triggered by upgrades or development to existing service stations that does not change the overall character and intensity of use nor results in additional traffic volumes which the PDP seeks to manage. | |
| CL - Contaminated Land | Introduction | S238.020 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | The amendments to the Contaminated Land chapter introduction since the DDP is supported. | Retain the Contaminated Land chapter introduction as notified. |
| CL - Contaminated Land | CL-O1 | S238.021 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Objective CL-O1 is supported. | Retain Objective CL-O1 as notified. |
| CL - Contaminated Land | CL-P2 | S238.022 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support in part | Policy CL-P2 is supported in principle, however, an amendment is sought to change "sites" under clause (2) to "land" so that it is consistent with the rest of the policy and its references to contaminated land and potentially contaminated land. | Amend Policy CL-P2 as follows: Manage the subdivision, change of use, or disturbance of contaminated land to ensure it is safe for human health by: 1. Encouraging a best practice approach to site management for sites land with elevated contaminant levels, which may include remediation, containment, and/or disposal of contaminated soil; and 2. Ensuring the land is suitable for its intended use. |
| HAZ - Hazardous | Introduction | S238.023 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New | Support | The Hazardous Substances chapter introduction is supported. | Retain the Hazardous Substances chapter introduction as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|----------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Substances | | | Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | | | |
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | HAZ-O1 | S238.024 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Objective HAZ-O1 is supported. | Retain Objective HAZ-O1 as notified. |
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | HAZ-O2 | S238.025 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Objective HAZ-O2 is supported. | Retain Objective HAZ-O2 as notified. |
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | HAZ-P1 | S238.026 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Policy HAZ-P1 is supported. | Retain Policy HAZ-P1 |
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | HAZ-P2 | S238.027 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Policy HAZ-P2 is supported. | Retain Policy HAZ-P2 as notified. |
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | HAZ-R1 | S238.028 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Rule HAZ-R1 is supported. | Retain Rule HAZ-R1 as notified. |
| HAZ - Hazardous | HAZ-R2 | S238.029 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New | Support | Rule HAZ-R2 is supported. | Retain Rule HAZ-R2 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|---|----------------|--|--|
| Substances | | | Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | | | |
| NH - Natural Hazards | Introduction | S238.030 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Oppose in part | Under the notified definitions, service stations are captured as "commercial activities" and are therefore, "potentially hazard sensitive activities". Service stations are not listed under the notified "hazard sensitive activities" definition. The activity classifications in the Natural Hazards chapter introduction, however, contradict the definitions, as service stations are included in the "hazard sensitive activities" list on page 2. It is inappropriate to list service stations as "hazard sensitive activities". Additionally, doing so would be contradictory to the PDP's definitions and inconsistent with the classification of all other commercial and industrial activities (irrespective of the quantity of hazardous substances involved, where they are stored and how they are used) as being "potentially hazard sensitive activities". | Amend the Natural Hazards chapter introduction as follows: [...] To assist with determining the consequences associated with natural hazards, buildings and activities have been categorised according to the potential consequences to life and property as a result of those activities occurring within a natural hazard area. Any activity that is not specifically listed below is considered a less hazard sensitive activity. Activities are categorised as hazard sensitive activities, potentially hazard sensitive activities or less hazard sensitive activities. Hazard sensitive activities comprise the following:- Community facilities;- Marae;- Healthcare facilities;- Emergency service facilities;- Educational facilities;- Entertainment activities;- Retirement villages;- Residential activities and residential units; and - Service stations. Potentially hazard sensitive activities comprise the following:- Buildings associated with primary production;- Commercial activities;- Industrial activities; and - Rural industry activities. Less hazard sensitive activities comprise of the following:- Accessory buildings used for non-habitable purposes;- Parks, facilities;- Parks |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | furniture; and – Buildings and structures associated with temporary activities. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P4 | S238.031 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Policy NH-P4 is supported. | Retain Policy NH-P4 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P6 | S238.032 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Policy NH-P6 is supported. | Retain Policy NH-P6 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P9 | S238.033 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Policy NH-P9 is supported. | Retain Policy NH-P9 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R2 | S238.034 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Rule NH-R2 is supported. Considers it appropriate that less hazard sensitive activities are afforded a general permitted activity status in all hazard areas. | Retain Rule NH-R2 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R3 | S238.035 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support in part | Support the Rule NH-R3 in principle, on the basis that it only applied to new activities and associated buildings but associated buildings, but seek some amendments. | Amend Rule NH-R3 as follows: "NH-R3 Any potentially hazard sensitive activity and associated buildings within moderate hazard areas and low hazard areas All zones 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. The activity or building is located within the possible liquefaction-prone area.; or b. The building is located within a flood hazard |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|----------|--------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | <p>overlay and does not have a footprint greater than 10m².</p> <p>All zones 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary</p> <p>Where: a. any building located in a flood hazard overlay has a finished floor level above the 1% AEP level; and a. The building is located within a flood hazard overlay and has:</p> <p>i. a footprint greater than 10m²; and ii. a finished floor level above the 1% AEP level.</p> <p>b. The activity is not located within a low to moderate fault hazard areas.</p> <p>Matters of discretion:</p> <p>1. For activities in the moderate hazard area, the matters in Policy NH-P3.</p> <p>2. For activities in the low hazard area, the matter in Policy NH-P4.</p> <p>All zones 3. Activity status: Discretionary</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance is not achieved with NH-R3(2)."</p> |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R4 | S238.036 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Rule NH-R4 is supported. | Retain Rule NH-R4 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R5 | S238.037 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited | Support | Rule NH-R5 is supported. | Retain Rule NH-R5 as notified |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---|----------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | | and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | | | |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R1 | S238.038 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Rule GRZ-R1 is supported on the basis that it applies to building and structures (including construction, additions and alterations) at existing service stations (and thus such activities are not a discretionary activity under Rules GRZ-R15 (commercial activities) or GRZ-R16 (any activity not otherwise listed in this chapter)). | Retain Rule GRZ-R1 as notified. |
| NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone | NCZ-R1 | S238.039 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Rule NCZ-R1 is supported on the basis that it applies to buildings and structures (including construction, additions and alterations) at existing service stations (and thus such activities are not a discretionary or non-complying activity under Rules TCZ-R15 (drive through activities) or TCZ-R16 (any activity not otherwise listed in this chapter)). | Retain Rule NCZ-R1 as notified. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-R1 | S238.040 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Rule TCZ is supported on the basis that it applies to buildings and structures (including construction, additions and alterations) at existing service stations (and thus such activities are not a discretionary or non-complying activity under Rules TCZ-R15 (drive-through activities) or TCZ-R16 (any activity not otherwise listed in this chapter)). | Retain Rule TCZ-R1 as notified. |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-O1 | S238.041 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Objective MUZ-O1 is supported. Considers that service stations are appropriate to, and support the role and functions of, the range of commercial, light industrial, residential, recreational and community activities in the Mixed Use Zone. | Retain Objective MUZ-O1 as notified. |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-O3 | S238.042 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Objective MUZ-O3 is supported. Considers that service stations and truck stops are an appropriate commercial activity in the zone and will not compromise the viability and vibrancy of the Town Centre Zone. | Retain Objective MUZ-O3 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-P1 | S238.043 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support in part | Policy MUZ-P1 is supported in principle but the Fuel Companies consider that service stations are an appropriate activity in the Mixed Use Zone for the reasons outlined in the submissions on Objectives MUZ-O1 and MUZ-O3, and nothing that the policy still retains the clear qualifier of "where they can meet the above criteria" under (a) to (c). | Amend Policy MUZ-P1 as follows: MUZ-P1 Compatible use and development Allow use and development that is compatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the Mixed Use Zone, where: a. the design and scale of any buildings is compatible with the surrounding area; b. there is an adequate existing and/or planned infrastructure to the service the activity; and c. the activity is not of a scale and nature it would undermine the purpose, function, and amenity values of the Town Centre Zone. Compatible activities may include the following (where they can meet the above criteria): a. residential activities consistent with MUZ-P3; b. healthcare activities; c. visitor accommodation; d. industrial activities (excluding noxious or offensive industry); e. community facilities; f. service stations; g. trade suppliers; and h. recreation activities. |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-P2 | S238.044 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Policy MUZ-P2 is supported. | Retain Policy MUZ-P2 as notified. |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-P3 | S238.045 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Policy MUZ-P3 is supported. | Retain Policy MUZ-P3 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|----------|---|---|
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-R1 | S238.046 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Rule MUZ-R1 is supported on the basis that it applies to buildings and structures (including constructions, additions and alterations) at existing service stations (and thus such activities are not a discretionary activity under MUZ-R12 (drive-through activities) or MUZ-R17 (any activity not otherwise listed in this chapter)). | Retain Rule MUZ-R1 as notified. |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | New provision request | S238.047 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Submitters consider that service stations are appropriate to, and support the role and function of, the range of commercial, light industrial, residential, recreational and community activities in the Mixed Use Zone. The "service stations" definition does not currently assist as service stations are not specifically provided for within the zone's rules or other provisions (i.e., they are assessed as "drive-through activities" and it is inappropriate that they are treated the same as say new drive-through restaurants in mixed use areas). Existing and new service stations, including any additions or alterations, should be provided for within the zone, otherwise these activities would require resource consent and be unduly restricted despite service stations being activities that are appropriate in the zone. The approach taken in the proposed new service station rule is similar to other permitted activity rules in the zone in terms of requiring compliance with Standard MUZ-S6, the restricted discretionary activity status if this is not met, and the matters of discretion (noting that we consider that operational and functional needs should be recognised and has been added). New buildings ² , structures, additions and alterations to the service station are managed under Rule MUZ-R1. | Insert a new Rule MUZ-RXX as follows: MUZ-RXX Service Station 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with: i. MUZ-S6.2 Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with MUZ-RXX(1)(a). Matters of discretion: 1. The matters of discretion for any infringed standard(s). 2. The operational need and functional need of the activity. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-O3 | S238.048 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited | Support | Objective GIZ-O3 is supported. While service stations and truck stops are not industrial activities, the Fuel Companies consider that | Retain Objective GIZ-O3 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|----------|--|---|
| | | | and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | | they support the role and function of industrial activities in the zone. | |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-O4 | S238.049 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Objective GIZ-O4 is supported. Considers that service stations and truck stops are an appropriate commercial activity in the zone and will not compromise the viability and vibrancy of the Commercial and Mixed Use Zones. | Retain Objective GIZ-O4 as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-P2 | S238.050 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Policy GIZ-P2 is supported. | Retain Policy GIZ-P2 as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-P3 | S238.051 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Objective GIZ-P3 is supported. Considers that service stations and truck stops are an appropriate commercial activity in the zone that supports the role and function of industrial activities in the zone and will not compromise the viability and vibrancy of the Commercial and Mixed Use Zones. | Retain Policy GIZ-P3 as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-R1 | S238.052 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | Rule GIZ-R1 is supported on the basis that it applies to buildings and structures (including construction, additions and alterations) at existing service stations and truck stops (and thus such activities are not a restricted discretionary activity under GIZ-R8 (drive-through activities) or GIZ-R14 (any activity not otherwise listed in this chapter)). | Retain Rule GIZ-R1 as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | New provision request | S238.053 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support | While service stations and truck stops are not industrial activities, the submitters state that they are appropriate to, and support the role and function of, industrial activities in the General Industrial Zone. The "service stations" definition does not currently assist as service stations are not specifically provided for within the zone's rules or other provisions (i.e. they are assessed as "drive-through activities", and it is inappropriate that | Insert a new Rule GIZ-RXX as follows: GIZ-RXX Service station1. Activity status: Permitted Where:b. Compliance is achieved with:i. GIZ-S6.2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where:a. Compliance is not achieved with GIZ-RXX(1)(a).Matters of discretion:1. The matters of discretion |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | they are treated the same as say new drive-through restaurants in industrial areas). Existing and new service stations, including any additions or alterations, should be provided for within the zone, otherwise these activities would require resource consent and be unduly restricted despite service stations and truck stops being activities that are appropriate in the zone. The approach taken in the proposed new service station rule is similar to other permitted activity rules in the zone in terms of requiring compliance with Standard GIZ-S6, the restricted discretionary activity status if this is not met, and the matters of discretion (considers that operational and functional needs should be recognised and has been added). New buildings, structures, additions and alterations to the service station are managed under Rule GIZ-R1. | for any infringed standard(s).2. The operational need and the functional need of the activity. |
| CL - Contaminated Land | CL-P1 | S238.058 | bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies') | Support in part | Policy CL-P1 is supported in principle however an amendment is sought to change "sites" under clause (b) to "land" so that it is consistent with the rest of the policy and its references to contaminated land and potentially contaminated land. | Policy CL-P1 is supported in principle however an amendment is sought to change "sites" under clause (b) to "land" so that it is consistent with the rest of the policy and its references to contaminated land and potentially contaminated land. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S226.001 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | The proposed zoning reflects the sites location within the existing Riversdale Settlement. | Retain the proposed Settlement Zone at 288 Riversdale Road. |
| Planning Maps | Specific Controls | S226.002 | Brian John McGuinness | Neutral | Notes that the Coastal Environment chapter as a whole (with specific reference to CE-O1, CE-O5, and CE-P5) requires consideration of potential subdivision, use, and development while recognizing that these activities can occur within the coastal environment where identified values are not compromised. | No specific decision requested. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R2 | S226.003 | Brian John McGuinness | Oppose in part | It does not appear to be the intention of the plan to support the non-complying activity status for subdivision within the Coastal Environment Overlay within the Settlement Zone. | Amend SUB-R2 to include a new matter of control as follows "19. In Settlement Zones located in the Coastal Environment Overlay, effects on the coastal |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------|---------------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | environment." (secondary relief) |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P7 | S226.004 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P4 | S226.005 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P1 | S226.006 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O5 | S226.007 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O4 | S226.008 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O3 | S226.009 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O2 | S226.010 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O1 | S226.011 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P4 | S226.012 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P2 | S226.013 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P1 | S226.014 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O3 | S226.015 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O2 | S226.016 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain as notified |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O1 | S226.017 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain as notified. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P2 | S226.018 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain as notified. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-O2 | S226.019 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P13 | S226.020 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P12 | S226.021 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P11 | S226.022 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P4 | S226.023 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P1 | S226.024 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-O2 | S226.025 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------|---|--|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R12 | S226.026 | Brian John McGuinness | Oppose in part | Submitter states that SUB-R12 requires that subdivision in the Coastal Environment Overlay achieves a minimum lot side of 40ha. The application of SUB-R12 is inconsistent with SUB-R2. A controlled activity status for subdivision in the Settlement Zone, where the Coastal Environment Overlay applies would be more appropriate. Amendment to SUB-R12 could be made to exclude the application of this rule to sites that are in the Settlement Zone. Alternatively an amendment to SUB-R12 to provide for subdivision in the coastal environment as a restricted discretionary activity, where the allotments would comply with SUB-S1 would also be appropriate. | Amend Rule SUB-R12 as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: (a) The site is not located in the Settlement Zone (Where a site is located in the Settlement Zone See Rule SUB-02)' OR ... (i) Any allotment created must have a minimum allotment size of 40ha or(ii) In the Settlement Zones located in the Coastal Environment any allotment created shall have a minimum allotment size that complies with SUB-S1... |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S9 | S226.027 | Brian John McGuinness | Oppose | Whilst a Financial Contribution chapter has been provided in the Plan. Standard SUB-S9 needs to be redrafted to include an appropriate standard for development contributions for subdivision. | Amend Standard SUB-S9 to include a standard for development contributions within SUB-S9. |
| FC - Financial Contributions | | S226.028 | Brian John McGuinness | Oppose | LGA requires annual review under the LTP and Annual Plan process. This is the most appropriate method outside of the Plan, and leaves contributions outside the Plan. Financial contributions timings are conditional on resource consent being granted, and can be secured by way of consenting conditions, they do not need to be included in the plan as there are other methods for this being achieved. | Delete FC - Financial Contributions chapter in its entirety. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P5 | S226.029 | Brian John McGuinness | Oppose in part | Submitter supports the intention of the Policy. However an amendment is needed to improve the interpretation of the Policy by Plan users identifying that the areas of the coastal settlements are identified as settlement zone. The Policy refers to the special qualities of each settlement however, the plan does not | Amend Policy CE-P5: ... Providing for residential units within existing coastal settlement zones to ensure the special qualities of each settlement are maintained. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | identify what these are or how they are achieved. | |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-O1 | S226.030 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Supports the intention of Objective. | Retain as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S1 | S226.031 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Supports Standards in Settlement Zone | Retain SETZ-S1 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R1 | S226.032 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Supports Rule as proposed. | Retain as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R7 | S226.033 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Supports Rule as proposed. | Retain as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R4 | S226.034 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Supports Rule as proposed. | Retain as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R3 | S226.035 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Supports Rule as proposed. | Retain as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R2 | S226.036 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Supports Rule as proposed. | Retain as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R13 | S226.037 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Supports Rule as notified. | Retain SETZ-R13 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-P2 | S226.038 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Supports the intention of the Policy. | Retain as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-P1 | S226.039 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Supports the intention of the Policy. | Retain as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-O1 | S226.040 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Supports the intention of the Objective. | Retain as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R12 | S226.041 | Brian John McGuinness | Oppose in part | It does not appear to be the intention of the plan to support the non-complying activity status for subdivision within the Coastal Environment Overlay within the Settlement Zone. | Amend SUB-R12 to allow for subdivision within the Settlement Zone affected by a Coastal Environment overlay to be undertaken as a Controlled activity. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|----------|--|--|
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S2 | S226.042 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Supports Standards in Settlement Zone | Retain SETZ-S2 as notified |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S3 | S226.043 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Supports Standards in Settlement Zone | Retain SETZ-S3 as notified |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S4 | S226.044 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Supports Standards in Settlement Zone | Retain SETZ-S4 as notified |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S5 | S226.045 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Supports Standards in Settlement Zone | Retain SETZ-S5 as notified |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S6 | S226.046 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Supports Standards in Settlement Zone | Retain SETZ-S6 as notified |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S7 | S226.047 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Supports Standards in Settlement Zone | Retain SETZ-S7 as notified |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S8 | S226.048 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Supports Standards in Settlement Zone | Retain SETZ-S8 as notified |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S9 | S226.049 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Supports Standards in Settlement Zone | Retain SETZ-S9 as notified |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S10 | S226.050 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Supports Standards in Settlement Zone | Retain SETZ-S10 as notified |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | GRZ-S11 | S226.051 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Supports Standards in Settlement Zone | Retain SETZ-S11 as notified |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S12 | S226.052 | Brian John McGuinness | Support | Supports Standards in Settlement Zone | Retain SETZ-S12 as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R7 | S95.001 | Brookside Developments - Featherston Limited | Oppose | Rules applying to Flood Alert Areas should be removed until more detailed research has been done to justify the Flood Hazard Areas shown on the planning maps. This "regulatory" tool directly contradicts the claim on page 19 of the S32 report that the Flood Alert information is only used for "information purposes only". | Delete NH-R7 until Flood Alert Areas can be fully justified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|--|----------|---|--|
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P13 | S95.002 | Brookside Developments - Featherston Limited | Oppose | Policy should be removed until more detailed research has been done to justify the Flood Alert Areas shown on the planning maps, using all the information available to SWDC, including modelling and preventative measures already in place for site specific, approved subdivisions. | Delete NH-P13 until Flood Alert Areas can be fully justified with robust, evidence-based mapping data. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P12 | S95.003 | Brookside Developments - Featherston Limited | Oppose | Policy should be removed until more detailed research has been done to justify the Flood Alert Areas shown on the planning maps, using all the information available to SWDC, including modelling and preventative measures already in place for site specific, approved subdivisions. | Delete NH-P12 until Flood Alert Areas can be fully justified with robust, evidence-based mapping data. |
| Planning Maps | Hazards and Risks | S95.004 | Brookside Developments - Featherston Limited | Oppose | There is lack of evidence and data to justify mapping of Flood Alert Areas on the Brookside site. Brookside constructed flood mitigation swales and have provided SWDC with accurate mapping of the site. The 'High Hazard' area does not accurately represent any flood risk on the site post-mitigation development. There is concern for the ramifications outside of the planning process including saleability, insurance premiums, reputational damage, and stress and anxiety to landowners. | Delete the Flood Alert Area from Brookside's land at 114A and 116A Harrison St East/Community Green and the 18 lots already created instages 2-4A. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P1 | S95.005 | Brookside Developments - Featherston Limited | Oppose | The submitter notes that there is a lack of technical evidence to justify having Flood Alert Areas. Section 32 report states "For some hazards (eg. Flood Alert Areas) a non-regulatory approach is taken, and the hazard is mapped for information only purposes. The mapped data was not considered robust enough to apply rules to these areas." Therefore, there is no current justification for rules to apply to these areas. | Delete the Flood Alert Areas from Proposed District Plan until sufficient robust and evidence-based data is available. |
| Planning Maps | Designations | S118.001 | Bruce Sollitt | Oppose | Opposed to proposed Designation SWDC-S-26. States that there is inadequate notification and consultation. The resource consent was non notified. The proposal for the site is not compliant with gifting criteria. | Delete proposed Designation SWDC-S-26. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|---|------------------|---------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | Significant health risks relating to smell, toxicity and effect on groundwater for surrounding residents and community. There is a disregard for large investments in small holdings and the effects on their values. | |
| Tangata Whenua | Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi | S195.001 | Bryon Mudgway | Oppose | <p>Despite the fact that consultation hui were held (thank you) the information provided on how lands owned or administered by individuals, whānau, marae, land trusts etc, the process of opt-in and opt-out was very contentious and speculative. The involvement of the Māori Land Court (MLC) in relation to opting in of all lands under their jurisdiction was not made clear until the last consultation hui held on 10 December 2023. Representatives of MLC should have been involved with the series of consultation and more so, needed to seek permission direct with Māori o Wairarapa in regard to the Māori Purpose Zone opt -in or out, kaupapa. The combined Wairarapa Councils breached Te Tiriti i.e. Article 2 - not enabling tangata whenua to participate in decision making and solely relying on advice of MLC & Article 3 equitable opportunity to opt-in or out of Māori Purpose Zone opposed to determining just the opt-in advice from MLC.</p> | Amend consultation period to afford tangata whenua o Wairapapa time to communicate with their whānau and beneficiaries that reside within and outside of Wairarapa. To enable this process to occur, extending the submission date for tangata whenua and to engage with both the Māori Land Court o Takitimu and Combined Wairarapa District Council representatives is requested. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S91.001 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Oppose | <p>Submitter intends to develop the site for residential use in the future. Considers rezoning is consistent with and efficiently and effectively achieves the proposed objectives. The proposed rezoning respects Martinborough's development pattern, contributes to meeting housing demand, would not result in fragmentation of highly productive land given existing fragmentation. It would support release of land for subdivision and development concurrently with the delivery of critical infrastructure, and enable subdivision and development of the</p> | Amend the maps to rezone 3 Roberts Street, Martinborough from Future Urban Zone to General Residential Zone. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | site to be restricted until infrastructure capacity is available. | |
| Planning Maps | Precincts | S91.002 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Oppose | To ensure that future development of 3 Roberts Street, Martinborough is consistent with the existing pattern of development in Martinborough. | Amend planning maps to include 3 Roberts Street, Martinborough in the Low-Density Residential Overlay. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S91.003 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Oppose | To accurately reflect the current land use of these properties. To ensure that the 'Roberts Street' block has a consistent zoning. | Amend planning maps to rezone properties at 5 - 19 Roberts Street, Martinborough from General Future Urban Zone to Residential Zone. |
| Strategic Direction | TW-O1 | S91.004 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain TW-O1 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | TW-O2 | S91.005 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain TW-O2 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | TW-O4 | S91.006 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain TW-O4 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O2 | S91.007 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain UFD-O2 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O3 | S91.008 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain UFD-O3 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O4 | S91.009 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain UFD-O4 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-O2 | S91.010 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain TR-O2 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-O3 | S91.011 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain TR-O3 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P1 | S91.012 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain TR-P1 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P2 | S91.013 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain TR-P2 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| TR - Transport | TR-P3 | S91.014 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain TR-P3 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P4 | S91.015 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain TR-P4 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P5 | S91.016 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain TR-P5 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P7 | S91.017 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain TR-P7 as notified. |
| CL - Contaminated Land | CL-O1 | S91.018 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support the intention of Objective. | Retain CL-O1 as notified. |
| CL - Contaminated Land | CL-P1 | S91.019 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain CL-P1 as notified. |
| CL - Contaminated Land | CL-P2 | S91.020 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain CL-P2 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-O1 | S91.021 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain NH-O1 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P4 | S91.022 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain NH-P4 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P12 | S91.023 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain NH-P12 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P13 | S91.024 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain NH-P13 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O1 | S91.025 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain SUB-O1 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O2 | S91.026 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain SUB-O2 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O3 | S91.027 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain SUB-O3 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P1 | S91.028 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain SUB-P1 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P2 | S91.029 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain SUB-P2 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P7 | S91.030 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Neutral | Support intention of Policy. | Retain SUB-P7 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P8 | S91.031 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Neutral | Support intention of Policy. | Retain SUB-P8 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R2 | S91.032 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support in respect of standard applying to the residential zone and future urban zone (subject to rezoning of 3 Roberts Street to Residential Zone). | Retain SUB-R2 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S1 | S91.033 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support in respect of standard applying to the residential zone and future urban zone (subject to rezoning of 3 Roberts Street to Residential Zone) | Retain SUB-S1 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-O1 | S91.034 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain GRZ-O1 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-O2 | S91.035 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain GRZ-O2 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-O4 | S91.036 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Objective. | Retain GRZ-O4 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P5 | S91.037 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain GRZ-P5 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P7 | S91.038 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain GRZ-P7 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P8 | S91.039 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Policy. | Retain GRZ-P8 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R1 | S91.040 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of Rule. | Retain GRZ-R1 as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-O1 | S91.041 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support in part | Support intention of Objective (subject to rezoning of 3 Roberts Street to Residential Zone). | Retain FUZ-O1 as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-O2 | S91.042 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support in part | Support intention of Objective (subject to rezoning of 3 Roberts Street to Residential Zone). | Retain FUZ-O2 as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-O3 | S91.043 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support in part | Support intention of Objective (subject to rezoning of 3 Roberts Street to Residential Zone). | Retain FUZ-O3 as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-P1 | S91.044 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support in part | Support intention of Policy (subject to rezoning of 3 Roberts Street to Residential Zone). | Retain FUZ-P1 as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-P2 | S91.045 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support in part | Support intention of Policy (subject to rezoning of 3 Roberts Street to Residential Zone). | Retain FUZ-P2 as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-P4 | S91.046 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support in part | Support intention of Policy (subject to rezoning of 3 Roberts Street to Residential Zone). | Retain FUZ-P4 as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-R1 | S91.047 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support in part | Support intention of Rule (subject to rezoning of 3 Roberts Street to Residential Zone). | Retain FUZ-R1 as notified. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S91.048 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Neutral | Any document incorporated by reference should be correctly referred to in the plan. | Amend provisions that refer to the 'Council's Engineering Development standrd' to currently refer to the 'Engineering and Development Standards 2023' incopriated by reference into the plan. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|----------|--|---|
| TR - Transport | TR-S1 | S91.049 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Oppose | The standard requires that roads are formed in accordance with the Council's Engineering Development Standard. The Council's Engineering Development Standard or Engineering and Development Standards 2023 contain a number of requirements that have not been developed as a 'standard' for a District Plan. It would be difficult for users to know if 'accordance' with the standard was achieved to ascertain activity status. | Amend TR-S1 to delete references to the 'Council's Engineering Development Standard'. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S5 | S91.050 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Oppose | The standard requires that accessways are formed in accordance with the Council's Engineering Development Standard. The Council's Engineering Development Standard or Engineering and Development Standards 2023 contain a number of requirements that have not been developed as a 'standard' for a District Plan. It would be difficult for users to know if 'accordance' with the standard was achieved to ascertain activity status. | Amend TR-S5 to delete reference to the 'Council's Engineering Development Standard'. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S8 | S91.051 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Oppose | The standard requires that vehicle crossing points are formed in accordance with the Council's Engineering Development Standard. The Council's Engineering Development Standard or Engineering and Development Standards 2023 contain a number of requirements that have not been developed as a 'standard' for a District Plan. It would be difficult for users to know if 'accordance' with the standard was achieved to ascertain activity status. | Amend TR-S8 to delete reference to the 'Council's Engineering Development Standard'. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S13 | S91.052 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Oppose | The standard requires that accessways include stormwater control in accordance with the Council's Engineering Development Standard. The Council's Engineering Development Standard or Engineering and Development Standards 2023 contain a number of requirements that have not been developed as a 'standard' for a District Plan. It would be difficult for users to know if 'accordance' with the standard was achieved to ascertain activity status. | Amend TR-S13 to delete reference to the 'Council's Engineering Development Standard'. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| TR - Transport | TR-S16 | S91.053 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Oppose | Minimum parking requirement in the South Wairarapa District is unnecessary. The s32 report does not provide any evidence to demonstrate the need for minimum parking requirements. Land use for parking can be an inefficient use of land and discourages the use of alternative transport methods (i.e. walking, cycling, and public transport). | Amend TR-S16 to delete the minimum car parking requirements and Table TR-9. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S3 | S91.054 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Oppose | The standard requires connection to Councils reticulated water supply systems at the allotment boundary in accordance with the Council's Engineering Development Standard. The Council's Engineering Development Standard or Engineering and Development Standards 2023 contain a number of requirements that have not been developed as a 'standard' for a District Plan. It would be difficult for users to know if 'accordance' with the standard was achieved to ascertain activity status. | Amend SUB-S3 to delete reference to the 'Council's Engineering Development Standard'. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S4 | S91.055 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Oppose | The standard requires connection to Councils reticulated wastewater systems at the allotment boundary in accordance with the Council's Engineering Development Standard. The Council's Engineering Development Standard or Engineering and Development Standards 2023 contain a number of requirements that have not been developed as a 'standard' for a District Plan. It would be difficult for users to know if 'accordance' with the standard was achieved to ascertain activity status. | Amend SUB-S4 to delete reference to the 'Council's Engineering Development Standard'. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S5 | S91.056 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Oppose | The standard requires treatment of stormwater in accordance with the Council's Engineering Development Standard. The Council's Engineering Development Standard or Engineering and Development Standards 2023 contain a number of requirements that have not been developed as a 'standard' for a District Plan. It would be difficult for users to know if 'accordance' with the standard was achieved to ascertain activity status. | Amend SUB-S5 to delete reference to the 'Council's Engineering Development Standard'. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|----------|--|---|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S9 | S91.057 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Oppose | <p>The plan notes: "Note: This Draft District Plan does not contain financial contribution provisions. The Councils have been reviewing different approaches for financial contributions. Specific consultation on financial contributions is proposed in 2023 and will be considered during the next phase in preparing the Proposed District Plan."</p> <p>A Financial Contributions chapter has been provided in the Proposed District Plan. This standard needs to be re-drafted to include an appropriate standard for development contributions for subdivision (or the relief sought in the financial contributions chapter).</p> | Amend SUB-S9 to refer to the financial contributions chapter. |
| FC - Financial Contributions | | S91.058 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Oppose | <p>The LGA requires annual review under the LTP and Annual Plan process. This most appropriate method outside the plan, and leaves contributions outside the District Plan. Financial contributions timings are conditional on resource consent being granted, and can be secured by way of consent conditions, they do not need to be included in the plan as there are other methods of this being achieved. See section 8.11 of the report attached to the original submission.</p> | Delete the Financial Contributions Chapter. |
| FC - Financial Contributions | FC-S2 | S91.059 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Oppose | <p>In Martinborough it is apparent significant works need to be undertaken to provide wastewater capacity to support existing and future residential development. The works are a result of continues mismanagement of assets over tie. Council has failed to undertake necessary maintenance and upgrade works to enable capacity and has not provided any capacity for growth. There is a need for financial contributions in order to support the provision and maintenance of infrastructure however it is not considered that is appropriate that the cost of these upgrades to provide capacity (which are currently unknown) are placed wholly on developers.</p> | No decision requested. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P4 | S91.060 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of policy. | Retain GRZ-P4 as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-P3 | S91.061 | Canoe Wines Limited Partnership | Support | Support intention of policy. | Retain FUZ-P3 as notified. |
| Planning Maps | Historical and Cultural Values | S265.001 | Carolyn Mary Wait | Support in part | Support the increasing protection of historic heritage precinct. | Amend maps to increase the size of the Historic Heritage Precinct in Greytown. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | New provision request | S265.002 | Carolyn Mary Wait | Amend | Make provision for supermarkets with safe access outside the Heritage Precinct, and require the area to reflect the style, values, and culture of the community. | Insert provisions in the Historic Heritage chapter to requiring large scale commercial activities, such as supermarkets, to locate outside Historic Heritage Precincts |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S108.001 | Catrina Sue | Oppose | Considers the opt-in/opt-out process for the Māori Purpose Zone was contentious, speculative, and unclear as to the involvement of the Māori Land Court (MLC) in relation to opting in of all lands under their jurisdiction. Considers that representatives of MLC should have been involved in consultation and needed to seek permission with Māori o Wairarapa. Considers that the Councils breached Te Tiriti (i.e. Article 2 - not enabling tangata whenua to participate in decision making and solely relying on advice of MLC & Article 3 equitable opportunity to opt-in or out of Māori Purpose Zone opposed to determining just the opt-in advice from MLC). | Amend submissions deadline to afford tangatawhenua o Wairarapa time to consult wider with their whānau and beneficiaries that reside within and outside of Wairarapa, engage with both the Māori Land Court o Takitimu, and the Combined Wairarapa District Council representatives. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S232.001 | CentrePort Limited | Support | Supports definition as it provides for Waingawa log hub operations including storage of raw materials. | Retain definition of 'Industrial Activity' as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-O1 | S232.002 | CentrePort Limited | Support | Supports intent of the objective. | Retain GIZ-O1 as notified. |
| GIZ - General | GIZ-P2 | S232.003 | CentrePort Limited | Support | Supports intent of the policy. | Retain GIZ-P2 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|----------|--|---|
| Industrial Zone | | | | | | |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-P4 | S232.004 | CentrePort Limited | Support | Supports intent of the policy. Considers that adding definitions for 'adjacent' and 'adjoining' and ensuring consistency throughout the plan would assist with interpretation. | Retain GIZ-P4 as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-R9 | S232.006 | CentrePort Limited | Oppose | The definition for 'rural industry' refers to activities 'undertaken in a rural environment'. Submitter considers that it is therefore not relevant in the GIZ and that most activities are captured by this definition would likely also fall within the definition of 'industrial activity' creating some confusion in application of the rules. | Delete Rule GIZ-R9 |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-S3 | S232.007 | CentrePort Limited | Amend | Supports the intent of the policy and considers that the setbacks are appropriate for the zone. Notes the use of 'adjacent' and 'adjoining' is unclear and would benefit from definitions to assist in interpretation. | Retain GIZ-S3 as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-S5 | S232.008 | CentrePort Limited | Amend | The Waingawa Structure Plan requires a 10m wide buffer around it's perimeter. This is more stringent requirement than GIZ-S5 and GIZ-S6. The submitter considers that it would be appropriate for these standards to specifically exclude sites in Waingawa Industrial Area, so that only GIZ-S7 applies, | Amend GIZ-S5: 1. Except in the Waingawa Industrial Area, A an industrial activity shall provide screening from any site zoned... |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-S6 | S232.009 | CentrePort Limited | Amend | The Waingawa Structure Plan requires a 10m wide buffer around it's perimeter. This is more stringent requirement than GIZ-S5 and GIZ-S6. The submitter considers that it would be appropriate for these standards to specifically exclude sites in Waingawa Industrial Area, so that only GIZ-S7 applies. | Amend GIZ-S6: 1. Except in the Waingawa Industrial Area, any outdoor storage or servicing area that is... |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-S7 | S232.010 | CentrePort Limited | Support | Supports inclusion of this standard. Requests that those standards are amended to reflect that they are superseded by GIZ-S7 in Waingawa. | Retain GIZ-S7 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R1 | S232.011 | CentrePort Limited | Amend | Considers it should not be necessary to gain resource consent for the maintenance and repair of vehicle crossing. Proposes a separate rule to provide for maintenance or | Amend TR-R1 Construction or , alteration, maintenance, and repair of accessways, vehicle crossings, parking, and loading areas. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|-------------------------|------------------|--------------------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | repair as a permitted activity where the form and function is not altered. | AND Add a new rule: TR-RX Maintenance and repair of accessways, vehicle crossings, parking and loading areas. All Zones. 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. the form and function of the accessway, vehicle crossing, parking or loading area is not altered. Note: if the form and function of the accessway is altered, Rule TR-R1 applies. |
| Appendix 5 - Industrial Design Guide | Industrial Design Guide | S232.012 | CentrePort Limited | Support | Supports intent of the design guide and considers that it generally balances ecological and amenity values with operational requirements. | Retain the Industrial Design Guide as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-R4 | S232.013 | CentrePort Limited | Support | Supports this rule and considers that the listed standards are generally appropriate. The submitter notes that GIZ-S10 refers to 'buildings and activities' and seeks clarification whether this rule (and other activity rules in this chapter) should require compliance with GIZ-S10. | Amend GIZ-R4 to require compliance with GIZ-S10 if GIZ-S10 applies to all activities as well as buildings. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-S10 | S232.014 | CentrePort Limited | Support | The submitter supports the intent of the policy however the standard refers to 'building and activities' which is referenced in GIZ-R1 and R3, which apply to buildings and structures. There is no direct mechanism for this to apply to other activities (i.e. not buildings), unclear of whether this is intentional. | Amend GIZ-S10 to clarify whether this standard applies to activities other than building and structures. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S232.015 | CentrePort Limited | Support | Supports the inclusion of this definition, noting log storage at Waingawa would fall under this definition. | Retain definition of 'outdoor storage' as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-O3 | S232.016 | CentrePort Limited | Support | Supports intent of the objective. | Retain GIZ-O3 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------|---------------------------------------|----------|--|---|
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-O5 | S232.017 | CentrePort Limited | Support | Supports intent of the objective. | Retain GIZ-O5 as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-P3 | S232.018 | CentrePort Limited | Support | Supports intent of the policy. | Retain GIZ-P3 as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-P5 | S232.019 | CentrePort Limited | Support | Supports intent of the policy but notes it is also relevant to other adjacent zones. Considers this may be missed when considering activities in other zones, and a cross-reference or similar in other zones would ensure it is not missed. | Retain GIZ-P5 as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-P6 | S232.020 | CentrePort Limited | Support | Supports intent of the policy | Retain GIZ-P6 as notified |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S232.021 | CentrePort Limited | Amend | Considers a definition for 'adjacent' could assist with Plan interpretation, and check this is used consistently and correctly throughout the Plan. | Insert a new definition of 'adjacent'. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S232.022 | CentrePort Limited | Support | Considers a definition for 'adjoining' could assist with Plan interpretation, and check this is used consistently and correctly throughout the Plan. | Insert a new definition of 'adjoining'. |
| Designations | SWDC - South Wairarapa District Council | S31.001 | Charlotte Gendall and Georgina Miller | Support | Support the continued operation of the temporary Martinborough Treatment Plant. If any changes are to be made, or the facility becomes permanent, notification to surroundings areas will be expected. | Retain the existing operation, maintenance, and improvements to the temporary Martinborough Treatment Plant (SWDC-S-25). |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | | S254.001 | Charmaine Kura-o-Tahu Kawana | Oppose | Considers the opt-in/opt-out process for the Māori Purpose Zone was contentious, speculative, and unclear as to the involvement of the Māori Land Court (MLC) in relation to opting in of all lands under their jurisdiction. Considers that representatives of MLC should have been involved in consultation and needed to seek permission with Māori o Wairarapa. Considers that the Councils breached Te Tiriti (i.e. Article 2 - not enabling tangata whenua to participate in | Amend submissions deadline to afford tangata whenua o Wairarapa time to consult wider with their whānau and beneficiaries that reside within and outside of Wairarapa, engage with both the Māori Land Court o Takitimu, and the Combined Wairarapa District Council representatives. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|--|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | decision making and solely relying on advice of MLC & Article 3 equitable opportunity to opt-in or out of Māori Purpose Zone opposed to determining just the opt-in advice from MLC). | |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S189.001 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Oppose | Throughout the plan, whether it be a matter of discretion or in an objective or policy, the term functional and operational need has been used. The terms functional need and operational need are separately defined in the PDP (as per the National Planning Standards) and as such, need to be separated when being referred to. Any assessment for a network utility should not have to meet both terms, but only one of them. | Amend the term 'functional and operational need' each time it is used in the PDP as follows: Functional need and or operational need. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S189.002 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support | Definitions rely on NESTF definitions, National Planning Standards and RMA. | Retain the Definition of the following - Antenna, Cabinet, Customer Connection Line, Functional Need, Infrastructure, Network Utility, Network Utility Operator, Operational Need, Pole. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S189.003 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand | Support | The definition of upgrade clearly outlines what is required for a proposal for a Network Utility Operator to use the upgrade provisions. However, it relies on other provisions, being maintenance and repair; it is noted the definitions of maintenance and repair relate solely to heritage structures not network utility structures. | Amend the definition of Upgrade as follows: As it applies to network utilities, means the improvement or increase in carrying capacity, operational efficiency, security, or safety of existing infrastructure, but excludes maintenance and repair. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | | | |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S189.004 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | NU-R10 refers to communication kiosks, but there is currently no definition of what these are in the PDP. | Insert a definition of Communication Kiosk as follows: Any structure intended for public use to facilitate telecommunications and includes boxes or booths for telephone, video screen or internet services or other means to convey encrypted or non-encrypted sign, signal, impulse, writing, image, sound, instruction, information, or intelligence of any nature. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S189.005 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | The amendments sought to the subdivision amendments refer to a telecommunications network. As such, and to provide clarity, a definition of this term is needed. | Insert a definition of Telecommunication Network as follows: A system comprising telecommunication links to permit telecommunication. |
| Interpretation | Abbreviations | S189.006 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand | Support in part | The term NESTF is used in the PDP as an abbreviation of the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities) Regulations 2016 | Insert the following Abbreviation: NESTF - Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities) Regulations 2016 |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|--|----------|--|--|
| | | | Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | | | |
| National Direction Instruments | National Environmental Standards | S189.007 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support | Recognising the Resource Management (Network Utility Operations) Regulations 2016 as a relevant National Environmental Standards is supported | Retain the recognition of the NESTF as notified. |
| National Direction Instruments | Regulations | S189.008 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support | Recognising the Resource Management (Network Utility Operations) Regulations 2016 as a relevant National Environmental Standards is supported. | Retain the recognition of the Resource Management (Network Utility Operations) Regulations 2016 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | New provision request | S189.009 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand | Amend | A strategic objective seeking that rural communities and development are supported with the provision of infrastructure to enable rural communities to connect with and positively contribute to the area's economic and social wellbeing is sought. | Insert a new objective as follows: RE-O6 - Infrastructure Rural communities and development are provided with infrastructure to enable connections with and ongoing positive contributions to the Wairarapa's economic and social |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | | | wellbeing. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O1 | S189.010 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | The general direction of UFD-O1 is supported, however clarification is sought to what the term 'connected' means, and ensuring it is broader than simply a transport connection. | Amend UDF-O1 as follows: Wairarapa's urban form is a series of connected urban areas connected by infrastructure located along the main transport routes which each support a local community. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O2 | S189.011 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support | Recognising that urban growth needs to be serviced by infrastructure is supported. | Retain UFD-O2 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O4 | S189.012 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand | Support | Recognising that urban growth needs to be integrated with infrastructure is supported. | Retain UFD-O4 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | | | |
| Strategic Direction | INF-O1 | S189.013 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | A strategic direction objective for infrastructure is supported. However, it is unclear what "well managed" means in terms of adverse effects. Some infrastructure, due to its functional and operational need, will have residual adverse effects of varying degrees, which needs to be recognised in the objective. | Amend INF-O1 as follows: The benefits of infrastructure are recognised, while ensuring its adverse effects are well managed (and consideration given to the functional or operational need of the infrastructure) . and Ensure infrastructure is protected from incompatible land use, subdivision and development, including reverse sensitivity effects. |
| NU - Network Utilities | Introduction | S189.014 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support | The introduction appropriately explains the need for network utilities, including the benefits that they provide to modern society. It also clearly explains that the rules in the chapter apply on a district-wide basis, that the zone rules do not apply, but that the provisions in other district wide chapters do apply. This clarity is necessary, and supported. | Retain the introduction as notified |
| NU - Network Utilities | Introduction | S189.015 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand | Support | The NESTF is clearly recognised as also being relevant to the network utility planning framework. | Retain the Relationship with Other Regulations as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | | | |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O1 | S189.016 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support | Recognising the benefits of network utilities is strongly supported | Retain NU-O1 as notified |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O2 | S189.017 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | The objective as notified provides appropriate context for plan users in terms of the functional and operational need of network utilities, and their positive effects. However, as drafted it still requires adverse effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated. This should be to the extent practicable, as it is not always possible to completely avoid, remedy or mitigate all actual and potential adverse effects. | Amend NU-O2 as follows: The adverse effects of network utilities on the environment are avoided, remedied, or mitigated to the greatest extent practicable , while recognising: a. the functional need and operational need of network utilities; and b. that positive effects of network utilities may be realised locally, regionally, or nationally. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O3 | S189.018 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand | Support | Reverse sensitivity is an issue, and an objective to address is supported. | Retain NU-O3 as notified |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|----------|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | | | |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P1 | S189.019 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support | Recognising the benefits of network utilities is strongly supported. | Retain NU-P1 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P2 | S189.020 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support | NU-P2 is a useful policy, provided it is underpinned/supported by similar policies in the chapters which allow for land use | Retain NU-P2 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P3 | S189.021 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand | Support | Telecommunications technology evolves at a fast rate, often faster than District Plan provisions. A policy recognition technological advances is therefore supported. | Retain NU-P3 as notified |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | | | |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P4 | S189.022 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | While it is appropriate to address the actual and potential effects of network utilities, some additional qualification is proposed to NU-P4, to recognise the need for and benefits of network utilities to the communities which they are serving. | Amend NU-P4 as follows: Manage the adverse effects of network utilities, including effects on natural and physical resources, amenity values, sensitive activities, and the health, safety, and wellbeing of people and communities by: a. controlling the height, bulk, and location of network utilities, where practicable, without compromising the function or need for the proposed network utility; b. requiring compliance with recognised standards or guidelines for the potential adverse effects of noise, vibration, radiofrequency fields, and electric and magnetic fields; c. requiring the undergrounding of new network utilities in urban areas unless there are technological or operational constraints, or natural or physical features that make underground placement impractical or unreasonable; d. encouraging the undergrounding of new and existing network utilities in all other areas, while recognising there are technological or operational constraints, or natural or physical features that make underground placement impractical or unreasonable; e. mitigating adverse visual effects through landscaping and/or the use of |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | recessive colours and finishes, where possible; and f. requiring network utilities to adopt sensitive design to integrate network utilities within the site, existing built form and/or landscape, and to maintain the character and amenity of the surrounding area where practicable, without compromising the function or need for the proposed network utility. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P5 | S189.023 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | A policy which provides balance as to how decisions are made on the adverse effects of network utilities is supported. Again, some qualification is proposed to recognise the practical elements of network utility operations. The benefit of the network utility should also be considered. | Amend NU-P5 as follows: Ensure that network utilities avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects on the environment as much as is practicable , while recognising the functional need and operational need of the network utility, and having regard to: a. the extent to which adverse effects have been addressed through site, route, or method selection and/or the extent to which the network utility is constrained by functional need or operational need; b. the necessity of the network utility, including: i. the need to quickly repair and restore disrupted services; and ii. the impact of not operating, repairing, maintaining, upgrading, removing, or developing the network utility; c. the time, duration, or frequency of adverse effects; d. the location of existing network |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | utilities, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the complexity and connectedness of the networks and services; and ii. the potential for co-location and shared use of network utility corridors; and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> anticipated outcomes for the receiving environment, including the role, function, and predominant planned character of the underlying zone, and how the network utility will benefit the users of that zone. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R3 | S189.024 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | The rule requires amendment so that terms within the rule align with defined terms in the PDP. For instance the rule refers to a telecommunications pole whereas the definitions in the PDP only have a definition for pole and that definition aligns with the NESTF. There is no definition of a tower. | Amend NU-R3 as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The realignment, relocation, or replacement of a line, pipe, telecommunication pole, pole, tower, conductor, switch, transformer, or ancillary structure is within 5m of the existing alignment or location; i. a pole is not replaced with a tower; ii. a replacement pole, tower, or telecommunication pole does not exceed the height of the replaced pole or tower or telecommunication pole by the greater of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) more than 15%; or b) the maximum structure height for the underlying zone set out in NU-S1; ii the diameter or width of a replacement pole or telecommunication pole: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) does not exceed twice that of the replaced pole at its widest point; or |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>b) where a single pole is replaced with a pi pole, the width of the pi pole structure must not exceed three times the width of the replaced pole at its widest point; iv. a replacement tower's footprint does not exceed the width of the tower by more than 25%; v. there are no additional towers;</p> <p>vi. an additional pole, up to a maximum of two poles, is necessary to achieve the conductor clearances required by NZECP 34:2001; and</p> <p>vii. all structures that are no longer required for network utility purposes are removed within two years of being replaced or becoming redundant; or</p> <p>b. The realignment, relocation, or replacement of any other network utility;</p> <p>i. all structures that are no longer required for network utility purposes are removed within two years of being replaced or becoming redundant; and</p> <p>ii. compliance is achieved with all Network Utilities Standards</p> |
| <p>NU - Network Utilities</p> | <p>NU-R4</p> | <p>S189.025</p> | <p>Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand</p> | <p>Support in part</p> | <p>Defined terms in the PDP need to be used to provide clarity for permitted activity standards. The reference to all Network Utility Standards should be more specific. For instance, why is NU-S3 Parking and Access Requirements a consideration for customer connection lines?</p> | <p>Amend NU-R4 as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The connection does not include a new tower;</p> <p>b. The connection does not exceed three additional poles; and</p> <p>c. Compliance is achieved with all</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | | | Network Utilities Standard NU-S1 . |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R5 | S189.026 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | Permitted provision for temporary network utilities is supported. However, temporary network utilities give rise to temporary effects. Subclause NU-R5(1)(c) requires compliance with all network utility standards. This means there is no additional benefit to a temporary facility over and above a permanent one in the same location. While it is appropriate that some network utility standards are met, it is not essential for all standards to be met. | Amend NU-R5 as follows: 1. Activity status: PermittedWhere: a. The temporary network utility operates for a maximum of 12 months; b. All temporary network utilities and associated buildings and structures are removed from the site on completion of the works; and c. Compliance is achieved with all Network Utilities Standards NU-S4, NU-S5, NU-S6, and NU-S7 . |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R7 | S189.027 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support | Providing for network utilities within existing buildings is supported. | Retain NU-R7 as notified |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R10 | S189.028 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand | Support | The permitted sizes provided for communications kiosk or minor utility structures and cabinets, and electric vehicle charging stations are appropriate. | Retain NU-R10 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | | | |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R11 | S189.029 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | <p>For the most part, the rule clearly aligns with regulated activities under the NESTF. Restricted Discretionary activity status is appropriate for activities which cannot meet the permitted requirements. Not all network utility standards are necessary. For example NU-S2 (relating to setbacks) is not needed due to the relatively slimline nature of telecommunication structures, and clause NU-R11(1)(a) requiring setbacks from residential zone boundaries.</p> <p>Likewise, telecommunication facilities do not give rise to parking and access requirements, or electric and magnetic fields (hence the NESTF only being regulating radiofrequency effects).</p> <p>Some minor tweaking of the permitted provisions is needed to provide for technological changes that are occurring.</p> | <p>Amend NU-R11 as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: PermittedWhere:...</p> <p>f. For antenna attached to a building, the antenna does not exceed a height of 5m above the building height if the building is in a residential zone and is less than 15m high, or 5m above the point of attachment to the building in all other zones;</p> <p>g. Other network utility buildings or structures do not exceed a footprint of 26m² or and a height of 21.8m in residential zones and a footprint of 5m² and a height of 2.5m in all other zones; and</p> <p>h. Compliance is achieved with all Network Utilities Standards NU-S1, NU-S4, NU-S6 and NU-S7</p> |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R12 | S189.030 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New | Support in part | <p>Providing a rule which has a graduated (Controlled then Restricted Discretionary) activity status for activities that are regulated under the NESTF but cannot meet the permitted regulations of that document is supported. The matters of control are appropriate and work together well. A greater panel antenna width is sought to provide greater certainty for new technologies.</p> | <p>Amend NU-R12 as follows:1. Activity status: ControlledWhere</p> <p>a. For panel antenna: a width of 0.89m is not exceeded.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | | | |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R13 | S189.031 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Amend | Providing a rule which has a graduated (Controlled then Restricted Discretionary) activity status for activities that are regulated under the NESTF but cannot meet the permitted regulations of that document is supported. The matters of control are appropriate and work together well. A minor tweak is sought so it is clear which face of a panel antenna the permitted area applies to. | Amend NU-R14 as follows: 1. Activity status: Controlled Where: a. A new panel antenna does not exceed a maximum front face area of 2m ² ; and b. For antenna attached to a building, provided the antenna does not exceed a height of 5m above the point of attachment to the building |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R14 | S189.032 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | <p>Providing a rule which has a graduated (Controlled then Restricted Discretionary) activity status for activities that are regulated under the NESTF but cannot meet the permitted regulations of that document is supported. The matters of control are appropriate and work together well.</p> <p>A minor tweak is sought so it is clear which face of a panel antenna the permitted area applies to. Functional and operational need are separately defined in the PDP, and the matter of control, through use of the word 'and' requires both to be considered. Given the separate definitions, they should be assessed independently and not linked.</p> | <p>Amend NU-R14 as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Controlled Where: a. A new panel antenna does not exceed a maximum front face area of 2m²;and b. For antenna attached to a building, provided the antenna does not exceed a height of 5m above the point of attachment to the building.</p> <p>Matters of control:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The functional need and or operational need of, and benefits from, the network utility, including the potential impact on the levels of service or health and safety if the work is not undertaken. The amenity values of the respective zone and the extent to which any adverse visual amenity effects can be avoided, remedied, or mitigated. The location of network utilities, including the need for connections to |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | existing networks and services. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R15 | S189.033 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Amend | Permitted provision (a) allows buildings and structures not otherwise provided to have a height of the maximum building and structure height for the underlying zone is complied with, or the building does not exceed a height of 10m, whichever is greater. This is supported. It allows for buildings with the same height characteristics as other uses within a zone. The same principle should be applied to building footprint. The current permitted standard of 20m ² is too small for a new telecommunications exchange, yet in most instances the permitted footprint or site coverage in the underlying zone is appropriate for such a structure. | Amend NU-R15 as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The maximum building and structure height for the underlying zone is complied with, or the building does not exceed a height of 10m, whichever is greater; b. The building or structure does not exceed a footprint for the underlying zone is complied with of 20m²; c. The building or structure is set back 3m from any site boundary in any Residential Zone; and d. Compliance is achieved with all Network Utilities Standards. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-S1 | S189.034 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | The wording in the standard needs to align with defined terms in the PDP, and as such the term tower should be deleted. The proposed permitted heights are generally appropriate, although there should be encouragement for colocation as per the direction provided in NU-P5(d)(ii). The exclusions from the height standards for the Residential and Commercial zones are also appropriate. The same exclusions should apply to all other zones. | Amend NU-S1 as follows [Residential Zones] For towers and poles: 15m For telecommunications poles: For a single user of a pole, 15.7m or 5m above the permitted height standard of the zone in which the structure is located, whichever is the greater. For two or more users of a pole, the permitted height in S1A plus an additional 5m of height. Except that: 1. Omni directional 'whip', GPS, or dipole antenna that complies with dimensions in NU-R11(d) are excluded from the 'combined height' (i.e. only the pole needs to comply with the maximum |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------|---|
| | | | | | | <p>structure height). Lightning rods are exempt from maximum height standard. [Commercial Zones] For towers and poles: 20m For telecommunications poles: For a single user of a pole, 20m or 5m above the permitted height standard of the zone in which the structure is located, whichever is the greater. For two or more users of a pole, the permitted height in S1A plus an additional 5m of height Except that: 1. Omni directional 'whip', GPS, or dipole antenna that complies with dimensions in NU-R11(d) are excluded from the 'combined height' (i.e. only the pole needs to comply with the maximum structure height). Lightning rods are exempt from maximum height standard.</p> <p>[Rural Zones, Open Space Zones, General Industrial Zone, Special Purpose Zone] 25m, or 30m where there are two or more users of the same pole. Rural Zones 35m, or 40m where there are two or more users of the same pole: 1. Omni directional 'whip', GPS, or dipole antenna that complies with dimensions in NU-R11(d) are excluded from the 'combined height' (i.e. only the pole needs to comply with the maximum</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | structure height). Lightning rods are exempt from maximum height standard. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P3 | S189.035 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | The use of transport corridors for other infrastructure should also be recognised in this policy. | Amend TR-P3 as follows: Identify and manage a classification of roads and other transport corridors within the Wairarapa based on the One Network Framework to ensure that the function of each corridor is recognised and protected when managing subdivision and land use. Recognise that transport corridors are an appropriate space for other infrastructure. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R1 | S189.036 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Oppose | Given the direction provided in the NESTF (as explained in the cover letter to the submission) a clear exclusion to telecommunication network utility structures from the chapter is sought. | Insert the following to the introduction to the chapter: The provisions in this chapter do not apply to telecommunication network utility structures and activities. NOTE: This request applies to Rules NH-R1, NH-R2, NH-R3 and NH-R4. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P3 | S189.037 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower | Support in part | Recognising that some activities are appropriate is important. Providing heritage buildings with appropriate infrastructure sustains such a building for modern use, and this should be recognised in the policy framework. | Amend HH-P3 as follows: Enable the following activities relating to scheduled historic heritage buildings and items, where they retain historic heritage values and contribute to the ongoing function and use of the building or item: |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | | | 1. Maintenance and repair; 2. Seismic strengthening and building safety alterations; and 3. Demolition of non-scheduled buildings within a heritage precinct. 4. Servicing of the building and items with network utilities. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P7 | S189.038 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | Like HH-P3, infrastructure is important to sustain activities within scheduled heritage precincts, and this should be recognised in the policy framework. | Amend HH-P7 as follows: Provide for new buildings and structures, and additions or alterations to existing non-scheduled buildings or structures within a scheduled heritage precinct, where the work: 1. Is compatible with the form, proportions, materials, and setting of existing buildings within the scheduled heritage precinct 2. Provides continuity and coherence with the heritage values and streetscape qualities within the scheduled heritage precinct; 3. Contributes to the long-term viability or ongoing use of the building or item; and 4. Aligns with the guidance for heritage buildings and areas set out in the Residential Design Guide or Centres Design Guide as applicable. 5. Is for a network utility building or structure, and there is a functional or operational requirement for the location of the building or structure |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R10 | S189.039 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand | Support | The permitted sizes provided for communications kiosk or minor utility structures and cabinets, and electric vehicle charging stations are appropriate. | Retain NU-R10 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | | | |
| HH - Historic Heritage | New provision request | S189.040 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | A new rule is sought in order to ensure that customer connections to heritage buildings are permitted, as opposed to falling under HH-R14 and require restricted discretionary consent. New customer connections provide for the adaptive reuse of buildings, and by having appropriate permitted activity standards, adverse effects on the heritage item can be avoided, remedied or mitigated. | Insert a new Permitted Activity Rule as follows: HH-RX Customer connections to a heritage building or item listed in SCHED1 Heritage Buildings and ItemsActivity Status: Permitted where - Customer connections a heritage building or item listed in SCHED1 Heritage Buildings and Items where the customer connection shall not be attached to a primary feature or front façade of the heritage building or structure.Activity status where not achieved: ControlledWhere:a. Compliance is not achieved with HH-RX(1). Matters of control: 1. The matters listed in HH-P3. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-P2 | S189.041 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support | Recognising that works to prevent damage to infrastructure and to enable the installation of underground network utilities in the policy framework is supported. | Retain TREE-P2 as notified |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-P6 | S189.042 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support | Recognising that works to prevent damage to infrastructure and to enable the installation of underground network utilities in the policy framework is supported. | Retain TREE-P6 as notified |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-R1 | S189.043 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | Permitting trimming as required by the Telecommunications Act 1991 is supported. Amending subclause 1(a)(iv) to recognise telecommunications lines alongside an electricity line is sought. There is no difference in effect between telecommunication or electricity lines. | Amend TREE-R1 as follows: 1. Activity status: PermittedWhere: a. The activity does not result in more than minor trimming of any notable tree, where minor trimming means: i. the removal of broken branches, deadwood, or diseased vegetation; ii. the removal of branches interfering with buildings or structures, but only to the extent that the branches are touching those buildings, or structures; iii. the trimming is required by statute or regulations, including the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003 or the Telecommunications Act 2001; iv. the trimming is required to address an imminent danger to an electricity or telecommunication line ; or v. other trimming necessary to maintain the health of a listed tree, certified by a qualified arborist. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-R2 | S189.044 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited | Support | The rule clearly permits earthworks for the purposes of installing underground network utilities, and this is supported. | Retain TREE-R2 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | | | |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-R3 | S189.045 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | Permitting trimming as required by the Telecommunications Act 1991 is supported. Amending subclause 1(a)(iv) to recognise telecommunications lines alongside an electricity line is sought. There is no difference in effect between telecommunication or electricity lines. | Amend TREE-R3 as follows: 1. Activity status: PermittedWhere: a. The activity does not result in more than minor trimming of any street tree, where minor trimming means: i. the removal of broken branches, deadwood, or diseased vegetation; ii. the removal of branches interfering with buildings or structures, but only to the extent that the branches are touching those buildings, or structures; iii. the trimming is required by statute or regulations, including the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003 or the Telecommunications Act 2001; iv. the trimming is required to address an imminent danger to an electricity or telecommunication line; or v. other trimming necessary to maintain the health of a listed tree, certified by a qualified arborist. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-R4 | S189.046 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One | Support | The rule clearly permits earthworks for the purposes of installing underground network utilities, and this is supported. | Retain TREE-R4 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | | | |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R6 | S189.047 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support | The rule clearly permits earthworks for the purposes of installing underground network utilities, and this is supported. | Retain SASM-R6 as notified |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R7 | S189.048 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | A rule providing clear guidance as to what new or extensions of existing buildings or structures in site or area of significance to Māori listed in SCHED4 Sites and Significance to Māori is supported. However it is unclear what the scope of an existing legal instrument includes. Does this include resource consents or leases? And how does new infrastructure fall into a permitted activity, when it is unlikely to have an existing legal instrument, but one may form through the process of establishing the infrastructure. | Amend the rule, or have a separate rule for upgrading and a separate rule for new, so that it is clear what the scope of an existing legal instrument is |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P5 | S189.049 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One | Support | Recognising that maintenance of the safety and efficiency of network utilities and existing access tracks to network utilities is appropriate in areas of significant indigenous vegetation or habitat is supported. | Retain ECO-P5 as notified |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | | | |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P7 | S189.050 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | Similar recognition of network utilities as is provided in ECO-P5 should be included in ECO P-7 | Amend ECO-P7 as follows: Provide for the modification of vegetation outside of habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna where: a. the indigenous vegetation is kanuka, manuka, or tauhinu; b. other indigenous vegetation where loss of mature indigenous vegetation is minimised; c. timber is for reasonable personal use of up to 50m ³ over any 10-year period; d. modification is undertaken in accordance with an approval under Part IIIA of the Forests Act 1949; e. the naturally occurring indigenous vegetation has grown under the canopy of a plantation forest or as a consequence of the harvesting of plantation forest; f. the plantation forestry and other vegetation has been planted and managed for horticulture or agriculture purposes; g. necessary for the avoidance of imminent danger to human life or property; h. activities are carried out subject to and in accordance with any specific covenants or other legal agreements entered into with the District Council, or GreaterWellington Regional Council, or Department of Conservation, or QEII Trust; and i. it is necessary for the construction or maintenance of a firebreak. j. it is necessary for the construction or maintenance of a network utility. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|--|---|
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P8 | S189.051 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | If a network utility cannot comply with ECO-R2.1, it becomes a restricted discretionary activity under ECO-R2.2, with a matter of discretion being the provisions contained within ECO-P8. As such, ECO-P8 should consider the functional or operational requirements of the network utility | Amend ECO-P8 as follows: Manage the modification of indigenous vegetation outside of habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna to ensure any adverse effects on the biological diversity of indigenous species and habitats are avoided, remedied, or mitigated, considering: a. the significance and values of the vegetation and habitat; b. the extent of modification, including measures to avoid or minimise the loss, damage, or disruption to ecological processes, functions, and integrity of the vegetation and habitat; and c. the effects of the modification on the significance and values of the vegetation and habitat, including potential cumulative effects; and d. for any network utility the functional need or operational need of the network utility |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-R1 | S189.052 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support | Permitting modification to comply with the Telecommunications Act 2001 is supported. | Retain ECO-R1 as notified |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous | ECO-R2 | S189.053 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), | Support in part | Permitting modification for the operation and/or maintenance and repair of existing pasture, fences, drains, structures, network utilities, and infrastructure, fire breaks including existing roads or tracks (including | Amend ECO-R2 as follows: 1. Activity status: PermittedWhere one or more of the following applies: a. The modification is associated with conservation activities or customary |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|--|----------|--|--|
| Biodiversity | | | Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | | walking or cycling tracks). Construction should also be included, as construction activities can require modification of indigenous vegetation outside of a Significant Natural Area | <p>activitiesb. Compliance is achieved with ECO-S1;</p> <p>c. No more than 50m³ of timber harvested for reasonable personal use over any 10-year period;</p> <p>d. The harvesting of indigenous timber undertaken in accordance with an approval under Part IIIA of the Forests Act 1949;</p> <p>e. The construction, operation and/or maintenance and repair of existing pasture, fences, drains, structures, network utilities, and infrastructure, fire breaks including existing roads or tracks (including walking or cycling tracks);</p> <p>f. Trimming that is required to comply with the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003or</p> <p>Telecommunications Act 2001;</p> <p>g. Activities carried out subject to and in accordance with any specific covenants or other legal agreements entered into with the District Council, or Greater Wellington Regional Council, or Department of Conservation, or QEII Trust;</p> <p>h. The trimming or removal of indigenous vegetation that has been planted and managed specifically for commercial horticulture, plantation forestry, or agricultural purposes; or</p> <p>i. For the avoidance of loss of life, injury, or serious damage to property;</p> <p>j. The modification is required in accordance with Section 43 and 64 of</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017; k. The modification is required to remove vegetation infected by an unwanted organism under the Biosecurity Act 1993. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P3 | S189.054 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | The policy is supported, however given the PDP defines infrastructure, there is no need to include examples of infrastructure within the policy wording. A minor typo is also picked up. | Amend NATC-P3 as follows: Enabled earthworks in proximity to Significant Waterbodies; Allow earthworks within 25m of Significant Waterbodies where they are for the purpose of maintenance works on infrastructure, such as maintaining drains, man-made dams, access tracks or roads, for approaches to bridges and culverts or for water supply infrastructure, including irrigation |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-R1 | S189.055 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | Permitting earthworks within 25m of a Significant Waterbody for existing infrastructure is supported. The functional or operational requirements of infrastructure should be a matter of discretion for the rule. | Amend NATC-R1.2 as follows: Matters of discretion:... 9. The functional need or operational need of infrastructure |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-R2 | S189.056 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), | Support in part | The functional or operational requirements of infrastructure should be a matter of discretion for the rule | Amend NATC-R2.2 as follows: Matters of discretion:... 9. The functional need or operational |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | | | need of infrastructure |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P3 | S189.057 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support | Recognising that some structures have a functional or operational need to be located in an ONFL is supported. | Retain NFL-P3 as notified |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P5 | S189.058 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support | Recognising that some structures have a functional or operational need to be located in an ONFL is supported. Has policies are read as a whole, there is no need for the cross reference in NFL-P5(d) to NFL-P3 and NFL-P4 | Amend NFL-P5 as follows d. the activity is consistent with Policies NFL-P3 and NFL-P4. |
| NFL - Natural Features and | NFL-R1 | S189.059 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), | Support in part | There can be instances where roads pass through ONFLs, and in such instances it should be appropriate for other infrastructure to be located within road reserve. This should be encouraged through permitted activity | Amend NFL-R1 as follows: 1. Activity status: PermittedWhere: a. Compliance is achieved with i. NFL-S1; ii. NFL-S2; and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|---|
| Landscapes | | | Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | | status, so that infrastructure providers seek out sites and therefore co-locate effects, before considering other areas in ONFLs. | iii. NFL-S3; or b. Earthworks, modification of indigenous vegetation, or buildings and structures are associated with conservation activities; c. The proposal is for a network utility structure which is entirely located within formed legal road; and d. The Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes is not located within the Coastal Environment; and e. Is not associated with plantation forestry. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-S3 | S189.060 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | Having a permitted height for structures in ONFLs is supported, however 5m is too low for telecommunication poles, as it will more than likely cause a non-compliance with radiofrequency standards. 8m is what is permitted in the Queenstown Lakes ONFLs, and is the lowest appropriate height for poles to efficiently achieve their functional use. This is appropriate given the slimline nature of a pole as opposed to a building, which reduces its visual effects. | Amend NFL-S3(1)(b) as follows: the building or structure must not exceed one storey and must not exceed a maximum height of 5m, except for poles which can be up to 8m high |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O2 | S189.061 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | An objective about servicing is supported, however it is only focussed on Council provided infrastructure, not all infrastructure. All infrastructure is necessary to give effect to the PDPs strategic objectives UFD-O4 and INF-O1, as well as SUB-P2 as notified. As such, amendments to SUB-O2 are sought. | Amend SUB-O2 as follows: Subdivision and developments are serviced to provide for the likely or anticipated use of the land while avoiding, remedying, or mitigating adverse effects on the environment by ensuring: a. subdivisions within the urban boundary connect to reticulated water, and wastewater services (and reticulated stormwater services where they are available or provide for on-site stormwater disposal), telecommunications networks and power networks with sufficient capacity to accommodate |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | <p>proposed or anticipated development; and</p> <p>b. subdivisions in Rural Zones are capable of being serviced via on-site water, wastewater, and stormwater measures when development occurs on the site, and are capable of connecting to a telecommunications network.Note. In the submission received through Spoken a. above reads differently using the words 'open access fibre networks'</p> |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P2 | S189.062 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | SUB-P2 requires subdivision to be located where appropriate infrastructure is available, or to provide infrastructure in an integrated and comprehensive manner. The specifics of what providing infrastructure in an integrated manner does not consider telecommunications. This should be included and as such an amendment is sought. | <p>Amend SUB-P2 as follows:</p> <p>Require subdivision to be located where appropriate infrastructure is available, or to provide infrastructure in an integrated and comprehensive manner by:</p> <p>a. ensuring appropriate infrastructure has the capacity to accommodate the development or anticipated future development of the land in accordance with the purpose of the zone, is in place at the time of subdivision or development, and integrates with existing and planned infrastructure;</p> <p>b. requiring connections to Council's reticulated systems within the urban boundary to meet the performance criteria of the relevant Council;</p> <p>c. ensure allotments can connect to a telecommunications network; ed; ensuring allotments outside the urban boundary are of a sufficient size and shape with appropriate soil conditions to accommodate on-site wastewater, stormwater, and water supply infrastructure, and that there is</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>sufficient water supply capacity for firefighting purposes and there is an ability to connect to telecommunications network; de; ensuring roads and any vehicle access to sites meet minimum design standards to allow for safe and efficient traffic movements and can safely accommodate the intended number of users and the intended functioning of the road or access; ef; providing for transport network connections within and between communities; fg; where consistent with the zone, providing for a variety of travel modes that reflect the purpose, character, and amenity values of the zone, including walking, cycling, and access to and infrastructure for public transport while recognising the role that efficient transport infrastructure and connectivity plays in reducing greenhouse gas emissions; andgh; achieving safe and efficient access onto and from state highways.</p> |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R1 | S189.063 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited | Support | SUB-R1 is supported as it is subject to SUB-S6 Network Utility Services. | Retain SUB-R1 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | | | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R2 | S189.064 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | SUB-R2 is supported as it is subject to SUB-S6 Network Utility Services and amendment of the requirement for telecommunications infrastructure to be designed in accordance with the Council's engineering standards. While this is relevant for Council controlled infrastructure, the telecommunications network operators should be responsible for determining the design on their network requirements. | Amend SUB-R2 as follows: Matters of Control 8. Provision of appropriate infrastructure and services and their design and location, including water supply (including firefighting water supply), wastewater systems, stormwater control and disposal, telecommunications and electricity in accordance with Council's engineering standards, except for telecommunications. 8.1 Provision of appropriate telecommunications, including their design and location shall be accordance with the telecommunication network operators requirements subject to SUB-S6. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R3 | S189.065 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support | SUB-R3 is supported as it recognises that subdivisions for network utility purposes can have different characteristics and drivers compared to standard subdivision in any given zone. | Retain SUB-R3 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S189.066 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), | Support | SUB-R4 is supported as it is subject to SUB-S6 Network Utility Services. | Retain SUB-R4 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | | | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R5 | S189.067 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support | SUB-R5 is supported as it is subject to SUB-S6 Network Utility Services. | Retain SUB-R5 as notified. |
| FC - Financial Contributions | FC-P1 | S189.068 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | Financial contributions recognising the costs of new infrastructure are supported. The title of each of policy FC-P1, FC-P2, FC-P3 and FC-P4 all refer the infrastructure generally, but the detail in the policy itself refers only to water, wastewater, stormwater and transport infrastructure. Yet new developments can require upgrades to or developments of other infrastructure. As such, these policies should recognise all infrastructure, not just water, wastewater, stormwater and transport companies would welcome further discussion with Council as to how to become party to these financial contributions. | Amend FC-P1 as follows: Require subdividers and developers to meet the full costs of new water, wastewater, stormwater and transport infrastructure associated with the subdivision and development, including linkages and the costs of local upgrading of infrastructure, where the new infrastructure is required to solely serve the proposed subdivision or activity. |
| FC - Financial Contributions | FC-P2 | S189.069 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), | Support in part | Financial contributions recognising the costs of new infrastructure are supported. The title of each of policy FC-P1, FC-P2, FC-P3 and FC-P4 all refer the infrastructure generally, but the detail in the policy itself refers only to | Amend FC-P2 as follows: Require subdividers and developers to contribute towards any previous upgrading of water, wastewater, stormwater and transport infrastructure |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | | water, wastewater, stormwater and transport infrastructure. Yet new developments can require upgrades to or developments of other infrastructure. As such, these policies should recognise all infrastructure, not just water, wastewater, stormwater and transport infrastructure. The telecommunications companies would welcome further discussion with Council as to how to become party to these financial contributions. | when a subdivision or development will utilise excess capacity. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P3 | S189.070 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | Financial contributions recognising the costs of new infrastructure are supported. The title of each of policy FC-P1, FC-P2, FC-P3 and FC-P4 all refer the infrastructure generally, but the detail in the policy itself refers only to water, wastewater, stormwater and transport infrastructure. Yet new developments can require upgrades to or developments of other infrastructure. As such, these policies should recognise all infrastructure, not just water, wastewater, stormwater and transport infrastructure. The telecommunications companies would welcome further discussion with Council as to how to become party to these financial contributions. | Amend FC-P3 as follows: Where additional capacity of water, wastewater, stormwater and transport infrastructure is needed to mitigate the adverse effects of a subdivision or development, require subdividers or developers to meet the proportion of these costs generated by the subdivision or development. |
| FC - Financial Contributions | FC-P4 | S189.071 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | Financial contributions recognising the costs of new infrastructure are supported. The title of each of policy FC-P1, FC-P2, FC-P3 and FC-P4 all refer the infrastructure generally, but the detail in the policy itself refers only to water, wastewater, stormwater and transport infrastructure. Yet new developments can require upgrades to or developments of other infrastructure. As such, these policies should recognise all infrastructure, not just water, wastewater, stormwater and transport infrastructure. The telecommunications companies would welcome further discussion with Council as to how to become party to these financial contributions. | Amend FC-P4 as follows: Require subdividers and developers to make a fair and equitable contribution towards water, wastewater, stormwater and transport infrastructure to mitigate the cumulative adverse effects on infrastructure to ensure the level of service meets the needs of future occupants and does not adversely affect the level of service for existing users. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|--|
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P4 | S189.072 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support | Recognising that there can be a functional or operational need for structures to be located in the coastal environment is supported. | Retain CE-P4 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P6 | S189.073 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support | Recognising that there can be a functional or operational need for structures to be located in areas of very high and high natural character in the coastal environment is supported | Retain CE-P6 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-R3 | S189.074 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | Having a permitted height for structures in coastal environments that are areas of outstanding natural character is supported, poles, as it will more than likely cause a non-compliance with radiofrequency standards. 8m is what is permitted in the Queenstown Lakes ONLs, and is the lowest appropriate height for poles to efficiently achieve their functional use. This is appropriate given the slimline nature of a pole as opposed to a building, which reduces its visual effects. | Amend CE-R3(1)(d)(ii) as follows a maximum height of 5m, except for poles which can be up to 8m high. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-S3 | S189.075 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support in part | Having a permitted height for structures in coastal environments is supported, however 3m, 5m and 7m is too low for telecommunication poles, as it will more than likely cause a non-compliance with radiofrequency standards. 8m is what is permitted in the Queenstown Lakes ONLs, and is the lowest appropriate height for poles to efficiently achieve their functional use. This is appropriate given the slimline nature of a pole as opposed to a building, which reduces its visual effects. | Amend CE-S3(1)(b) as follows: the building or structure must not exceed a maximum height of 7m, except for poles which can be up to 8m high. Amend CE-S3(2)(b) as follows: the building or structure must not exceed a maximum height of 3m, except for poles which can be up to 8m high. Amend CE-S3(3)(b) as follows: the building or structure must not exceed one storey and must not exceed a maximum height of 5m, except for poles which can be up to 8m high. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-S1 | S189.076 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | Support | The maximum permitted noise levels in all zones are appropriate for telecommunications infrastructure. | Retain NOISE-S1 as notified. |
| SIGN - Signs | SIGN-R4 | S189.077 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and | Amend | Occasionally, infrastructure rollouts are supported by signs advising people that new infrastructure is available. For example, Crown Infrastructure Partners, the Government's infrastructure arm, required this for the Ultra-Fast Broadband fibre rollout. As such, such signage should be recognised in the temporary sign provisions. | Amend SIGN-R4 as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where the other rules in this chapter do not apply, provided that: a. The total face area of all temporary signs per site shall be no greater than 3m ² except in the case of temporary signs for Local Body or General Elections on public land where no individual sign is greater than 3m ² and the Council has provided written authorisation for these to be erected; |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|----------|---|---|
| | | | Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) | | | <p>b. The maximum height of any temporary sign shall not exceed 6m above ground level;</p> <p>c. Any temporary sign advertising an event shall not be displayed for more than 8 weeks before and shall be removed within 7 days after the date of the event;</p> <p>d. Any temporary sign advertising Local Body or General Elections shall not be displayed for more than 9 weeks before polling day and shall be removed by the close of the day before polling day;</p> <p>e. Any temporary signs advertising the sale or auction of a property (real estate sign) shall be located on the site to which they relate and be removed within 3 weeks of the date on which it is sold</p> <p>f. Any temporary sign advertising new infrastructure provided by a network utility operator shall be removed within 3 months of the infrastructure being made operational'</p> <p>fg. No temporary sign shall be located on any public road without the written authorisation of Council;</p> <p>hg. No temporary sign shall use reflective materials, or be illuminated, flashing, or moving;</p> <p>hi. On removal, the entire sign including support structures is removed and any disturbed ground is reinstated to its previous condition; and</p> <p>ij. Compliance is achieved with:</p> <p>i. SIGN-S7; and</p> <p>ii. SIGN-S8</p> |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S6 | S189.078 | Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), | Amend | A standard requiring new lots in the residential, commercial, mixed use, general industrial and rural zones to connect to a | Amend: Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, and General Industrial Zone, and Rural Zones |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|--|----------|---|--|
| | | | <p>Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark)</p> | | <p>telecommunications network is supported. The standard should not be qualified on whether or not telecommunication lines pass within 200m of a site. In urban areas the submitter believe it is reasonable to require open access fibre connections to each allotment. Primarily due to expense, and disruption to berms, footpaths, trees and other linear network services in the road post the subdivision.</p> <p>For large subdivisions/developments the submitter believe the applicant should be responsible for providing an assessment from the wireless network operator/s to establish what wireless connectivity is available. The applicant should be responsible making provision for at least a site for a wireless facility in areas where wireless connectivity is difficult or not available. Residents in a new subdivision or development will expect the ability to use wireless services in their dwelling or business premises or when outside.</p> <p>Rural zone subdivisions should be required to have telecommunication connectivity either wireless or fixed line. A requirement for assessment how connectivity will be achieved and consultation with telecommunication network utility providers is appropriate.</p> | <p>1. Electricity and telecommunications services shall be provided to the useable area of each new lot where power lines and telecommunications lines pass within 200m of any boundary of any new lot.2. Telecommunication connection in Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, and General Industrial Zones. to an open access fibre network shall be provided to the useable area of each new lot; andb. Applicant provides an assessment of what and how telecommunications will be provided to each allotment in the subdivision via confirmation in writing from telecommunication network operator/s.i. Contract to construct fibre connections: andii. If any subdivision in any zone is creating 100 allotments or more shall provide an assessment that sets out the ability ie coverage and capacity of the existing mobile/wireless networks to serve the subdivision and potential development capacity. In the situation that the existing wireless networks do not have the capacity to serve the subdivision and potential development, work with the network operators to identify and provide land required to enable the new wireless telecommunications network to serve the subdivision.3. Rural zones telecommunication connection shall be</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>provided to the useable area of each new lot. The applicant shall provide an assessment that sets out the ability ie coverage and capacity of the existing mobile/wireless networks to serve the subdivision. In the situation that the existing wireless networks do not have the capacity to serve the subdivision, the applicant shall work with the network operators to identify and provide land required to enable the new wireless telecommunications network to serve the subdivision.</p> |
| <p>SUB - Subdivision</p> | <p>SUB-S6</p> | <p>S142.001</p> | <p>Chorus New Zealand Ltd</p> | <p>Amend</p> | <p>The intent of SUB-S6 to ensure that network utility services are provided for in the subdivision process is supported. However, the submitter believes that SUB-S6 should be amended or an additional standard created to ensure that connection to an open-access fibre network is provided for at the time of subdivision.</p> <p>Connection to an open-access fibre network to the usable area of all new allotments should be required at the time of subdivision alongside other essential services.</p> <p>Not providing fibre at the time of subdivision can result in unnecessary and disruptive effects from retroactively installing fibre optic cables in newly created roads, footpaths and berms as well as increased costs to the end user.</p> <p>The relief sought will ensure that the subdivision standards are consistent with SUB-O3 and SUB-P2 while still providing a</p> | <p>Insert an additional subdivision standard specifically related to the provision of telecommunications services as follows:SUB-SX Telecommunications servicesResidential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Used Zones, General Industrial Zone and Rural Lifestyle Zones:1. Connection to an open-access fibre network must be provided to the useable area of each new allotmentGeneral Rural Zones:1. Connection to a telecommunications network (fibre, mobile or wireless including satellite) must be provided to the usable area of each new allotmentMatters of discretion:Alternative provision of telecommunications services</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | consenting pathway for instances where the applicant is able to demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory telecommunications connection can be provided. | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O2 | S142.002 | Chorus New Zealand Ltd | Support in part | An objective about servicing is supported, however it is only focused on Council provided infrastructure, not all infrastructure. All infrastructure is necessary to give effect to the PDPs strategic objectives UFD-O4 and INF-O1, as well as SUB-P2 as notified. As such, amendments to SUB-O2 are sought. | Amend SUB-O2 as follows: Subdivision and developments are serviced to provide for the likely or anticipated use of the land while avoiding, remedying, or mitigating adverse effects on the environment by ensuring: a. subdivisions within the urban boundary connect to reticulated water and wastewater services (and reticulated stormwater services where they are available or provide for on-site stormwater disposal), open-access fibre networks and power networks with sufficient capacity to accommodate proposed or anticipated development; and b. subdivisions in Rural Zones are capable of being serviced via on-site water, wastewater, and stormwater measures when development occurs on the site, and are capable of connecting to a telecommunications network. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P2 | S142.003 | Chorus New Zealand Ltd | Support in part | SUB-P2 requires subdivision to be located where appropriate infrastructure is available, or to provide infrastructure in an integrated and comprehensive manner. The specifics of what providing infrastructure in an integrated manner does not consider telecommunications. This should be included and as such an amendment is sought. | Amend SUB-P2 as follows: Require subdivision to be located where appropriate infrastructure is available, or to provide infrastructure in an integrated and comprehensive manner by: a. ensuring appropriate infrastructure has the capacity to accommodate the development or anticipated future development of the land in accordance with the purpose of the zone, is in place at the time of subdivision or development, and integrates with existing and planned infrastructure; |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------|---|
| | | | | | | <p>b. requiring connections to Council's reticulated systems within the urban boundary to meet the performance criteria of the relevant Council;c. ensure allotments can connect to a telecommunications network;ed. ensuring allotments outside the urban boundary are of a sufficient size and shape with appropriate soil conditions to accommodate on-site wastewater, stormwater, and water supply infrastructure, and that there is sufficient water supply capacity for firefighting purposesde. ensuring roads and any vehicle access to sites meet minimum design standards to allow for safe and efficient traffic movements and can safely accommodate the intended number of users and the intended functioning of the road or access;ef. providing for transport network connections within and between communities;fg. where consistent with the zone, providing for a variety of travel modes that reflect the purpose, character, and amenity values of the zone, including walking, cycling, and access to and infrastructure for public transport while recognising the role that efficient transport infrastructure and connectivity plays in reducing greenhouse gas emissions; andgh. achieving safe and efficient access onto</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|---|------------------|-------------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | and from state highways. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S263.001 | Chris Peterson | Amend | The submission discusses that there are numerous strong walls which stand over 1m high and extend for 100m or more, and assumed to be constructed during the great depression and refugee for native skinks and geckos. The submission states an ecologists' report may be in order. | Amend Plan to protect heritage and ecological values of strong walls along Norfolk Road (inferred). |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R5 | S12.001 | Christopher Clarke | Oppose in part | There should be a minimum distance set for windfarms, being a minimum of 1.5km from any residential home. The submitter notes there are severe negative visual, financial, audible and mental impacts of wind farms on those residing nearby. | Amend ENG-R5 as follows: 'ENG-R5 Community-scale renewable electricity generation (wind), including operation, maintenance, repair and upgrade General Rural Zone 1. Activity status: Controlled Where: a. The activity is not located within: i. moderate hazard areas; ... x. 1.5km of a residential dwelling. ix. Highly productive land. ..." |
| ENG - Energy | | S12.002 | Christopher Clarke | Oppose in part | Submitter states that a social impact report should be an essential requirement for a resource consent application for wind/renewable energy farms. | Amend ENG-Energy chapter to include: Those seeking to establish a wind or solar farm must undertake a social impact report with their resource consent application. |
| Designations | SWDC - South Wairarapa District Council | S114.001 | Clive Trott | Oppose | The submission details the potential adverse effects of extending the designation area to allow for disposal on the Pain Farm site as well as potential effects on the history and community benefit of the site. | Amend the designation for WWTP in Martinborough to explore other options rather than using to irrigate Pain Farm. Delete the "open option" for the Council to establish facilities for the storage of treated wastewater in the future. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB - Table 1 | S248.001 | Colin and Helen Southey | Oppose in part | The Proposed Plan takes a conservative approach to rural subdivision with a 40ha minimum lot size. The Rural Zone s32 Report notes that based on an assessment of | Amend SUB - Table 1 to reduce minimum lot size in the General Rural Zone from 40ha to 10ha. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>subdivision lot sizes, the demand for rural lots is either for small lots under 8ha or larger farm lots. The 8ha is noted as aligning with the Operative District Plan minimum lot size - however, the minimum lot sizes are 4ha. It is possible that the s32 report was actually referring to 4ha and not 8ha as there have been many 4ha allotments created.</p> <p>It is submitted that the 40ha minimum lot size is too restrictive. In some rural contexts 40ha is a large area of land. There will be circumstances where this restriction will become an impediment to productive land use (such as high value market gardens and orchards) which do not require 40ha of land. A discretionary activity consenting pathway to the approval of sub 40ha lots does not offer enough certainty to applicants.</p> <p>In the context of the Proposed Plan's 40ha minimum lot size, it would be difficult to overcome the overriding presumption in the NPS-HPL that fragmentation decreases production. (Please refer to original submission for the full list of reasons).</p> | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S248.002 | Colin and Helen Southey | Oppose in part | <p>The approach taken in Carterton and South Wairarapa where small lots (between 2 and 4ha), under certain circumstances, can be further subdivided is strongly preferred to the creation of a single "lifestyle zone" as is proposed in the Masterton District. These small lots have already had their productive potential compromised and are large enough to provide for additional rural housing. In many circumstances, existing rural lots are larger than their owners actually need them to be. This results in underutilised land and a lot of lawn mowing.</p> <p>It is submitted that Masterton is no different to Carterton and the South Wairarapa and providing for additional housing within the smaller rural sites in Masterton is the best</p> | Amend SUB-R4 (1) (a) to include Masterton District. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|---|------------------|------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | way to utilise these sites and provide for rural housing. | |
| Designations | SWDC - South Wairarapa District Council | S145.001 | Colin Walter Baruch | Oppose | The submission raises concerns around notification of this process and poor management of the current wastewater facilities. | Amend the designation for SWDC-S-16 (Martinborough wastewater disposal) to not include the Pain Farm area. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S92.001 | Country Village Heaven | Oppose | The submitter is concerned about the commercial creep into the Residential Zone and the adverse visual effects this is having with non-compliant signage, lighting, and often the style of the buildings being built. The submitter wishes to retain a condensed Town Centre/commercial centre and therefore opposes the Town Centre zone extending from Kuratāwhiti/Jellicoe Streets to 33 Main Street, Greytown (The Top Pub). | Rezone the Town Centre Zone from Kuratāwhiti/Jellicoe Streets to 33 Main Street, Greytown (The Top Pub) back to General Residential Zone. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-S1 | S92.002 | Country Village Heaven | Amend | The existing heritage buildings and trees and heights of existing building should be key drivers to ensure they remain the dominant buildings. | Amend GRZ-S1 to limit buildings to two storeys and a maximum height of 8m |
| Planning Maps | Specific Controls | S92.003 | Country Village Heaven | Amend | Submitter wants a frontage with the ability to create people friendly experiences and to excite the human spirit rather than two carparks and large high fences to the north. | Insert 'Active Street Frontage' mapping on West Street (Inferred) |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-S1 | S92.004 | Country Village Heaven | Amend | The existing heritage buildings and trees and heights of existing building should be key drivers to ensure they remain the dominant buildings. | Amend TCZ-S1 to limit buildings to two storeys and a maximum height of 10m |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S163.001 | Craig Dowling | Oppose | <p>Seeks that "Oddfellows Hall" at 11 Hastwell Street, Greytown is not included in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings and Items. The submitter is the joint owner of the building and property.</p> <p>Considers that the listing will impose on the rights of property and building owners to maintain and/or develop and enhance the building, including more costs and restrictions. Considers the building's location away from Greytown's Main Street means it does not significantly contribute to the general nature of Greytown's heritage. Considers the building</p> | Amend SCHED1 - Heritage buildings and Items: Hm161 - Oddfellows Hall - 11 Hastwell St, Greytown - (ALL DP 8727) |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>has basic features, representative of its age but not of particular architectural design uniqueness. Notes the wooden facade was added after the deterioration of the previous stucco facade, which was an aesthetic enhancement that would not have been allowed had the building been listed on the schedule as now proposed. Considers Council's prior decisions around areas adjacent to the building demonstrates the heritage and aesthetic considerations on this street are considered differently to properties on the Main Street or on prior scheduled areas (refers to the siting of a large cellphone tower immediately adjacent to the rear of the building on neighbouring land). Considers the bigger negative impact on the heritage of Greytown would be an unrestricted development of the large adjacent carpark area on Hastwell Street. Considers heritage listing needs a strong but high bar. There is no famous event, famous person, or stunning architectural characteristics associated with the building. Considers a property owner should be able to invest in a property and buildings in a way that secures the property's current and future viability as the owner sees fit. Considers the risk of regulatory overreach is that communities wither, along with its buildings, as investment into the future finds other places to go.</p> | |
| Planning Maps | Hazards and Risks | S77.001 | Daniel Bradley | Oppose | <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the flood alert areas and modelling is not up to date for the site at Brookside Development, Featherston as flood mitigation swales have been constructed. There are also discrepancies in s32 report justification.</p> | Delete Flood Alert areas from Planning Maps until accurate data is available. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P13 | S77.002 | Daniel Bradley | Oppose | <p>NH-P13 should be deleted until more detailed research has been conducted to justify mapped flood hazard areas.</p> | Delete NH-P13. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------|----------|---|---|
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P12 | S77.003 | Daniel Bradley | Oppose | NH-P12 should be deleted until more detailed research has been conducted to justify mapped flood hazard areas. | Delete NH-P12. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R7 | S77.004 | Daniel Bradley | Oppose | NH-R7 should be deleted until more detailed research has been conducted to justify mapped flood hazard areas. | Delete NH-R7. |
| Planning Maps | Hazards and Risks | S77.005 | Daniel Bradley | Oppose | There is a lack of evidence to justify the flood alert areas and modelling is not update date for the site at Brookside Development, Featherston as flood mitigation swales have been constructed. There are also discrepancies in s32 report justification. | Amend Flood Alert area from 3b Community Green. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S70.001 | Dan Kellow | Oppose | A General Residential Zone would enable residential development, thereby increasing the supply of land for residential development in Greytown. Sites are not within any natural hazard overlays. Sites are adjacent with properties which are General Residential and the rezoning of these sites would not be out of character with the surrounding area. Despite being LUC Class 1 both sites are too small to have adequate production capacity. The existing activity of the sites does not align with GRUZ-O1 therefore, the sites should be zoned for the activities that are occurring on them rather than primary production activities which do not occur on either site. | Amend zoning of 18 Mole Street and 92 Kuratawhiti St from General Rural Zone to General Residential Zone. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O1 | S70.002 | Dan Kellow | Support | This objective is supported as (b) recognises that a variety of housing types are provided for. | Retain Objective SUB-O1 as proposed. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P1 | S70.003 | Dan Kellow | Support | Clause (a) is supported as it recognises 'existing' character of a zone. | Retain Policy SUB-P1 as proposed. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P6 | S70.004 | Dan Kellow | Amend | Submitter states that Policy SUB-P6 is not consistent with Policy SUB-P8 because SUB-P8 recognises there are circumstances set out in the NPS-HPL where subdivision of HPL is potentially acceptable. | Amend Policy SUB-P6 to recognise subdivision of Highly Productive Land is potentially acceptable in certain circumstances, as is set out in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|--|--|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P8 | S70.005 | Dan Kellow | Support | SUB-P8 is supported as it is directly addresses subdivision of HPL and confirms that there are exceptions in the NPS-HPL. | Retain Policy SUB-P8 as proposed. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S70.006 | Dan Kellow | Oppose | Considers that the NPS-HPL has not been appropriately given effect to in relation to highly fragmented HPL areas within the General Rural Zone. These sites have not been provided for which results in uncertainty and potentially restricts further development unnecessarily. Subdivision is a Discretionary Activity under rule SUB-R4 (4) if clause 3.8 of the NES-HPL is met. The Discretionary Activity status should be amended to also include reference to clause 3.10 of the NPS-HPL given the number of fragmented sites in the area. Clause 3.10 addresses HPL that is subject to permanent or long-term constraints. Non reversible land fragmentation is an example of a long term constraint given in the NPS-HPL Guide to Implementation. | Amend SUB-R4(4) to refer to NPS-HPL clause 3.10. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O1 | S70.007 | Dan Kellow | Support | Supports policy GRUZ-O1 as the word 'primarily' ensures recognition of non-primary production activities. | Retain Objective GRUZ-O1 as proposed. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O2 | S70.008 | Dan Kellow | Support | Supports objective GRUZ-O2 as the word 'predominant' recognises that the character of the General Rural zone as described is not exhaustive. | Retain Objective GRUZ-O2 as proposed. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O6 | S70.009 | Dan Kellow | Amend | This submission supports proposed objective GRUZ-O6 but that it is amended to include the word 'highly' is inserted before 'productive' to ensure the objective aligns with the National Policy Statement - Highly Productive Soil (NPS-HPL). | Amend Objective GRUZ-O6 as follows: Rural lifestyle subdivision and development is managed in a way that avoids additional fragmentation of highly productive land and its productive potential. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P1 | S70.010 | Dan Kellow | Support | Supports Policy GRUZ-P1 as it confirms that rural lifestyle development is provided for in the General Rural zone. There is however, no guidance on what is an appropriate location. | Retain Policy GRUZ-P1 as proposed. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P2 | S70.011 | Dan Kellow | Support in part | Amend Policy to ensure the focus is on avoiding fragmentation of productive land and not smaller non-productive blocks of land. | Amend Policy GRUZ-P2 as follows: 'GRUZ-P2 Incompatible Activities. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | Avoid activities and development that: a. Are incompatible with the purpose, character, and amenity of the General Rural Zone; b. Will result in the fragmentation of productive land and the productive potential of land; or c. Will result in reverse sensitivity effects and/ or conflict with permitted activities in the General Rural Zone including primary production and ancillary activities.' |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P4 | S70.012 | Dan Kellow | Support in part | This policy should be in the Subdivision Chapter given it directly addresses subdivision. This submission supports GRUZ-P4 with one amendment as shown above. 'Sites' is proposed over 'areas' as it focuses on the characteristics of a specific site rather than area which is a broader term that ought to relate somewhere identified on the district plan maps. | Amend Policy GRUZ-P4 |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P9 | S70.013 | Dan Kellow | Support | Supports GRUZ-P9 as it recognises the NPS-HPL has exceptions that allow development and subdivision of HPL. The word subdivision is however unnecessary given the wording of SUB-P8. | Retain Policy GRUZ-P9 as proposed. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S70.014 | Dan Kellow | Support | An application to subdivide where SUB-R4(1)(e) is not met would be a Discretionary Activity (default for the subdivision activity which is not otherwise addressed). Notes the Draft District Plan (DDP) used a different approach, the equivalent Non-Complying rule stated that a non-compliance with SUB-R4 (1) (a), (b) and (c) would be a Non-Complying Activity. Suggests for clarity that the DDP approach of directly referencing the clauses of SUB-R4 (1) in the Discretionary and Non-Complying rules is the more easily understood approach. Submitter understands | Clarify SUB-R4 to make non-compliance with this SUB-R4(1)(e) a Discretionary activity. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | that council officers will address SUB-R4 (1) (e) not being referenced in SUB-R4 (2) - (5) in the s42 report by stating that the Non-Complying status was the intended activity status for subdivisions that cannot comply with the minimum section sizes set out in SUB-R4 (1)(e). It is also understood while there is no minimum Lot size specified in SUB-R4 (e) (i) and (ii) that council officers will suggest a minimum 0.5ha Lot will be a requirement. Submitter requests that subdivision of Lots less than 4ha should always be a Discretionary Activity (where they are HPL), and not elevate to Non-Complying, irrespective of resultant Lot sizes. Considers this approach would provide recognition that there are HPL sites in the General Rural zone that are smaller than 4ha that may be suitable for subdivision due to the surrounding land uses, location, and existing activity on site, but cannot meet SUB-R4 (1)(e) due to being 2 hectares or smaller. Considers these factors, just as much as allotment size, are relevant when considering the acceptability of a proposal. | |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | | S268.001 | Dan Riddiford | Oppose | States opposition to all related provisions that may affect the future development of the church, shed, and land owned by the Catholic Church on Kitchener Street, Martinborough. (Assume this is the St Anthony's Catholic Church at 36 Kitchener St, Martinborough). | Amend provisions in the General Rural Zone to enable future development of the site at 36 Kitchener St, Martinborough |
| SUB - Subdivision | | S268.002 | Dan Riddiford | Oppose | States opposition to all related provisions that may affect the future development of the church, shed, and land owned by the Catholic Church on Kitchener Street, Martinborough. (Assume this is the St Anthony's Catholic Church at 36 Kitchener St, Martinborough). | Amend SUB-Subdivision chapter to enable future development of the site at 36 Kitchener Street, Martinborough (referring to subdivision of highly productive land in the General Rural Zone) |
| HH - Historic Heritage | | S268.003 | Dan Riddiford | Oppose | States opposition to all related provisions that may affect the future development of the church, shed, and land owned by the Catholic Church on Kitchener Street, Martinborough. | Amend the HH-Historic Heritage chapter to enable future development of the site at 36 Kitchener St, Martinborough |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------|------------|---|---|
| | | | | | (Assume this is the St Anthony's Catholic Church at 36 Kitchener St, Martinborough). | |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S269.001 | Dan Riddiford | Not Stated | <p>The emailed submission suggests topics to be treated as a submission in the meantime for a preparation of a future submission. These topics include:</p> <p>The failure of the present and proposed Wairarapa Districts Plan to correctly consider the property rights of ratepayers despite the obiter dicta of the Supreme Court in Waitakere v Estate Homes [2006] from para 43 or the stated wishes of the present Government in the Coalition Agreement.</p> <p>All Rules and Policies in the Coastal Marine Environment (including the Coastal Strip, Coastal Seafaces and all rivers, estuaries and "waterways" and soils)</p> <p>Previous communications to the SWDC over SASM's declaring them as significant despite (1) the statutory power requiring declaration as to significant parts rather than the entirety and (2) the proposed Rules and Policies will effect a substantial deprivation of the property rights of ratepayers in these areas.</p> <p>Controls on vegetation removal and earthworks</p> <p>All concerns raised in the submissions of Federated Farmers and Sheep and Cattle farmers generally in the South Wairarapa</p> | No decision requested. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S191.001 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | The proposed zoning reflects the sites location within the existing Riversdale Settlement | Retain extent of Settlement Zone as it relates to 288 Riversdale Road, Riversdale |
| Planning Maps | Specific Controls | S191.002 | David Ian McGuinness | Neutral | Notes that the Coastal Environment chapter as a whole (with specific reference to CE-O1, | No specific decision requested. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | CE-O5, and CE-P5) requires consideration of potential subdivision, use, and development while recognizing that these activities can occur within the coastal environment where identified values are not compromised. | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R2 | S191.003 | David Ian McGuinness | Oppose in part | It does not appear to be the intention of the plan to support the non-complying activity status for subdivision within the Coastal Environment Overlay within the Settlement Zone. | Amend SUB-R2 to include new matter of control (secondary relief): 19. In Settlement Zones located in the Coastal Environment Overlay, effects on the coastal environment. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R12 | S191.004 | David Ian McGuinness | Oppose | To tidy up inconsistency with SUB-R2 and allow for subdivision of Settlement Zone properties within the Coastal Environment. | Amend Rule SUB-R12: 1. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary Where: (a) the site is not located in the Settlement Zone (where a site is located in the Settlement Zone See Rule SUB-02) OR: (i) Any allotment created must have a minimum allotment size of 40ha or (ii) In the Settlement Zones located in the Coastal Environment any allotment created shall have a minimum allotment size that complies with SUB-S1. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S9 | S191.005 | David Ian McGuinness | Oppose | A financial contributions chapter has been provided in the PDP. This standard needs to be re-drafted to include an appropriate standard for development contributions for subdivision. | Insert a standard into SUB-S9 to enable development contributions. |
| FC - Financial Contributions | | S191.006 | David Ian McGuinness | Oppose | The LGA requires annual review under the LTP and Annual Plan process - this is the most appropriate method outside the plan and leaves contributions outside the DP. | Delete Financial Contributions chapter |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | Financial contributions timings are conditional on resource consent being granted and can be secured by way of consent conditions, the submitter does not believe they need to be included in the plan as there are other methods for this being achieved. | |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P5 | S191.007 | David Ian McGuinness | Oppose in part | The submitter supports intention of policy. Amendments improve interpretation for plan users by identifying that the areas of the coastal settlements are identified as settlement zone. | Amend Policy CE-P5(a) to read: ...providing for residential units within existing coastal settlement zones to ensure that special qualities to each settlement are maintained. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-O1 | S191.008 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Support intention of objective | Retain SETZ-O1 as notified |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-P1 | S191.009 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Support intention of the policy. | Retain SETZ-P1 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R1 | S191.010 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Support rule | Retain SETZ-R1 as notified |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S1 | S191.011 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Support standards in Settlement Zone. | Retain SETZ-S1 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-O1 | S191.012 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Objective | Retain NH-O1 as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P1 | S191.013 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Support intention of the policy. | Retain NH-P1 as notified. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-O2 | S191.014 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Support intention of Objective | Retain NFL-O2 as notified |
| NFL - Natural Features and | NFL-P2 | S191.015 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Support intention of the policy | Retain NFL-P2 as notified |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|--|--|
| Landscape s | | | | | | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O1 | S191.016 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Support intention of objective. | Retain SUB-O1 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P1 | S191.017 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Support intention of policy. | Retain SUB-P1 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O1 | S191.018 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Support intention of objective. | Retain CE-O1 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P1 | S191.019 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Support intention of policy. | Retain CE-P1 as notified. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S191.020 | David Ian McGuinness | Amend | Seeks any consequential amendments to give effects to the relief sought in this submission. | Amend the Plan to give effect to the decisions requested in this submission. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R12 | S191.021 | David Ian McGuinness | Oppose in part | It does not appear to be the intention of the plan to support the non-complying activity status for subdivision within the Coastal Environment Overlay within the Settlement Zone. | Amend SUB-R12 to allow for subdivision within the Settlement Zone affected by a Coastal Environment overlay to be undertaken as a Controlled activity. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-P2 | S191.022 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports intention of policy | Retain SETZ-P2 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R2 | S191.023 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports rule | Retain SETZ-R2 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R3 | S191.024 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports rule | Retain SETZ-R3 as notified |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R4 | S191.025 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports rule. | Retain SETZ-R4 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R7 | S191.026 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports rule | Retain SETZ-R7 as notified |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R13 | S191.027 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports rule | Retain SETZ-R13 as notified |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S2 | S191.028 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports standards in the Settlement Zone | Retain SETZ-S2 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S3 | S191.029 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports standards in the zone | Retain SETZ-S3 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S4 | S191.030 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports standards in the zone | Retain SETZ-S4 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S5 | S191.031 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports standards in the zone | Retain SETZ-S5 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S6 | S191.032 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports standards in the zone | Retain SETZ-S6 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S7 | S191.033 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports standards in the zone | Retain SETZ-S7 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S8 | S191.034 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports standards in the zone | Retain SETZ-S8 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S9 | S191.035 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports standards in the zone | Retain SETZ-S9 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S10 | S191.036 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports standards in the zone | Retain SETZ-S10 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | GRZ-S11 | S191.037 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports standards in the settlement zone | Retain SETZ-S11 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S12 | S191.038 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports standards in the zone | Retain SETZ-S12 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-O2 | S191.039 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports intention of the objective | Retain NH-O2 as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P4 | S191.040 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports the intention of the policy | Retain NH-P4 as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P11 | S191.041 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports intention of the policy | Retain NH-P11 as notified |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P12 | S191.042 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports intention of the policy | Retain NH-P12 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P13 | S191.043 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports intention of the policy | Retain NH-P13 as notified |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O2 | S191.044 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports intention of the objective | Retain SUB-O2 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O3 | S191.045 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports intention of the objective | Retain SUB-O3 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P2 | S191.046 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports intention of policy | Retain SUB-P2 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P4 | S191.047 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports intention of policy | Retain SUB-P4 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O2 | S191.048 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports intention of objective | Retain CE-O2 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O3 | S191.049 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports intention of the objective | Retain CE-O3 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O4 | S191.050 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports intention of the objective | Retain CE-O4 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O5 | S191.051 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports intention of the objective | Retain CE-O5 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P4 | S191.052 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports intention of policy | Retain CE-P4 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P7 | S191.053 | David Ian McGuinness | Support | Supports intention of policy | Retain CE-P7 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|--|
| ENG - Energy | | S272.001 | Denise Clements | Oppose | Supports the submission made by the South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group (SWWAG). | Amend provisions as requested in the submission by SWWAG (submission number 207). |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S185.001 | Dewes Brothers Ltd | Oppose in part | Notes the future land use is intended to be complimentary to the Hood Aerodrome. These activities are not provided for in General Rural Zone, and Mixed Use Zone would be the best fit. Alternatively, a Special Purpose Zone (Hood Aerodrome Ancillary Activities) would be suitable. Notes the land is classified as highly productive (LUC 3), but notes the site is barren and stony, and it's limited size (9.55ha) means it is not economically viable to use it for rural productive purposes. | Amend the zoning of the land for Lot 1 DP 591832 (no address - located between Masterton to the north and Hood Aerodrome to the south) from General Rural to Mixed Use Zone or Special Purpose (Hood Aerodrome Ancillary Activities). |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S236.001 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Neutral | When reviewing the rules of the Proposed Plan it was noted that some of the tables do not include the conjunctive or disjunctive term ('and' 'or'). | Amend the District Plan Rules Tables to include the correct conjunctive or disjunctive term ('and' 'or'). |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S236.002 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Neutral | The Proposed Plan includes titles for its objectives and policies. In some cases, this title does not reflect the content on the Objective or Policy. | Amend the District Plan provision titles to align with the outcome and content of the provision. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S236.003 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter notes inconsistencies with the matters of control, matters of discretion and assessment matters with reference to district wide matters, overlays and values. | Amend the District Plan to include 'indigenous biodiversity' in matters of control, matters of discretion and assessment matters where appropriate. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S236.004 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support | The submitter supports the proposed definitions as providing appropriate clarity and certainty for plan users and aligning with the RMA and higher order documents. | Retain Definitions chapter as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S236.005 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support in part | The submitter seeks consistency with the NPSIB definition of Biodiversity Offset. | Delete 'Biodiversity Offset' definition and replace with: biodiversity offset means a measurable conservation outcome that results from actions that are intended to: (a) redress any more than minor residual adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity after |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|---|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | all appropriate avoidance, minimisation, and remediation measures have been sequentially applied; and (b) achieve a net gain in type, amount, and condition of indigenous biodiversity compared to that lost. The principles in Schedule 3 to the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2023 apply to the use of biodiversity offsets. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S236.006 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support | The submitter supports the identification of coastal environments and the definition used for Coastal Environment. | Retain 'Coastal Environment' definition as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S236.007 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose in part | The submitter seeks to clarify the definition of conservation activities and exclude some activities to ensure the activities it provides for are clear and aligned with the purpose of maintain and protecting natural, historic, and ecological values. | Amend the definition for 'Conservation Activities' as follows: Means the use of land or buildings for activities undertaken for the purposes of maintaining, protecting, and/or enhancing the natural, historic, and/or ecological values of a natural or historic resource. It may include activities which assist to enhance the public's appreciation and recreational enjoyment of the resource and includes restoration planting, pest and weed control, track construction and maintenance , and plant nurseries to support these purposes. Excludes commercial activities. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S236.008 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks amendments to align with the definition of 'indigenous vegetation' in the NPSIB. | Delete 'indigenous vegetation' definition and replace with: ' indigenous vegetation means vascular and nonvascular plants that, in relation to a particular area, are native to the ecological district in which |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|--|------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | that areas located.' |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S236.009 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | Amend the definition of 'Modification' to ensure all clearance activities are captured and that the proposed provisions give effect to higher order documents and the proposed objectives and policies. | Amend 'Modification' definition as follows:As it relates to vegetation means the felling, removal,damage, or destruction of the vegetation including cutting, crushing, cultivation, irrigation, chemical application, drainage, stopbanking, mob stocking overplanting, or burning and the following activities within the vegetation drip line... |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S236.010 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | Given the schedule of Significant Natural Areas is not complete, the submitter seeks that the definition is extended to those areas which qualify as SNAs but have not yet been identified in the District Plan to give effect to the RMA, NPSIB and the RPS. | Amend 'Significant Natural Area' definition as follows: 'Means: a. an area considered significant due to ecological attributes as identified areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitat of indigenous fauna, as set out in SCHED5 - Schedule of Significant Natural Areas or b. areas that have been assessed as an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna in accordance with the criteria set out in ECO-P#.' |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S236.011 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Not Stated | Insert a new definition for Effects Management Hierarchy from the NPSIB as a consequential amendment to other submission points sought by the submitter. The submitter notes the effects management hierarchy must be applied to effects within areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitat of indigenous fauna as well | Insert a new 'Effects Management Hierarchy' definition as follows: Effects management hierarchy means an approach to managing the adverse effects of subdivision, use and development that requires that:a. adverse effects are avoided where |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|------------|--|---|
| | | | | | as for areas outside of mapped SNAs as required by the NPSIB. | <p>possible; b. where adverse effects that cannot be demonstrably avoided, they are minimised where possible; c. where adverse effects that cannot be demonstrably minimised, they are remedied where possible; d. in relation to adverse effects that cannot be avoided, minimised, or remedied, offsetting is provided where possible (including but not limited to biodiversity offsets and freshwater offsets); and e. where offsetting is not demonstrably possible, adverse effects are compensated; f. if compensation is not appropriate, and there are more than minor residual adverse effects, the activity is avoided.</p> |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S236.012 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Not Stated | The submitter seeks to define 'Compensation' as used in ECO-P6 so the meaning is clear. | <p>Insert a new 'Compensation' definition as follows: 'means an outcome that results from actions that are intended to compensate for residual adverse effects after all appropriate avoidance, minimisation, remediation, and offset measures (where appropriate), have been sequentially applied and implemented in accordance with NPSIB schedule 4 principles.'</p> |
| Strategic Direction | | S236.013 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support | The submitter supports the general strategic objectives that give effect to the RMA, NZCPS, NPSIB and RPS. | Retain Strategic Direction objectives that give effect to the RMA, NZCPS, NPSIB and RPS as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|---|
| Strategic Direction | CCR-O1 | S236.014 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter notes concerns that the strategic direction for climate change only includes mitigation of the effects. The sought amendment aligns with the RMA and Objective 5 of the NZCPS. | Amend CCR-O1 as follows: The Wairarapa develops and functions in a way that avoids or mitigates the effects of climate change. |
| Strategic Direction | CCR-O4 | S236.015 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose in part | The submitter notes the meaning of water resilience is unclear and is not considered as part of the s32 reporting. | Amend CCR-O4 to clarify meaning of 'water resilience' OR Insert definition for 'water resilience'. |
| Strategic Direction | NE-O1 | S236.016 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter notes the title does not correspond to the content of the strategic direction. Amendments are also sought to ensure the strategic direction gives effect to the RMA, NZCPS, NPSIB, and RPS. | Amend NE-O1 as follows: Natural character, landscapes, features, and areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitat of indigenous fauna are protected and restored so that the natural environment they contributes positively to the Wairarapa's sense of place and identity. |
| Strategic Direction | INF-O1 | S236.017 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter notes concerns that the objective does not provide sufficient direction and 'well managed' is subjective. | Amend INF-O1 as follows: The benefits of infrastructure are recognised, while ensuring its adverse effects are well managed avoided where practicable, remedied or mitigated, and infrastructure is protected from incompatible land use, subdivision and development, including reverse sensitivity effects. |
| ENG - Energy | | S236.018 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support in part | The ENG objectives and policies are supported if other amendments sought by the submitter are accepted. | Retain ENG objectives and policies as notified if other amendments sought by the submitter to the ECO chapter are accepted. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R1 | S236.019 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter considers a different framework for activities in scheduled or overlay sites is required as these areas are recognised as | Amend ENG-R1 to limit the application of the rule to All Zones excluding scheduled sites/overlays. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | having significant values and further consideration of effects is necessary. | Insert a new restricted discretionary rule for installation, maintenance, repair, upgrade, and removal of new utility equipment for investigating a site for suitability for a renewable electricity generation activity in scheduled sites/overlays and include existing matters of discretion and effects on the values of the scheduled sites. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R1 | S236.020 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks that all ENG rules should include effects on indigenous vegetation and natural character as a matter of discretion to give effect to the RMA, NZCPS, NPSIB and RPS. | Amend ENG-R1 to include effects on indigenous biodiversity and areas of high, very high or outstanding natural character as a matter of control OR matter of discretion. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R6 | S236.021 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter is concerned about the discretionary status for all sites within the General Rural Zone. | Amend ENG-R6(1) to exclude any part of the General Rural Zone that is a high hazard area, area of Outstanding Natural Character, an Outstanding Natural Feature or Landscape, a site or area of significance to Māori, or a Significant Natural Area. Amend ENG-R6 to include non-complying activity status for activities in any part of the General Rural Zone that is a high hazard area, area of Outstanding Natural Character, an Outstanding Natural Feature or Landscape, a site or area of significance to Māori, or a Significant Natural Area. Amend ENG-R6(2) to include activities within all other scheduled sites and overlays not included above as non-complying. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R7 | S236.022 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter considers non-complying activity status is more appropriate for activities within scheduled sites/overlays. | Amend ENG-R7 to include non-complying activity status for energy generation activities not otherwise provided for in scheduled sites or overlays. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P4 | S236.023 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter considers amendments are required to ensure the policy gives effect to higher documents and direction of the District Plan. | Amend NU-P4 to include: Avoiding adverse effects on areas and values identified in Schedules including SNAs and applying the effects management hierarchy where adverse effects cannot |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | be avoided; Avoid significant adverse effects on other areas of natural character, natural features and landscapes and indigenous biodiversity values that meet the criteria in Policy 11(b) of the NZCPS 2010; |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R3 | S236.024 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose in part | The submitter considers the matters of discretion relating to scheduled sites, overlays and values differs between rules in the NU Chapter. Amendments are required to be consistent and include significant natural areas and areas with outstanding, very high and high natural character. | Amend NU-R1 to include the following as a matter of control OR matter of discretion OR assessment criteria where appropriate: 'Effects on areas of outstanding natural landscapes and features, outstanding, very high and high natural character, significant natural areas, water, indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage and sites of significance to Māori.' |
| TR - Transport | TR-P6 | S236.025 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter considers the policy does not provide sufficient direction. | Amend TR-P6 as follows: 'Provide for the development and safe operation of the transport network, including the state highway network and rail network, while managing the adverse effects of the development and use of roads, including state highways, on adjacent activities, and avoiding adverse effects on areas and values identified in Schedules including SNAs and applying the effects management hierarchy where adverse effects cannot be avoided.' |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-O2 | S236.026 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support in part | The submitter supports the intent of the proposed objective but considers it necessary to amend the wording to make it clearer. | Amend NH-O2 as follows: NH-O2 Natural features defences Natural features defences are used to reduce the susceptibility of people, |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | communities, property, and infrastructure to damage from natural hazards. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | | S236.027 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support in part | The submitter considers that for clarity, plan users should be advised that approval from Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Toanga may be required when carrying out certain activities under the provisions. | Amend HH Chapter to include a note which advises approval may also be required from Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Toanga for certain activities. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-O1 | S236.028 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support | The proposed objective gives effect to s6(c) of the RMA, and Objective 2.1 of the NPSIB. | Retain ECO-O1 as notified. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-O2 | S236.029 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support in part | The proposed objective should protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna generally. | Amend ECO-O2 as follows: Areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna within the Wairarapa are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P1 | S236.030 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support | The submitter supports these non-regulatory methods for implementing the proposed objectives of the ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity chapter. | Retain ECO-P1 as notified. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P2 | S236.031 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support | The submitter supports these non-regulatory methods for implementing the proposed objectives of the ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity chapter. | Retain ECO-P2 as notified. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P9 | S236.032 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support | The submitter supports these non-regulatory methods for implementing the proposed objectives of the ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity chapter. | Retain ECO-P9 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|-----------------------|------------------|--|------------|--|---|
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P10 | S236.033 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support | The submitter supports these non-regulatory methods for implementing the proposed objectives of the ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity chapter. | Retain ECO-P10 as notified. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P3 | S236.034 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The proposed policy is insufficient to ensure areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitat of indigenous fauna are identified and protected as required by Policy 23 of the RPS. | Delete ECO-P3 and replace with: 'Identify and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitat of indigenous fauna and schedule them in the combined District Plan, including the ongoing identification and protection of Significant Natural Areas through resource consent applications, using the criteria set out in ECO-P#.' |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | New provision request | S236.035 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Not Stated | A new policy is required to ensure areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitat of indigenous fauna are identified and protected. The proposed wording is from Policy 23 of the RPS and generally aligns with the NPSIB. | Insert the following policy in the ECO Chapter: 'ECO-P# Criteria for areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitat of indigenous fauna Areas of indigenous vegetation will be considered significant if they meet one or more of the following criteria: (a) Representativeness: the ecosystems or habitats that are typical and characteristic examples of the full range of the original or current natural diversity of ecosystem and habitat types in a district or in the region, and: (i) are no longer commonplace (less than about 30% remaining); or (ii) are poorly represented in existing protected areas (less than about 20% legally protected).' |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|---|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | | <p>(b) Rarity: the ecosystem or habitat has biological or physical features that are scarce or threatened in a local, regional or national context. This can include individual species, rare and distinctive biological communities and physical features that are unusual or rare. (c) Diversity: the ecosystem or habitat has a natural diversity of ecological units, ecosystems, species and physical features within an area. (d) Ecological context of an area: the ecosystem or habitat: (i) enhances connectivity or otherwise buffers representative, rare or diverse indigenous ecosystems and habitats; or (ii) provides seasonal or core habitat for protected or threatened indigenous species. (e) Tangata whenua values: the ecosystem or habitat contains characteristics of special spiritual, historical or cultural significance to tangata whenua, identified in accordance with tikanga Māori"</p> |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P4 | S236.036 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter considers the policy should be re-worded to give effect to the proposed District Plan objectives and NPSIB and be clear that subdivision, use and development within areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitat of indigenous fauna should avoid certain effects as set out in the NPSIB while applying the effects management hierarchy. | Amend ECO-P4 as follows: Protect those areas that are habitats comprising of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna in the Wairarapa from inappropriate subdivision, land use, and development by: 1. avoiding the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------|---|
| | | | | | | <p>modification of indigenous vegetation unless these activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. can be undertaken in a way that protects identified ecological values; or b. only providing for activities that demonstrate an operational need or functional need to be located in this area; <p>2. avoiding adverse effects on areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitat of indigenous fauna including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ba. ensuring areas are not removed in whole or part; loss of ecosystem of representation and extent; b. disruption to sequences, mosaics, or ecosystems within an SNA; c. fragmentation of SNAs or the loss of buffers or connection to other important habitats or ecosystems; d. a reduction in the function of the SNA as a buffer or connection to other important habitats or ecosystemse. a reduction in the population size or occupancy of Threatened, At Risk (Declining) species that use an SNA for any part of their life cycle. €3. requiring activities within or directly adjacent to these areas to avoid, remedy, or mitigate the adverse effects on the values of the area; and D4. managing effects of vegetation modification within the margins of any natural inland wetlands and rely upon Resource Management (National Environmental |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|--|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | | Standards for Freshwater)Regulations 2020 in all other cases. 5. applying the effects management hierarchywhere effects cannot be avoided. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P5 | S236.037 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submission opposes enabling clearance/modification in areas of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The submitter recognises that some vegetation clearance is appropriate in some circumstances however amendments are required to give effect to s6 of the RMA, NPSIB and Policy 24 of the RPS. | Delete ECO-P5 and replace with: ' ECO-P5 Indigenous vegetation modification within areas of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna Only allow modification of indigenous vegetation in areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitat of indigenous fauna where the indigenous vegetation modification is necessary: a. for the operation, maintenance, repair or upgrade of existing tracks, structures and fences;c. to avoid loss of life, injury, or damage to property;d. for removal of broken branches, deadwood,diseased vegetation, or exotic species;e. is for a conservation activity or in accordance with a conservation covenant;f. is for a customary activity.' |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P6 | S236.038 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks to include an definition of 'effects management hierarchy' and amendments to ECO-P4 that incorporate the intent of this policy. | Delete ECO-P6 and combine with amended ECO-P4 as sought by the submitter. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P7 | S236.039 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The proposed policy does not ensure indigenous biodiversity is maintained as required by s31(1)(b)(iii) of the RMA and Objective 1 of the NPSIB. It is not necessary | Delete ECO-P7 and replace with: ' ECO-P7 Maintain indigenous biodiversity Maintain indigenous |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|--|----------|---|--|
| Biodiversity | | | | | to specifically state the permitted activities within a policy. | biodiversity by: a. applying the effects management hierarchy;b. minimising fragmentation or reduction in the extent of indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna;c. maintaining and, where appropriate, enhancing or restoring the functioning of ecological corridors, linkages, dunes and indigenous coastal vegetation and wetlands;d. minimising adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity which is significant to tangata whenua;restricting the modification or disturbance of coastal indigenous vegetation, dunes, estuaries and wetlands; and e. recognising the benefits of active management of indigenous biodiversity, including voluntary pest and stock control and formal legal protection.' |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P8 | S236.040 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter considers the policy is unclear and does not provide sufficient direction to ensure indigenous biodiversity is maintained. The submitter seeks to delete the policy and rely on the inclusion of the effects management hierarchy alongside other relief sought by the submitter including revised wording of ECO-P7. | Delete ECO-P8. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P11 | S236.041 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support | Support the intent of the policy to protect indigenous biodiversity. | Retain ECO-P11 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|--|----------|--|--|
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P12 | S236.042 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter wishes to clarify what is intended by conservation lots. | Amend ECO-P12 to define 'conservation lots'. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-R1 | S236.043 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter is concerned that the PA thresholds do not apply to permitted activities in SNAs and seeks amendments to ensure SNAs are protected whilst allowing some permitted clearance for appropriate activities. The sought amendments also ensure SNAs are protected as required by s6(c) of the RMA and Policy 24 of the RPS. | Amend ECO-R1 as follows: ECO-R1 Modification of indigenous vegetation within a Significant Natural Area or Recommended Area of Protection All Zones 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The modification of indigenous vegetation is for one or more of the following: i. associated with a conservation activity or a customary activity and complies with ECO-S1; ii. trimming that is required to comply with the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003 or the Telecommunications Act 2001; iii. carried out subject to and in accordance with any specific covenants or other legal agreements for conservation purposes entered into with the District Council, or Greater Wellington Regional Council, or Department of Conservation, or QEII Trust and complies with ECO-S1; ... Insert a new restricted discretionary rule for modification of indigenous vegetation within a Recommended Area of Protection that does not comply with |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | ECO-R1(1) and include the following matters of discretion: a. The significance and values of the vegetation and habitat; b. The application of the effects management hierarchy; c. The effects on indigenous biodiversity; - Matters set out in ECO-P4, ECO-P5 and ECO-P7 as amended by the submitter. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-R2 | S236.044 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | <p>The submitter raises concerns that the District Plan does not provide for ongoing identification and protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitat of indigenous fauna, this includes not currently applying PA thresholds to conservation and customary activities.</p> <p>The approval process and consideration of effects for harvesting of indigenous timber under the Forests Act 1949 is different to that required under the RMA. The proposed rule therefore relies on an adequate assessment of the effects on indigenous biodiversity as a result of the removal has been undertaken as part of the approval. This is inconsistent with s6 of the RMA.</p> | <p>Amend ECO-R2 as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>a. The modification is associated with conservation activities or customary activities and complies with ECO-S1; The harvesting of indigenous timber undertaken in accordance with an approval under Part IIIA of the Forests Act 1949;</p> <p>2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Discretionary</p> <p>OR any alternative relief to address the submitters concerns.</p> |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-R3 | S236.045 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support in part | The submitter seeks to amend the provision to include SNAs to better give effect to ECO-P11. | Amend ECO-R3(1)(a) as follows: a. The site(s) on which the goats are kept is not located within 2km of the Natural Open Space Zone or a significant natural area; ... |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous | ECO-S1 | S236.046 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose in part | The submitter opposes allowing clearance of kanuka and manuka and considers setbacks should be required from wetland regardless of location due to sedimentation impacts. | Amend ECO-S1 as follows: 1. Indigenous vegetation is not within 20m of a natural inland wetland; 2. The indigenous |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|--|----------|--|---|
| Biodiversity | | | | | | vegetation is kanuka, manuka, ortauhinu; and 3. Any other indigenous vegetation species where:... |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | APPENDIX ECO-1 | S236.047 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support | The submitter supports the inclusion of the Pest Plan species list. | Retain APPENDIX ECO-1 as notified. |
| NATC - Natural Character | | S236.048 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support | The submitter generally supports the NATC chapter policies which give effect to s6 of the RMA. | Retain NATC chapter policies which give effect to s6 of the RMA as notified. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P3 | S236.049 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter considers the title of the policy does not appropriately reflect the intent of the policy. Earthworks should not be enabled near significant waterbodies while there are specific activities that have a functional need for these works. Activities referenced including maintenance of drains and man-made dams have the potential to have adverse effects on threatened or at-risk species. | Amend NATC-P3 as follows: 'Enabled earthworks in proximity to Significant Waterbodies Only - allow earthworks within 25 m of Significant Waterbodies where they are necessary for the purpose of maintenance works on infrastructure, such as maintaining drains, man-made dams, access tracks or roads, for approaches to bridges and culverts or for water supply infrastructure, including irrigation.' |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-R1 | S236.050 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The rule currently has no earthworks thresholds and therefore has the potential for significant adverse effects on natural character which is inconsistent with NATC-O1. It is inappropriate to permit the maintenance of drains and man-made dams without thresholds due to the likelihood of adverse effects on threatened or at-risk species. Regionally vulnerable Brown Mudfish are present within drains in the Wairarapa alongside other threatened or at-risk species. | Amend NATC-R1 to include appropriate earthworks thresholds AND Amend NATC-R1(a)(i) as follows if earthworks thresholds are not inserted: 'the maintenance of drains, man-made dams, access tracks, existing infrastructure or roads;' Amend NATC-R1 to include indigenous biodiversity in the matters of discretion. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|--|
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-O1 | S236.051 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose in part | The submitters seeks to amend NFL-O1 to align with policy 15 of NZCPS and to provide clarification. | Amend NFL-O1 as follows: 'The identified Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes are protected from the adverse effects of inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.' |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P4 | S236.052 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support | The submitter seeks to amend the wording to give effect to Policy 15(b) of NZCPS which requires significant adverse effects to be avoided and other adverse effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated on other natural features and landscapes in the coastal environment. | Amend NFL-P4 as follows: 'Avoid adverse effects from subdivision, use, and development on the identified characteristics and values of the Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes located within the Coastal Environment and avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of activities on other natural features and natural features in the Coastal Environment. ' |
| PA - Public Access | PA-O1 | S236.053 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support in part | The submitter seeks amendments to give effect to Policy 19 of NZCPS and considers the clauses of the objective better sit within the policies and the objective directs maintenance and enhancement of public access. | Amend PA-O1 as follows: 'Public access to and enjoyment of the coastal marine area , rivers, lakes, and natural inlandwetlands and their margins is maintained andenhanced in a manner that: a. preserves their natural character, indigenousbiodiversity, landscape, historic heritage, andcultural values; andb. minimises incompatibility of providing publicaccess with adjoining activities ' |
| PA - Public Access | PA-P3 | S236.054 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks amendments to give effect to Policy 19 of NZCPS. | Amend PA-P3 as follows: 'Ensure use, subdivision, and development of the coastal environment provides for, |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------|----------------|------------------|--|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | | <p>enhances, public access to and along the Coastal Marine Area. Access should only be restricted for the following reasons:</p> <p>....</p> <p>d. to protect public health and safety; ore. to protect threatened indigenous species; orf. to protect dunes, estuaries and other sensitive natural areas or habitats; org. to avoid or reduce conflict between public uses of the coastal marine area and its margins; orh. for temporary activities or special events; ori. for defence purposes in accordance with the Defence Act 1990</p> |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O1 | S236.055 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | <p>The submitter seeks amendments for certainty and to ensure the objective supports the maintenance and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs as required by the RMA, NPSIB and NZCPS. SUB-O1(f) does not give effect to Policy 3 or Policy 25 of the NZCPS and is not consistent with CCR-O1 of the District Plan.</p> | <p>Amend SUB-O1 as follows:</p> <p>'SUB-O1 Subdivision and development design</p> <p>Subdivision will and developments create allotments and patterns of land use and development that:</p> <p>a. provide for the anticipated accord with the purpose, character, and amenity of each zone,</p> <p>b. and maintain and enhance the qualities and values of the site(s) including natural features and landscapes, waterbodies, indigenous</p> <p>...</p> <p>d. are be well-functioning, accessible, integrated, and connected with adjoining neighbourhoods;</p> <p>...</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | | g. respond appropriately to the risks of natural hazards and is resilient to climate change. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P3 | S236.056 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submission considers the policy is superfluous to the district wide policies. | Delete SUB-P3 and rely on the objectives and policies in district-wide matters chapters OR if the policy is retained, amend to clarify and ensure consistency with the strategic directions and other objectives and policies in the district-wide matters chapters OR Amend SUB-P3 to include a clause seeking the protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features or sites or items with significant values. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R1 | S236.057 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks a consistent approach to indigenous biodiversity within the matters of discretion in all the relevant SUB rules. | Amend SUB-R1 as follows: '1. Activity status: Controlled Matters of control: 4. Protection, maintenance, or enhancement of natural features and landforms, indigenous biodiversity , historic heritage, sites of significance to Māori, or archaeological sites.' 2. Activity status: Controlled Matters of control: 4. Protection, maintenance, or enhancement of natural features and landforms, indigenous biodiversity , historic heritage, sites of significance to Māori, or archaeological sites.' |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R7 | S236.058 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter generally supports the intent of this rule but seek amendments to further clarify that where subdivision involves SNA, and no conservation covenant is created the proposed subdivision will be a non-complying activity. | Amend SUB-R7 as follows: 1. Activity status: Controlled Matters of control: 5. The effects of the subdivision on the significance and values of the vegetation and habitat indigenous biodiversity, |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|--|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | | including potential cumulative effects.16. The application of the effects management hierarchy. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | | S236.059 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support | The submitter supports the objective and policies which seek to protect the values of the districts rivers, avoid adverse effects of motorised craft and manage the effects of surface water activities on indigenous biodiversity. | Retain ASW Chapter as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | | S236.060 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support | The submitter generally supports the CE Chapter as notified. | Retain CE Chapter as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P2 | S236.061 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter raises concerns that the policy wording suggests conservation and customary activities are not subject to avoiding adverse effects. These activities are less likely to be inappropriate use and development, but they are still required to avoid adverse effects. | Amend CE-P2 as follows: 'Avoid adverse effects from subdivision, use, and development on the identified qualities, characteristics, and values of Outstanding Natural Character by: a. only providing for conservation activities and customary activities; and b. avoid adverse effects on those qualities, characteristics, and values of any other activities.' |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P4 | S236.062 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The policy is inadequate implementation of Policy 11 of the NZCPS. Policy 11 directs specific circumstances where adverse effects should be avoided and then where significant adverse effects should be avoided. | Amend CE-P4 as follows: 'Manage subdivision, use, and development within the coastal environment to ensure: ... vii. avoiding significant adverse effects on significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna and, for other indigenous biodiversity, avoid significant adverse effects, and avoid remedy or mitigate other adverse effects.; |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P6 | S236.063 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks to include areas of high natural character. | Amend CE-P6 as follows: 'a. Provide for the maintenance, repair, and removal of existing infrastructure in areas identified as High and Very High Natural Character ; and' |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P8 | S236.064 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support in part | The submitter seeks to give better effect to Policy 3 of NZCPS. | Amend CE-P8 as follows: 'b. avoid new residential activities and other hazardsensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities within... ' |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-S1 | S236.065 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks to include indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion to all CE standards. | Amend CE-S1 to include effects on indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R1 | S236.066 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks to include indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion to all GRUZ rules to ensure the Councils obligation to maintain indigenous biodiversity under s31 of the RMA is met. | Amend GRUZ-R1 to include effects on indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R12 | S236.067 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter considers that quarrying, including a farm quarry, should be discretionary in any scheduled site or overlay. | Amend GRUZ-R12 to include a discretionary activity status for quarry activities within scheduled sites or overlays. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-O1 | S236.068 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter considers the objective does not appropriately capture the purpose of the NOSZ or provide sufficient direction, in particular as the policies rely on the purpose of the zone. | Amend NOSZ-O1 as follows: ' The natural environment in the Natural Open Space Zone is retained or enhanced and any activities, buildings, and other structures are compatible with the characteristics of the zone. The Natural Open Space Zone primarily provides for the ongoing management of land that has a conservation focus. ' |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|--|---|
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-O2 | S236.069 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The proposed objective repeats the purpose of the NOSZ and includes a statement that is better suited in a policy. | Delete NOSZ-O2 and replace with: ' The character and amenity values of the Natural Open Space Zone are maintained or improved, and include areas:a. with high natural, historic heritage and cultural values; andb. of indigenous vegetation, and natural landscapes; andc. with very limited built form that is consistent with the purpose of the zone.' |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-O3 | S236.070 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support | The submitter supports this objective. | Retain NOSZ-O3 as notified. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | | S236.071 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support | The submitter generally supports the policies and rules of the notified NOSZ Chapter excluding some amendments as covered in the submission. | Retain NOSZ Chapter policies as notified. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-P2 | S236.072 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support in part | The submitter seeks to clarify the wording of this policy. | Amend NOSZ-P2(a) as follows: 'a. consistent with any applicable ConservationManagement Strategy or Plan, ReserveManagement Plan, or reserve status under theReserves Act 1977;' |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-P5 | S236.073 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter considers that providing for relocatable building and structures does not align with the purpose of the NOSZ and direction is provided for by NOSZ-R1. | Delete NOSZ-P5. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-R3 | S236.074 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter considers that providing for relocatable building and structures does not align with the purpose of the NOSZ and direction is provided for by NOSZ-R1. | Delete NOSZ-R3. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-R1 | S236.075 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter considers that providing for relocatable building and structures does not align with the purpose of the NOSZ. | Amend NOSZ-R1 as follows: 1. Activity status: PermittedWhere: a. The building or structure is associated with ancillary to a conservation activity; and.... AND to include any consequential amendments. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-R9 | S236.076 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support in part | The submitter operates several campgrounds and therefore consider further clarification is required. | Amend NOSZ-R9 as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted b. The site is operated by Council, the Department of Conservation or by a licensed operator under the Camping-Grounds Regulations 1985.' |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-S1 | S236.077 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support in part | The submitter is concerned that all NOSZ Standards matters of discretion do not appropriately address potential adverse effects on the characteristics and qualities of the NOSZ. | Amend NOSZ-S1 to include the following matters of discretion: a. any impacts on the purpose, character and qualities of the zone; andb. any impacts on the character and qualities of the surrounding area; andc. any impacts on the public use and enjoyment of the site and surrounding area; andd. any adverse effects of removing indigenous vegetation on ecological values. |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | | S236.078 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Neutral | The submitter notes that that some heritage sites from the operative Wairarapa District Plan on public conservation land have not been included in the Proposed Plan. These include the Rimutaka Railway Tunnel and Water Drop Shaft | Amend SCHED1 to include the Rimutaka Railway Tunnel and Water Drop Shaft. |
| SCHED5 - Schedule of | | S236.079 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support in part | The submitter supports this schedule. | Retain SCHED5 - Schedule of Significant Natural Areas as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| Significant Natural Areas | | | | | | |
| SCHED6 - Schedule of Recommended Areas for Protection | | S236.080 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support in part | The submitter generally supports SCHED6 as notified subject to acceptance of other relief sought by the submitter to the ECO Chapter. The submitter is concerned that no provisions apply to these areas meaning they are treated like any other land use for the purpose of indigenous vegetation clearance. | Retain SCHED6 as notified subject to acceptance of relief sought by the submitter to the ECO Chapter. |
| SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies | | S236.081 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose in part | The submitter seeks to include additional waterbodies which have high natural character and ecology values, including natural aquatic habitats that support the presence of threatened, at risk, or regionally distinctive indigenous species. | Amend SCHED 11 to include the following waterbodies: Booths stream and upper tributaries; Waikoukou Stream where it drains into the Ruamahanga river; Kaiwhata River; Waiohuru Stream; Whangaimoana Stream; Unnamed stream running through Awarere (E 1850571, N 5438410); Bocketts Stream; Boundary creek and tributaries; Manganui Stream; Otukura Stream; Parapara Stream; Waitawatautau Stream; Patanui Stream; Kellys stream/willow tree stream confluence; Whangaimoana Stream; McCrearys Pond; Battery Pond; Otauira Stream Tributary; Reefs Creek; Wakamoekau Creek; Kaipaitangata Stream; Mikimiki Stream AND amend to include Biodiversity, Ecological, or Natural Character Values to Mangatarere Stream and Makoura Stream. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R2 | S236.082 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks that all ENG rules should include effects on indigenous vegetation and natural character as a matter of discretion to give effect to the RMA, NZCPS, NPSIB and RPS. | AmendENG-R2 to include effects on indigenous biodiversity and areas of high, veryhigh or outstanding natural character as a matter of control OR matter of discretion. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R3 | S236.083 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks that all ENG rules should include effects on indigenous vegetation and natural character as a matter of discretion to give effect to the RMA, NZCPS, NPSIB and RPS. | AmendENG-R3 to include effects on indigenous biodiversity and areas of high, veryhigh or outstanding natural character as a matter of control OR matter of discretion. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|----------------|--|--|
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R4 | S236.084 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks that all ENG rules should include effects on indigenous vegetation and natural character as a matter of discretion to give effect to the RMA, NZCPS, NPSIB and RPS. | AmendENG-R4 to include effects on indigenous biodiversity and areas of high, veryhigh or outstanding natural character as a matter of control OR matter of discretion. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R5 | S236.085 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks that all ENG rules should include effects on indigenous vegetation and natural character as a matter of discretion to give effect to the RMA, NZCPS, NPSIB and RPS. | AmendENG-R5 to include effects on indigenous biodiversity and areas of high, veryhigh or outstanding natural character as a matter of control OR matter of discretion. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R6 | S236.086 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks that all ENG rules should include effects on indigenous vegetation and natural character as a matter of discretion to give effect to the RMA, NZCPS, NPSIB and RPS. | AmendENG-R6 to include effects on indigenous biodiversity and areas of high, veryhigh or outstanding natural character as a matter of control OR matter of discretion. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R7 | S236.087 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks that all ENG rules should include effects on indigenous vegetation and natural character as a matter of discretion to give effect to the RMA, NZCPS, NPSIB and RPS. | AmendENG-R7 to include effects on indigenous biodiversity and areas of high, veryhigh or outstanding natural character as a matter of control OR matter of discretion. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R8 | S236.088 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks that all ENG rules should include effects on indigenous vegetation and natural character as a matter of discretion to give effect to the RMA, NZCPS, NPSIB and RPS. | AmendENG-R8 to include effects on indigenous biodiversity and areas of high, veryhigh or outstanding natural character as a matter of control OR matter of discretion. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R4 | S236.089 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose in part | The submitter considers the matters of discretion relating to scheduled sites, overlays and values differs between rules in the NU Chapter. Amendments are required to be consistent and include significant natural areas and areas with outstanding, very high and high natural character. | Amend NU-R4 to include the following as a matter of control OR matter of discretion OR assessment criteria where appropriate: 'Effects on areas of outstanding natural landscapes and features, outstanding, very high and high natural character, significant natural areas, water, indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage and sites of significance to Māori.' |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R5 | S236.090 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose in part | The submitter considers the matters of discretion relating to scheduled sites, overlays and values differs between rules in the NU Chapter. Amendments are required to be | Amend NU-R5 to include the following as a matter of control OR matter of discretion OR assessment criteria where appropriate: |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | consistent and include significant natural areas and areas with outstanding, very high and high natural character. | 'Effects on areas of outstanding natural landscapes and features, outstanding, very high and high natural character, significant natural areas, water, indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage and sites of significance to Māori.' |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R6 | S236.091 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose in part | The submitter considers the matters of discretion relating to scheduled sites, overlays and values differs between rules in the NU Chapter. Amendments are required to be consistent and include significant natural areas and areas with outstanding, very high and high natural character. | Amend NU-R4 to include the following as a matter of control OR matter of discretion OR assessment criteria where appropriate: 'Effects on areas of outstanding natural landscapes and features, outstanding, very high and high natural character, significant natural areas, water, indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage and sites of significance to Māori.' |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R9 | S236.092 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose in part | The submitter considers the matters of discretion relating to scheduled sites, overlays and values differs between rules in the NU Chapter. Amendments are required to be consistent and include significant natural areas and areas with outstanding, very high and high natural character. | Amend NU-R9 to include the following as a matter of control OR matter of discretion OR assessment criteria where appropriate: 'Effects on areas of outstanding natural landscapes and features, outstanding, very high and high natural character, significant natural areas, water, indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage and sites of significance to Māori.' |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R10 | S236.093 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose in part | The submitter considers the matters of discretion relating to scheduled sites, overlays and values differs between rules in the NU Chapter. Amendments are required to be consistent and include significant natural areas and areas with outstanding, very high and high natural character. | Amend NU-R10 to include the following as a matter of control OR matter of discretion OR assessment criteria where appropriate: 'Effects on areas of outstanding natural landscapes and features, outstanding, very high and high natural character, |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | significant natural areas, water, indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage and sites of significance to Māori.' |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R11 | S236.094 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose in part | The submitter considers the matters of discretion relating to scheduled sites, overlays and values differs between rules in the NU Chapter. Amendments are required to be consistent and include significant natural areas and areas with outstanding, very high and high natural character. | Amend NU-R11 to include the following as a matter of control OR matter of discretion OR assessment criteria where appropriate: 'Effects on areas of outstanding natural landscapes and features, outstanding, very high and high natural character, significant natural areas, water, indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage and sites of significance to Māori.' |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R12 | S236.095 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose in part | The submitter considers the matters of discretion relating to scheduled sites, overlays and values differs between rules in the NU Chapter. Amendments are required to be consistent and include significant natural areas and areas with outstanding, very high and high natural character. | Amend NU-R12 to include the following as a matter of control OR matter of discretion OR assessment criteria where appropriate: 'Effects on areas of outstanding natural landscapes and features, outstanding, very high and high natural character, significant natural areas, water, indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage and sites of significance to Māori.' |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R13 | S236.096 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose in part | The submitter considers the matters of discretion relating to scheduled sites, overlays and values differs between rules in the NU Chapter. Amendments are required to be consistent and include significant natural areas and areas with outstanding, very high and high natural character. | Amend NU-R13 to include the following as a matter of control OR matter of discretion OR assessment criteria where appropriate: 'Effects on areas of outstanding natural landscapes and features, outstanding, very high and high natural character, significant natural areas, water, |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage and sites of significance to Māori.' |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R14 | S236.097 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose in part | The submitter considers the matters of discretion relating to scheduled sites, overlays and values differs between rules in the NU Chapter. Amendments are required to be consistent and include significant natural areas and areas with outstanding, very high and high natural character. | Amend NU-R14 to include the following as a matter of control OR matter of discretion OR assessment criteria where appropriate: 'Effects on areas of outstanding natural landscapes and features, outstanding, very high and high natural character, significant natural areas, water, indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage and sites of significance to Māori.' |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R15 | S236.098 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose in part | The submitter considers the matters of discretion relating to scheduled sites, overlays and values differs between rules in the NU Chapter. Amendments are required to be consistent and include significant natural areas and areas with outstanding, very high and high natural character. | Amend NU-R15 to include the following as a matter of control OR matter of discretion OR assessment criteria where appropriate: 'Effects on areas of outstanding natural landscapes and features, outstanding, very high and high natural character, significant natural areas, water, indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage and sites of significance to Māori.' |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R16 | S236.099 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose in part | The submitter considers the matters of discretion relating to scheduled sites, overlays and values differs between rules in the NU Chapter. Amendments are required to be consistent and include significant natural areas and areas with outstanding, very high and high natural character. | Amend NU-R16 to include the following as a matter of control OR matter of discretion OR assessment criteria where appropriate: 'Effects on areas of outstanding natural landscapes and features, outstanding, very high and high natural character, significant natural areas, water, indigenous biodiversity, historic |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | heritage and sites of significance to Māori.' |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R17 | S236.100 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose in part | The submitter considers the matters of discretion relating to scheduled sites, overlays and values differs between rules in the NU Chapter. Amendments are required to be consistent and include significant natural areas and areas with outstanding, very high and high natural character. | Amend NU-R17 to include the following as a matter of control OR matter of discretion OR assessment criteria where appropriate: 'Effects on areas of outstanding natural landscapes and features, outstanding, very high and high natural character, significant natural areas, water, indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage and sites of significance to Māori.' |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R12 | S236.101 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks a consistent approach to indigenous biodiversity within the matters of discretion in all the relevant SUB rules. | Amend SUB-R12 as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Matters of discretion: 2. Protection, maintenance, or enhancement of natural features and landforms, indigenous biodiversity , historic heritage, sites of significance to Māori, or archaeological sites' |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R13 | S236.102 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks a consistent approach to indigenous biodiversity within the matters of discretion in all the relevant SUB rules. | Amend SUB-R13 as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Matters of discretion: 2. Protection, maintenance, or enhancement of natural features and landforms, indigenous biodiversity , historic heritage, sites of significance to Māori, or archaeological sites' |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|----------|---|--|
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-S2 | S236.103 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks to include indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion to all CE standards. | AmendCE-S2 to include effects on indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-S3 | S236.104 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks to include indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion to all CE standards. | AmendCE-S3 to include effects on indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R3 | S236.105 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks to include indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion to all GRUZ rules to ensure the Councils obligation to maintain indigenous biodiversity under s31 of the RMA is met. | AmendGRUZ-R3 to to include effects on indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R4 | S236.106 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks to include indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion and matter of control to all GRUZ rules to ensure the Councils obligation to maintain indigenous biodiversity under s31 of the RMA is met. | AmendGRUZ-R4 to to include effects on indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion and a matter of control. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R7 | S236.107 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks to include indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion to all GRUZ rules to ensure the Councils obligation to maintain indigenous biodiversity under s31 of the RMA is met. | AmendGRUZ-R7 to to include effects on indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R8 | S236.108 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks to include indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion to all GRUZ rules to ensure the Councils obligation to maintain indigenous biodiversity under s31 of the RMA is met. | AmendGRUZ-R8 to to include effects on indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R9 | S236.109 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks to include indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion to all GRUZ rules to ensure the Councils obligation to maintain indigenous biodiversity under s31 of the RMA is met. | AmendGRUZ-R9 to to include effects on indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R12 | S236.110 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks to include indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion to all GRUZ rules to ensure the Councils obligation to maintain indigenous biodiversity under s31 of the RMA is met. | Amend GRUZ-R12 to to include effects on indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R13 | S236.111 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks to include indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion to all GRUZ rules to ensure the Councils obligation | Amend GRUZ-R13 to to include effects on indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | to maintain indigenous biodiversity under s31 of the RMA is met. | |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R14 | S236.112 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Oppose | The submitter seeks to include indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion to all GRUZ rules to ensure the Councils obligation to maintain indigenous biodiversity under s31 of the RMA is met. | Amend GRUZ-R14 to to include effects on indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-S2 | S236.113 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support in part | The submitter is concerned that all NOSZ Standards matters of discretion do not appropriately address potential adverse effects on the characteristics and qualities of the NOSZ. | Amend NOSZ-S2 to include the following matter of discretion: a. any impacts on the purpose, character and qualities of the zone; and b. any impacts on the character and qualities of the surrounding area; and c. any impacts on the public use and enjoyment of the site and surrounding area; and d. any adverse effects on removing indigenous vegetation on ecological values. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-S3 | S236.114 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support in part | The submitter is concerned that all NOSZ Standards matters of discretion do not appropriately address potential adverse effects on the characteristics and qualities of the NOSZ. | Amend NOSZ-S3 to include the following matter of discretion: a. any impacts on the purpose, character and qualities of the zone; andb. any impacts on the character and qualities of the surrounding area; andc. any impacts on the public use and enjoyment of the site and surrounding area; andd. any adverse effects on removing indigenous vegetation on ecological values. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-S4 | S236.115 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support in part | The submitter is concerned that all NOSZ Standards matters of discretion do not appropriately address potential adverse effects on the characteristics and qualities of the NOSZ. | Amend NOSZ-S4 to include the following matter of discretion: a. any impacts on the purpose, character and qualities of the zone; andb. any impacts on the character and qualities of the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | surrounding area; andc. any impacts on the public use and enjoyment of the site and surrounding area; andd. any adverse effects on removing indigenous vegetation on ecological values. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-S5 | S236.116 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support in part | The submitter is concerned that all NOSZ Standards matters of discretion do not appropriately address potential adverse effects on the characteristics and qualities of the NOSZ. | Amend NOSZ-S5 to include the following matter of discretion: a. any impacts on the purpose, character and qualities of the zone; andb. any impacts on the character and qualities of the surrounding area; andc. any impacts on the public use and enjoyment of the site and surrounding area; andd. any adverse effects on removing indigenous vegetation on ecological values. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-S6 | S236.117 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support in part | The submitter is concerned that all NOSZ Standards matters of discretion do not appropriately address potential adverse effects on the characteristics and qualities of the NOSZ. | Amend NOSZ-S6 to include the following matter of discretion: a. any impacts on the purpose, character and qualities of the zone; andb. any impacts on the character and qualities of the surrounding area; andc. any impacts on the public use and enjoyment of the site and surrounding area; andd. any adverse effects on removing indigenous vegetation on ecological values. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open | NOSZ-S7 | S236.118 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support in part | The submitter is concerned that all NOSZ Standards matters of discretion do not appropriately address potential adverse | Amend NOSZ-S7 to include the following matter of discretion: a. any impacts on the purpose, character and qualities of the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|---|
| Space Zone | | | | | effects on the characteristics and qualities of the NOSZ. | zone; andb. any impacts on the character and qualities of the surrounding area; andc. any impacts on the public use and enjoyment of the site and surrounding area; andd. any adverse effects on removing indigenous vegetation on ecological values. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-S8 | S236.119 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support in part | The submitter is concerned that all NOSZ Standards matters of discretion do not appropriately address potential adverse effects on the characteristics and qualities of the NOSZ. | Amend NOSZ-S8 to include the following matter of discretion: a. any impacts on the purpose, character and qualities of the zone; andb. any impacts on the character and qualities of the surrounding area; andc. any impacts on the public use and enjoyment of the site and surrounding area; andd. any adverse effects on removing indigenous vegetation on ecological values. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-S9 | S236.120 | -Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson | Support in part | The submitter is concerned that all NOSZ Standards matters of discretion do not appropriately address potential adverse effects on the characteristics and qualities of the NOSZ. | Amend NOSZ-S9 to include the following matter of discretion: a. any impacts on the purpose, character and qualities of the zone; andb. any impacts on the character and qualities of the surrounding area; andc. any impacts on the public use and enjoyment of the site and surrounding area; andd. any adverse effects on removing indigenous vegetation on ecological values. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S190.001 | DMST International Limited | Oppose | Notes the landowner has been in discussions with MDC regarding the development of the site for several years. Rezoning to General | Amend the planning maps to rezone 42 and 64 Millard Avenue, Masterton, from General |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | Residential Zone will enable development of the site and allow for investment in the local community, help reduce demand on land around Masterton's urban area (particularly LUC1-3 land), and improve housing affordability in the long-term. The assessment included the submissions rezoning report indicates that the proposed rezoning is strongly aligned with the purpose of the Act and the relevant objectives and policies of the Proposed Plan. | Rural Zone to General Residential Zone. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S190.002 | DMST International Limited | Oppose | The submitter considers it unnecessary to rezone the Site (42-64 Millard Ave) to the Future Urban Zone ahead of a live residential zoning, as the necessary site investigations have already been undertaken to confirm the suitability of the site for future residential development. In addition there are impediments to future development of the identified FUZ sites that do not exist on the site. | Amend the planning maps to rezone 42 and 64 Millard Ave, Masterton from General Rural Zone to Future Urban Zone (secondary relief) |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | | S82.001 | Dublin Street Wines Ltd | Oppose | The submission notes that the site was not previously under the Rural (special) zoning for viticulture protection and that soil conditions in the area suggest the layer is inappropriate at this location. | Amend the Martinborough Soils Overlay so it does not apply to 142 Dublin Street. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S239.001 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support | East Leigh Limited supports all provisions not submitted on below. | Retain |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S239.002 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose in part | In many cases, the definitions chapter incorporates a definition by reference to another document and then repeats the definition. This has the potential to give the misleading impression that the definition will auto-update if the reference document is amended (for example, if a referenced NPS is amended). Under the RMA and the National Planning Standards, incorporations by reference are fixed at the time a plan is made (unless subsequently amended by a plan change. | Delete references to source documents for definitions and instead restate definitions where applicable. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|----------|--|---|
| Interpretation | Definitions | S239.003 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose | The proposed definition is inconsistent with the NPS-IB. | Delete definition "Biodiversity Offset". |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S239.004 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose | This definition is internally inconsistent. What is "shown in planning maps" may be different to what is defined in the NPS-HPL. In a situation where land is within the mapped HPL overlay but doesn't meet the NPH-HPL definition, it would be ambiguous whether that land meets the definition. The term "planning maps" are not defined. It is not clear whether this means the HPL overlay in this plan or other planning maps in other (non-statutory) documents. Definition is not necessary in light of NPS-HPL. | Delete definition 'Highly productive land'. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S239.005 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose | This definition is ambiguous; it is not clear whether it includes bacteria, algae or fungi. The definition does not add clarity. Definition leaves "indigenous vegetation" defined, but "vegetation" not defined. This will create issues with interpreting rules and policy which refer to vegetation generally. | Delete definition "Indigenous vegetation" |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S239.006 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Amend | There are indications in the plan that "development capacity" is intended to be defined. However, there is no definition. The definition from the NPS-UD should be included. | Insert definition for "Development capacity" as follows: Development capacity means the capacity of land to be developed for housing or for business use, based on:(a) the zoning, objectives, policies, rules, and overlays that apply in the relevant proposed and operative RMA planning documents; and(b) the provision of adequate development infrastructure to support the development of land for housing or business use. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O2 | S239.007 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose | The objective is overly broad and not necessary given the inclusion of RN-O3. Not all land in the GRUZ needs to remain available for primary production and not all | Delete Objective RE-O2. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | productive capacity needs to be protected. This policy would require absurd outcomes. For example, the restoration of wetlands in the GRUZ would be contrary to the outcome because it would render the land available for primary production. Areas with low productive capacity do not need to remain available for primary production. Sustainable management requires that areas of low productivity be available for other purposes. | |
| Strategic Direction | New provision request | S239.008 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Amend | The strategic direction chapter is silent as to coastal communities in the Wairarapa. Such communities include Castlepoint, Riversdale Beach, Ngawi, Cape Palliser and Lake Ferry. These communities have special character and are not adequately covered by UFD-O5. Many New Zealanders desire the opportunity to live in these sorts of communities. An objective should be inserted addressing objectives for these communities. | Insert new objective as follows or an equivalent objective in an appropriate location: CS - Coastal Settlements Objectives CS-O1 Infrastructure There is sufficient development capacity to meet demand for growth in Wairarapa's coastal communities. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S1 | S239.009 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support in part | There is no geographical reason for engineering standards to vary between the Districts. | Amend - The 'Engineering Development Standard' referenced should apply to all three Districts for consistency. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S6 | S239.010 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support in part | Table TR-5 Minimum sight distance measured in accordance with "Figure TR-1". The correct Figure is "Figure TR-3" | Amend Note to read: "Sight distance measured in accordance with Figure TR-3". |
| TR - Transport | TR-S6 | S239.011 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose in part | Figure TR-3 and Figure R04 in the Engineering Development Standard are inconsistent. | Delete Figure TR-3 and reference Figure R04 of the Engineering Design Standard |
| TR - Transport | TR-S8 | S239.012 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose in part | Sealing a vehicle accessway for a distance of 30m from the edge of a road carriageway is excessive and not justified. | Amend TR-S8 as follows: "TR-S8 Vehicle crossing information [...] 2. Any vehicle crossing to a sealed road shall be formed, surfaced with concrete, chip seal or asphaltic concrete, and drained for a minimum distance of 30m 10m from the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | edge of the road carriageway. [...] 4. All crossing to a state highway shall be sealed from the edge of the carriageway for a minimum distance of 30m 10m . [...]" |
| TR - Transport | TR-S10 | S239.013 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support in part | Figures TR-7 and TR-8 should be amended to be consistent with TR-S8. | Amend diagram to show required extent of seal consistent as per TR-S8. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P7 | S239.014 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose | This policy applies to all vegetation, including non-indigenous, non-threatened vegetation. It is not supported by any objective. This policy requires routine activities such as pasture mowing to be 'managed'. The policy doesn't provide for modification of indigenous vegetation (or other vegetation) in situations requiring no conservation efforts. This policy is not justified by national direction or the principle of sustainable management. The policy is grammatically incoherent and so its operation is unpredictable. | Delete Policy ECO-P7. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P8 | S239.015 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support in part | The policy as drafted requires adverse effects on indigenous vegetation to be avoided, remedied, or mitigated in all circumstances regardless of whether the indigenous vegetation is threatened. This policy is not justified by the NPS-IB. | Amend Policy ECO-P8 as follows: "ECO-P8 Management of effects on other indigenous vegetation Manage the modification of indigenous vegetation outside of habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna to ensure any adverse effects on the biological diversity of indigenous species and habitats, where appropriate are avoided, remedied, or mitigated, considering: |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous | ECO-R2 | S239.016 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose | This rule makes most activities involving clearance of indigenous vegetation restricted discretionary. ELL considers this rule is unjustified and absurd. | Delete Rule ECO-R2. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Biodiversity | | | | | | |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-O2 | S239.017 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose | Amenity is different from landscape values. This objective conflates the two ideas. This objective serves no purpose. | Delete Objective NFL-O2 |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P2 | S239.018 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support | It is ambiguous what landscapes would be special amenity landscapes that are not ONLs. Reference to the criteria in NFL-P1 is inappropriate. This policy serves no purpose. | Delete Policy NFL-P2. |
| PA - Public Access | PA-P1 | S239.019 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support in part | This policy is too broad and applies to any water body, no matter how small. This is not justified. The default provisions in S 230(3) of the RMA only apply to rivers "whose bed has an average width of 3 meters or more where the river flows through or adjoins an allotment" and lakes "whose bed has an area of 8 hectares or more". | Amend Policy PA-P1 as follows: "PA-P1 Esplanade reserves and strips and access strips Require, where appropriate... ...This policy does not apply to: a. rivers whose bed has an average width of less than 3 meters where the river flows through or adjoins an allotment.b. lakes whose bed has an area of less than 8 hectares." |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P6 | S239.020 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose in part | This policy is too broad - specifically (a) which notes that small lot subdivision is only appropriate where the soil resource is fragmented, not located on highly productive land and does not compromise the use of land for primary production activities. While ELL supports the protection of highly productive land - there are areas in the GRUZ that are not fragmented but that are appropriate for small lot subdivision. Particularly areas with low productive capacity. | Amend Policy SUB-P6 as follows: SUB-P6 Avoid inappropriate subdivision in the General Rural Zone Avoid subdivision... a. limiting small lot subdivision within the General Rural Zone to only areas where the soil resource is fragmented, is not located on highly productive land, and it does not compromise the use of land for primary production activities; and ..." |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R1 | S239.021 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support in part | This rule needs to be reformatted so that it is clear. Bullet points ii. -x. should be further bullet pointed separately under 'i'. | Amend Rule SUB-R1 as follows: "... General Rural Zone 2. Activiy status: Controlled Where a. The minimum lot size of any lot created by the boundary adjustment is 0.5ha; and i. The boundary adjustment complies with, or does not increase any existing or previously approved non-compliance with: ii. a. SUB-S2 iii. b. SUB-S3 iv. c. SUB-S4 v. d. SUB-S5 vi. e. SUB-S6 vii. f. SUB-S7 viii. g. SUB-S8 ix. h. SUB-S9; and x. i. SUB-S10; and b. The boundary adjustment complies with, or does not increase any existing or previously approved non-compliance with the relevant standards of the underlying zone. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R2 | S239.022 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support in part | Support the minimum lot size standard SUB-S1 referenced in this rule in respect of all Residential Zones. This allows additional infill development by utilising existing services instead of pushing out the urban boundaries to accommodate additional development. | Retain Rule SUB-R2 (1) |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S1 | S239.023 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose in part | Do not support average lot requirements for the residential zone when creating 3 or more lots. | Amend SUB-R1 and SUB - Table 1 to remove average lot requirements. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S1 | S239.024 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose in part | East Leigh Limited does not support (b)(i) SUB-Table 1 and the protection of highly productive land in line with NPS-HPL. There is no justification for a Wairarapa wide 40ha minimum, particularly on land that isn't identified as Highly Productive Land. Supports the removal of the 4ha minimum lot size provided for in the Operative Plan as ELL consider this was too large for rural-residential development, yet not large enough to provide for productive use. ELL believes there should | Delete and add rules for small lot subdivision. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | be some provision for smaller lot subdivision in the rural zone that is not identified as productive land. This could be achieved by allowing a limited number of small lots per title (0.5ha for example with a date provision to also limit subdivision of new titles) and setting a minimum lot size for the balance lot to protect and maintain rural character and amenity. By allowing limited smaller lot subdivision in the rural zone the plan is encouraging/ supporting the economic and social well-being of rural communities. | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S239.025 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose in part | Masterton should be included in (a) given the characteristics of the Masterton Rural Zone are no different than Carterton and South Wairarapa Districts. There should be a consistent approach across all three districts. Notes that with the exclusion of Masterton from this rule, there is no provision for any general rural lots less than the 40ha minimum in the Masterton District. This is overly restrictive and will have significant effects on property values for rural ratepayers. | Delete paragraph (1)(a) so that the rule applies to Masterton District. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R5 | S239.026 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose | It is not clear what the term 'vacant' means in respect of (e). Given this rule addresses surplus residential units, is a lot that contains any building considered to meet this rule? Or is the term vacant used in reference to any lot that doesn't contain a residential unit? Further clarification is needed. | Amend to clarify what allotments count as 'vacant'. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R10 | S239.027 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose in part | Sees no reason why any subdivision that creates new vested roads needs to be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity. Given appropriate standards can be met around standard, formation etc., it should be assessed as a controlled activity as matters of discretion can address these matters appropriately. | Amend Rule SUB-R10 to controlled activity. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R12 | S239.028 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose in part | East Leigh Limited does not support a minimum lot size of 40ha for subdivision within the Coastal Environment, including the non-complying status for any subdivision that | Delete/Re-word and insert rules for small lot subdivision. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | does not comply with SUB-R12. As with the rural zone, ELL supports the ability for limited small lot subdivision with larger balance lots but with additional matters of consideration around design/ development in the coastal environment. The matters of discretion don't recognise the Wairarapa Coastal Strategy or the 'Caring for your Coast' guidelines which are existing non-statutory documents that guide development in the Coastal Environment. In lieu of these documents being referenced ELL would support a Coastal Design Guide in addition to the other Design Guides included in the appendices. | |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O2 | S239.029 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose | <p>Objective CE-O2 is overly broad. Objective 2 of the NZCPS reads: To preserve the natural character of the coastal environment and protect natural features and landscape values through: recognising the characteristics and qualities that contribute to natural character, natural features and landscape values and their location and distribution; identifying those areas where various forms of subdivision, use, and development would be inappropriate and protecting them from such activities; and encouraging restoration of the coastal environment.</p> <p>The proposed policy goes beyond this objective. Taken literally the objective directs the disestablishment of all coastal settlements as well as primary production in the coastal environment.</p> <p>The focus on Natural Character ignores Landscape Character, which is modified and has no legislative support for restoration. Landscape is not the same as Natural Character, both of which are modified at Riversdale. Insert a separate Landscape objective recognising this fact.</p> | Amend Objective CE-O2 to make it consistent with Objective 2 in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. |
| CE - Coastal | CE-O3 | S239.030 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose in part | It is not clear what "are not increased" means in this objective. The objective assumes that | Amend Objective CE-O3 as follows: "CE-O3 Risk from coastal hazardsThe risk |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--|---|
| Environment | | | | | current risk levels from coastal hazards are appropriate. | and consequences from coastal hazards including the impacts of sea level rise on people, property, infrastructure, and the environment are not increased. The risk from coastal hazards, including the impacts of sea level rise on people, property, infrastructure and the environment, are managed and, where appropriate, minimised and reduced. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P1 | S239.031 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose | This Policy is inconsistent with Policy 4 of the RPS. In particular, it doesn't accord with the criteria for identifying the landward extend of the coastal environment required by policy 4 of the RPS. | Delete and replace Policy CE-P1 with policy including criteria in policy 4 of RPS. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P4 | S239.032 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose in part | The requirement for a functional need or operational need for subdivision, use and development in the coastal environment is not supported | Amend Policy CE-P4 as follows: "CE-P4 Activities and subdivision within the coastal environment. Manage subdivision, use, and development within the coastal environment to ensure: a- there is a functional need or operational need for the activity to be located in the coastal environment; and b. a. a. the form, scale, and nature of the activity will not detract from the natural character of the coastal environment by: ... iv. minimising manage modification of indigenous vegetation and incorporating revegetation and planting of disturbed areas; ..." |
| CE - Coastal | CE-P5 | S239.033 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose | This policy is ambiguous and not justified by an objective or national direction. | Delete Policy CE-P5. or |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| Environment | | | | | In paragraph 1, it is ambiguous what "within existing coastal settlements" means: this could be referring to zoning, or some more subjective perception on the boundary of the settlement. It is also ambiguous whether this limits the provision of residential units to in-filling or allows the outward growth of existing settlements. | Amend Policy CE-P5 to clarify that existing coastal settlement includes future extensions to those settlements. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-R6 | S239.034 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose | As drafted this rule applies to the whole district, not just the coastal environment. If limited to the coastal environment, it is not clear that there are any activities not otherwise provided for in the chapter and so the rule is not necessary. | Delete Rule CE-R6. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-S2 | S239.035 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose | This standard is inconsistent with ECO-R2. | Amend Rule ECO-R2 for consistency. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-S3 | S239.036 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support in part | The gross floor area of 200m ² is too small and not justified. | Amend Standard CE-S3 as follows "CE-S3 Buildings and structures 1. Buildings and structures within the coastal environment must meet the following standards: a. the gross floor area of any individual building or structure on a site must not exceed 200m²-300m² ; b. the building... ..." |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R1 | S239.037 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support | Generally supportive of Rule SETZ-R1. | Retain Rule SETZ-R1 as notified. |
| Designations | MDC - Masterton District Council | S239.038 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Amend | Proposed area in this designation includes Lot 1 DP 451871 (Record of Title 579619). Understands that the council has no current plans to use that land for that purpose. The inclusion of that land in the designation is, therefore, not reasonably necessary for the proposed works. It should be excluded from the designation at this time. | Amend Designation MDC-M-50 boundary to remove Lot 1 DP 451871 from the designation. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------|-------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Planning Maps | Zones | S239.039 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Amend | The zoning at Riversdale Beach does not accord with part 3 of the General Approach character of the plan. There is no policy guidance in the Proposed District Plan or the RPS as to how land should be zoned. As such, the zoning operated as a rule or method without a supporting policy. The proposed map applies the General Rural Zone to lots which has already been consented, subdivided or developed as residential lots in Riversdale Beach. This is contrary to the Zone Standard in the National Planning Standards. Those lots should be zoned Settlement Zone. The mapping does not provide for the anticipated demand for residential development or the anticipated effects of climate change in Riversdale Beach. The above proposed zoning would better implement national direction including. [see original submission] | Amend proposed zoning around Riversdale Beach from GRUZ to SETZ and NOSZ as set out in attached map. |
| Planning Maps | General District-Wide Matters | S239.047 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support | Overlay at Riversdale Beach doesn't reflect best available data on what is HPL under the NPS-HPL definition. | Amend the NPS-HPL overlay to reflect Highly Productive Land as mapped in report of BakerAg attached. |
| Planning Maps | General District-Wide Matters | S239.048 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support in part | The coastal environment overlay, particularly at Riversdale Beach is inconsistent with the criteria in RPS policy 4. Riversdale settlement is excluded from the Coastal Environment overlay, yet built up areas inland of it are included in the mapped Coastal Environment. This is anomalous. It is feasible to exclude the settlement as its elements, patterns and processes are highly modified and have low Natural Character. Equally, it could be included in the CE and simply rated low Natural Character. It is improper to include built up areas inland of the excluded settlement. The CE mapping appears to have been simply rolled over from the Operative Combined District Plan. Techniques and case law has been updated since then and the | Amend the coastal environment overlay, in particular inland of the settlement at Riversdale Beach as set out in the attached map. Remap the Coastal Environment to only coincide with the Foreshore Protection Area or to include the Settlement, and if so, rate the Settlement Areas as Low Natural Character. Re-assess and remap the Coastal Environment according to current practice and at a scale applicable to Riversdale. Map the existing development as Residential and the consented but unbuilt areas as Residential. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | mapping and assessment needs to be redone. | |
| Planning Maps | Natural Environment Values | S239.049 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Oppose | The overlay is not justified. This overlay at Riversdale Beach and other coastal settlements and surrounds does not have any apparent basis. The coastline at Riversdale Beach does not meet the values in SAL1 of SCHED8. This is out of sync with the NZILA Landscape Assessment guidelines Te Tangi a te Manu. | Delete Overlay Significant/ Special Amenity Landscapes. In particular from coastal settlements and surrounds as appropriate when they do not have the values in SCHED8. Delete the 40m Coastal Contour overlay. |
| Planning Maps | Natural Environment Values | S239.050 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Amend | The foreshore protection area around settlements like Riversdale Beach is too narrow. It does not adequately provide for anticipated effects of climate change. | Amend Foreshore Protection Area overlay to better provide for future sea level rise. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R2 | S239.051 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support | Generally supportive of Rule SETZ-R2. | Retain Rule SETZ-R2 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R3 | S239.052 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support | Generally supportive of Rule SETZ-R3. | Retain Rule SETZ-R3 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R4 | S239.053 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support | Generally supportive of Rule SETZ-R4. | Retain Rule SETZ-R4 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R5 | S239.054 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support | Generally supportive of Rule SETZ-R5. | Retain Rule SETZ-R5 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R6 | S239.055 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support | Generally supportive of Rule SETZ-R6. | Retain Rule SETZ-R6 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R7 | S239.056 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support | Generally supportive of Rule SETZ-R7. | Retain Rule SETZ-R7 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R8 | S239.057 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support | Generally supportive of Rule SETZ-R8. | Retain Rule SETZ-R8 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R9 | S239.058 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support | Generally supportive of Rule SETZ-R9. | Retain Rule SETZ-R9 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R10 | S239.059 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support | Generally supportive of SETZ-R10. | Retain Rule SETZ-R10 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|---|------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--|---|
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R11 | S239.060 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support | Generally supportive of Rule SETZ-R11. | Retain Rule SETZ-R11 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R12 | S239.061 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support | Generally supportive of Rule SETZ-R12. | Retain Rule SETZ-R12 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R13 | S239.062 | East Leigh Limited ("ELL") | Support | Generally supportive of Rule SETZ-R13. | Retain Rule SETZ-R13 as notified. |
| Designations | SWDC - South Wairarapa District Council | S171.001 | Edgar Vandendungen | Oppose | The submission details the lack of consultation with surrounding sites, how the use of Pain Farm to distribute wastewater contradicts its intended use, historical mismanagement, and general disposal rules. | Amend the designation SWDC-S-26 (Martinborough Wastewater Disposal) to not include the Pain Farm complex and undertake full consultation with adjoining properties regarding the Martinborough wastewater treatment facility. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S19.001 | Edward Henrard | Not Stated | Submission relates to boundary adjustments, submitter discusses intent to subdivide. | No decision requested. |
| ENG - Energy | Introduction | S227.001 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Oppose in part | <p>Submitter states that paragraph 8 of the introduction is not clear or accurate, so should be amended or deleted.</p> <p>Solar irradiance is available all-over New Zealand at a level suitable for energy generation and is not a constraint that is specific to the Wairarapa.</p> <p>Proximity to a substation or overhead line is not a constraint. This is a convenience and cost saving for the proposing company.</p> <p>Flat land is not a constraint. Solar generation can and is being achieved on undulating land or hillsides in other countries. A less than 5% gradient is a cost cutting convenience for the proposing company.</p> | <p>Amend ENG-Energy Introduction as follows: "...There are potential tensions between the existing values of these areas and their potential for wind energy generation. Solar energy generation poses similar tensions. High quality solar farms need to account for the following in their design which constrains where they can be located: a. The solar irradiance of an area. b. Proximity to an existing substation or existing overhead line. c. Flat land with a less than 5 degree slope. By their nature, there is tensions between other competing land uses, in particular..."</p> |
| ENG - Energy | Introduction | S227.002 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Oppose in part | To understand the point in which the level of adverse effects become too much, it is considered a clear maximum point or level should be referred to. | Amend ENG-Energy chapter Introduction [paragraph 9], to include 'measurable levels' to support the statement "some level of adverse effects may need to be accepted..." |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| ENG - Energy | Introduction | S227.003 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Oppose in part | Infrastructure required for solar power generation has a short life span, high content of rare earth minerals and a large carbon footprint in their production. Noted there is no definition of 'sustainable' in the Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan document. | Amend ENG-Energy Chapter Introduction [paragraph 9], to include a definition of "sustainable" where it is referred to in the context of "sustainable energy future". |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-O3 | S227.004 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Oppose in part | The submitter expresses that solar and wind infrastructure needs to be renewed frequently compared to other forms of energy generation and solar being the least efficient form of energy generation. | Amend ENG-O3 as follows: 'ENG-O3 Energy generation and efficiency To move the Wairarapa towards a low emission economy through the efficient use of energy efficiency and generation of electricity from renewable sources in the Wairarapa.' |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P2 | S227.005 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Oppose in part | Small scale electricity generation should be for owner use to promote local resilience. | Amend ENG-P2 as follows: "ENG-P2 Enable small-scale renewable electricity generation Enable small-scale electricity generation for owners use and not to feed into the national grid where it is of a form and scale that avoids, remedies, or mitigates its adverse effects." |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P4 | S227.006 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Oppose in part | Submitter does not detail specific reasons for the decisions requested regarding ENG-P4(f), (h) and (i), but notes for (j) that contaminated soil can still grow food, but it will have absorbed accumulative chemicals the body can not remove. | Amend ENG-P4 as follows: Provide for large-scale renewable electricity generation activities where effects are appropriately managed, by having regard to:... f. potential adverse effects from the activity, including traffic generation, visual, light, safety, and noise , heat, accumulative noise, wireless connectivity interference, increased fire risk, and increased wind ; ... h. cumulative effects from multiple renewable electricity generation activities; [add measurement for how |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | <p>close power plants can be in relation to each other]</p> <p>i. potential for adverse effects on nearby residents, natural features and landscapes, waterbodies, indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage, and sites of significance to Māori;</p> <p>j. potential effects on the productive capacity healthy productivity of the land, including the ability to protect the productive capacity of highly productive land;</p> <p>...</p> |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P5 | S227.007 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Support in part | Submitter has not provided reason. | <p>Amend ENG-P5 as follows:</p> <p>"ENG-P5 Reverse Sensitivity Manage subdivision and land use activities to avoid adverse effects on the efficient operation of established renewable electricity generation facilities and manage placement of energy generation facilities to avoid reverse sensitivities of established residents and land use."</p> |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R1 | S227.008 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Support in part | Submitter has not provided reasons. | <p>Amend ENG-R1 as follows:</p> <p>'ENG-R1 Installation, maintenance, repair, upgrade, and removal of new utility equipment for investigating a site for suitability for a renewable electricity generation activity. All zones 1. Activity status: Permitted ... All Zones 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: ...</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | 7. Actual and potential loss of highly productive land. All Zones3. Activity Status: Discretionary x. Additional Infrastructure.' |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R2 | S227.009 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Support in part | Submitter has not provided specific reasons. | Amend ENG-R2 as follows: "ENG- R2 Operation, maintenance, repair, expansion and removal of existing renewable electricity generation activities ... b. All above ground structures and underground infrastructure that are no longer required for renewable electricity generation purposes are removed within two years of being replaced or becoming redundant:..." Insert "expansion of any existing renewable electricity generation activities" as a Discretionary Activity. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R3 | S227.010 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Support in part | No reasoning provided. | Amend to include a maximum size of "small scale". |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R4 | S227.011 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Support in part | No reasoning provided. | Amend to include maximum size of "community scale". |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R6 | S227.012 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Support in part | No reasoning provided. | Amend to include a maximum size of "large scale". |
| NOISE - Noise | Introduction | S227.013 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Support in part | Noise level regulations need to accommodate the low-level electrical buzz from solar facilities. There are also mechanical machinery turning panels. The constant nature of the noise during all daylight hours and its impact on sensitive activities needs to be addressed in the PDP. | Amend NOISE-Noise Introduction as follows: "...d. NZS6807:1994 Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas; and e. NZS 6808:2010 Acoustics Wind Farm Noise-; and f. NZS [xxxx:xxxx] Acoustics |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | Solar Energy Generation Noise. [attach accompanying document] " |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S227.014 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Support in part | Submitter does not provide specific reasons for the first two amendments. For the removal of "battery energy storage system" the submitter notes the definition should not automatically consider "battery energy storage systems" a part of a large-scale electricity generation activity. A large-scale electricity generation facility can function and exist without a battery storage system, and therefore should not be included in the definition. It is further noted, battery energy storage system should have separate and specific consent regulations. | Amend Definition for 'Large-scale renewable electricity generation activity' as follows: "Large-scale renewable solar and wind electricity generation activity Means electricity generation activities utilising renewable free energy sources for the purpose... ...It includes all ancillary components and activities such as substations, battery energy storage systems , climate/environmental monitoring equipment" |
| ENG - Energy | Introduction | S227.015 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Amend | Solar array structures are 'buildings'. They are fully roofed, whether this is through a permanently fixed table or on a tracking system, and are fixed or located on or in land. Therefore they should be held to the same standards as buildings, which should be made clear in the ENG chapter. | Amend the ENG-Energy chapter to state that solar array structures fall under the definition of 'building'. |
| ENG - Energy | Introduction | S227.016 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Amend | Arrays and other associated structures within the facility are infrastructure (in line with infrastructure definition) and intensively cover the land. Reference should therefore be made to them being 'infrastructure'. | Amend ENG-Energy chapter to include the term 'infrastructure' when referring to large-scale electricity generation. |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S227.017 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Amend | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | Amend ENG-Energy to include that all utility scale power generation consent applications are to be publicly notified. |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S227.018 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Amend | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | Amend ENG-Energy to include a standard regulating the location of utility scale solar power generation to non-residential areas, |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | non-prime farmland or marginal land. |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S227.019 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Amend | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | Amend ENG-Energy to include a new note that resource consent is to remain with the original parties (consent holder) and is not to be used as an instrument of trading to entities not party to the original applications. New owners would require a new resource consent / renewal of consent. |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S227.020 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Amend | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | Amend ENG-Energy to include a new standard setting out consultation requirements, mandating consultation with relative stakeholders; Iwi, conservation, aviation, water protection and historical authorities, telecommunications owners and operators. |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S227.021 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Amend | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | Amend ENG-Energy to oblige applicants to shoulder testing and assessment expenses. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-S2 | S227.022 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Oppose in part | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | Amend ENG-S2 to include the requirement for water quality monitoring; all water wells and bore within 5.5km of a solar panel prior to construction, during use, and up to 5 years after decommissioning. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-S1 | S227.023 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Oppose in part | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | Amend ENG-S1 to include a standard, that there shall be a three yearly review of decommissioning plans; including restoration, toxic waste disposal, fault of landowner's failure to decommission, financial assurance, cash held in country, not to include salvage values, disaster and half of production conditions. |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S227.024 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Amend | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | Amend ENG-Energy to include a new standard that includes: Applicant to establish safety protocols, provide annual equipment and training for emergency services, coordination plan with responders and hospitals, and cover cost for facility call outs. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | Applicant and landowner to procure adequate liability insurance; to cover injury, death, property damage. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P3 | S227.025 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Oppose in part | Community scale electricity generation should be for direct community use and not the national grid, to promote local resilience. | Amend ENG-P3 as follows: "ENG-P3 Provide for community-scale renewable electricity generation Encourage community-scale renewable electricity generation where it is for direct community use and not to feed into the national grid in the General Rural Zone where effects are appropriately managed..." |
| ENG - Energy | Introduction | S227.026 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Support in part | Solar power generation plants manufacture energy. The general description in the ENG-Energy section should therefore include words like buildings, infrastructure, manufacture and especially industrial activity. Words like 'green', 'solar farm', 'sustainable', 'renewable' have been overused and undefined by a very large industry. These words hide the industrial nature and impacts or power generation. | Amend ENG-Energy to include reference to energy generation plants being industrial activities. |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S227.027 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Amend | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | Amend ENG-Energy to include a new standard, requiring independent engineering Assessments to be undertaken for wind loading and wet ground conditions. |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S227.028 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Amend | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | Amend ENG-Energy to include a new standard, that ensures all applications include impact reports; visual, glare, noise, fire and safety |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S227.029 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Amend | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | Amend ENG-Energy to include a new standard requiring community impact evaluations; economic, tourism, agricultural, employment...with consent applications. |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S227.030 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Amend | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | Amend ENG-Energy to include the following provision: Construction and Maintenance1. Post-approval construction to commence |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | <p>within 12 months, if not plan approval null and void.2. Stringent development standards for chemical content with specific product details provided.3. Wildlife preservation corridor per 20Ha of Solar field no less than 10 meters in width4. Solar field size restrictions; Max 80.9Ha, not within 3.5km of another utility scale solar facility.5. Maximum 1% footprint of total farmland acreage per council to be used for renewable energy6. Fencing is not to be topped with razor wire nor to include opaque barriers.7. Sound and vibration levels limited and tested.8. Underground wiring to be inside conduit9. Modifications require new permits as if a new project10. Biannual statement of activity to be provided to ensure facility is actively producing electricity for the power grid. Panels below useful life threshold activate the decommissioning plan.</p> |
| <p>ENG - Energy</p> | <p>ENG-S4</p> | <p>S227.031</p> | <p>Elisabeth Jane Creevey</p> | <p>Support in part</p> | <p>Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added.</p> | <p>Amend ENG-S4 to also include the following specific requirements with regard to setbacks and height:1. No panel within 50m from non-participating property line or road2. No panel within 150m from a residential building.3. No panel within 3.6km from school property line4. No panel within 3.6km from a town boundary.5. No panel within 3.2km of</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | an artesian well or bore6.Solar field not placed within a storm water system, floodplain or above an aquifer -7. No panel exceed 4.5m at highest rotation - Notice given to any landing strip owner; setbacks to be agreed by landing strip owner |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S227.032 | Elisabeth Jane Creevey | Amend | Submitter notes this, including the other related submission points related to increasing regulations, are now being introduced to Local Council plans in countries that have had 20 years or more experience living with utility scale renewable energy systems, their impacts and associated companies. Submitter urges Councils to read the Spencer County, Indiana, July 2023.16 ordinance, which contains details of how these measures are implemented. | Amend ENG-Energy to provide specific protection for residents (either a rule or standard) as follows: Protection for Residents1. Complaints about energy generating facility interference of telecommunication, television broadcast, microwave transmissions or glare issues to be rectified within 24hrs at company cost.2. Solar companies must value guarantee all owner-occupied residential dwellings within 1.6 km of a solar panel for a period of 35 years. |
| Strategic Direction | CCR-O3 | S144.001 | E McGruddy | Support in part | Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy. | Amend CCR-O3 as follows: The Wairarapa develops and functions in a way that does not increase risk and consequences of natural hazards, and which anticipates and plans for community needs in significant events, eg, food security. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O5 | S144.002 | E McGruddy | Oppose | Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block | Delete RE-O5 as follows: Opportunities for rural lifestyle subdivision and development are only provided in parts of the rural environment where they do not conflict with enabling primary |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy. | production and protecting the productive capacity of the land. And insert: The Wairarapa contains vibrant and viable per-urban areas, buffering the interface between urban and rural zones and providing multiple social and economic services. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O3 | S144.003 | E McGruddy | Support in part | Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy. | Amend SUB-O3 as follows: "subdivision and development within urban boundaries and within existing small lot subdivisions are provided for where they integrate with the existing and planned...." |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P5 | S144.004 | E McGruddy | Support in part | Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy. | Amend SUB-P5 as follows: "Provide for subdivision, use and development were it does not compromise the purpose, character and amenity values of the General Rural Zone by: a) enabling and promoting openness and predominance of vegetation and development sympathetic to existing landforms; b) enabling and promoting a productive working landscape, providing for varying forms and scale for local and export markets; ... d) managing the density and location of residential development, providing for varying forms and scale for housing options; ensuring allotments can be self serviced; e) retaining a clear delineation and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | contrast peri-urban areas as buffers between the district's rural areas and urban areas; ... |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P6 | S144.005 | E McGruddy | Oppose in part | Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy. | Amend SUB-P6 as follows: "SUB-P6 Avoid inappropriate Subdivision in the General Rural Zone Avoid subdivision in the General Rural Zone that will result in sites that are of a size, scale, or location that is contrary to the anticipated purpose, character, or amenity values of the zone. Allow subdivision and development that results in the efficient and productive use of land, with lot sizes sufficient to accommodate intended land uses by: a) limiting enabling small lot subdivision within existing small holdings in the General Rural Zone to only in areas where the soil resource is fragmented, is not located on highly productive land, and it does not compromise the use of land for primary production activities; and ... |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S144.006 | E McGruddy | Oppose in part | Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy. | Amend SUB-R4 as follows: General Rural Zone: Subdivision of land less than 4ha 8ha in the General Rural Zone 1. Activity status: Controlled Permitted Where: a. The allotment subject to subdivision is located within either the South Wairarapa or Carterton District or |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------|----------------|------------------|------------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>Masterton District;</p> <p>b. The allotment is not located on highly productive land or within the Martinborough Soils Overlay or a mapped Hazard Overlay or a mapped Ecological or Landscape Overlay;</p> <p>c. The allotment subject to subdivision is less than 4ha-8ha in area;</p> <p>d. No provi...</p> <p>...</p> |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S144.007 | E McGruddy | Oppose | <p>Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy.</p> | <p>Delete matters of control under SUB-R4 (1):</p> <p>Matters of control:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, SUB-P2, SUB-P5, and SUB-P6. 2. The size, design, shape, location, and layout of lots. 3. Efficient use of land and compatibility with the role, function, and predominant character of the zone. 4. Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan. 5. The subdivision layout and accessibility from and connections to surrounding neighbourhoods. 6. Protection, maintenance, or enhancement of natural features and landforms, historic heritage, waterbodies, indigenous vegetation and biodiversity, sites and areas of significance to Māori, or archaeological sites. 7. The measures to avoid, remedy, or mitigate any adverse effects on any cultural, spiritual and/or heritage values, interests, or associations of importance to Māori that are |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------|---|
| | | | | | | <p>associated with the land being subdivided, including weed and pest control.7. The subdivision design and layout, and the design and location of building platforms and access to minimise earthworks and land disturbance and integrate built form into the natural landform.8. Provision of appropriate infrastructure and services and their design and location, including water supply (including firefighting water supply), wastewater systems, stormwater control and disposal, telecommunications and electricity in accordance with Council's engineering standards.9. Separation distances, barriers, acoustic treatment, and orientation of buildings.10. Fire rating of party/common walls.11. Energy efficiency and the ability for lots to use renewable energy.12. Effects on the stability of land and buildings, and potential to create new or exacerbate existing natural hazards and the matters set out in SUB-P4.13. Management of construction effects, including traffic movements, hours of operation, noise, earthworks, and erosion and sediment control.14. The staging of development and timing of works.15. Management of potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing land uses such as noise, odour, dust, and visual effects, including reverse</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | sensitivity effects relating to network utilities and significant hazardous facilities.16. Financial contributions.17. Bonds and other payments and guarantees.18. The matters referred to in sections 108 and 220 of the Act. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | Introduction | S144.008 | E McGruddy | Support in part | Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy. | Amend the introduction as follows: ... The Wairarapa is increasingly seen as an attractive place to reside. Rural lifestyle living provides a residential choice for people wanting a lifestyle on larger sites, with the opportunity to carry out small scale productive activities in a rural setting. Rural lifestyle blocks are clustered in "peri-urban" areas around the main towns and transport corridors and make a significant contribution to the vibrancy and economic prosperity of the districts - "greening" the landscape, prototyping new crops, growing produce for local markets, providing resilience in the event of a major earthquake or other significant natural event impacting urban centers and supply lines, and enhancing the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of their communities. The Rural Lifestyle Zone provides opportunities for rural lifestyle living in the Wairarapa. The General Rural Zone provides further opportunities for rural lifestyle living, in appropriate |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | locations and to an appropriate scale, insofar as it does not risk the loss and fragmentation of the rural character, productive land, and productive potential of the land within the Wairarapa rural hinterland . |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-01 | S144.009 | E McGruddy | Support in part | Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy. | Amend GRUZ-01 as follows: The General Rural Zone is used primarily for primary production, activities that support primary production, and other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone, and smallholdings clustered in peri-urban areas around the main towns . |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-02 | S144.010 | E McGruddy | Support in part | Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy. | Amend GRUZ-02 (b) as follows: The predominant character of the General Rural Zone are maintained and enhanced, which include: ... b. sparsely developed landscape with open space between buildings that are predominantly used for agricultural, pastoral and horticultural activities (e.g. barns and sheds), low density rural living (e.g. farmhouses, seasonal worker accommodation, and a small degree of rural lifestyle), and community activities (e.g. rural halls, domains, and schools) and more closely settled peri-urban areas serving as a transition between urban areas and the rural hinterland; ... |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|---|--|
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O6 | S144.011 | E McGruddy | Support in part | Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy. | Amend GRUZ-O6 (b) as follows: b. Opportunities for rural lifestyle subdivision and development in appropriate existing existing locations within the General Rural Zone is provided for enabled , insofar as GRUZ-O6(a) is met. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P1 | S144.012 | E McGruddy | Support in part | Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy. | Amend GRUZ-P1 as follows: a. Enable primary production activities that are compatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone. b. Provide for other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located in the General Rural Zone that are not incompatible with primary production. c. Provide for Enable rural lifestyle development in appropriate locations where GRUZ-P1(a) and GRUZ-P1(b) are enabled or provided for. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P3 | S144.013 | E McGruddy | Support in part | Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy. | Amend GRUZ-P3 as follows: Provide for subdivision, use, and development where it does not compromise the purpose, character, and amenity of the General Rural Zone, by: ... e. managing the density and location of enabling residential development within existing small lot subdivisions and restricting the development of new small lot subdivisions; f. ensuring allotments can be self-serviced; g. retaining a clear delineation and contrast smaller lots in peri-urban areas |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | | as a buffer between the Wairarapa's rural areas and urban areas; and... |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P4 | S144.014 | E McGruddy | Support | Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy. | Amend GRUZ-P4 as follows: GRUZ-P4 Avoid Discourage inappropriate subdivision Avoid Discourage subdivision in the General... |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S4 | S144.015 | E McGruddy | Support | Submitter lists a number of reasons to support decisions requested. In summary the submitter notes that the proposed plan creates an unfortunate and perhaps unintended inference that lifestyle block owners and their properties are not valued within Wairarapa society and economy. | Amend GRUZ-S4 as follows: 1. For sites comprising less than 40 ha 8ha : a. one up to three residential units per site subject to meeting the conditions set out in SUB-R4 ; and b. one minor residential unit per site, where the minor residential unit is located within 30m of the primary residential unit and has a gross floor area of no more than 80m2. 2. For sites comprising of 40 ha 8ha or more: ... Matters of discretion for sites of 8ha or more: 1. Whether it can be demonstrated that the residential unit(s) provides ancillary accommodation for landowners and/or workers involved with primary production on sites over 40 ha. ... |
| Introduction | Contents | S247.001 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Amend | District Plans must be prepared having regard to management plans and strategies prepared under other Acts (s74(2)(b)(i) of the RMA). The Wellington Region Waste Management and Minimisation Plan is one of those documents that should inform the strategic context of the Combined District | Insert the Wellington Region Waste Management and Minimisation Plan as an 'other document' with respect to section 74(2)(b)(i) of the Resource Management Act. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | Plan. Waste management and minimisation is a critical issue in the Wairarapa region and has significant impacts on meeting climate change goals. The actions of the WRWMMP need to inform District Plan provisions. | |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S247.002 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support in part | Refuse trucks need to have the appropriate space within road reserves to support collection of bins. With intensification, road reserves need to be carefully planned. While the placement of bins is temporary, the provision of space for their collection is paramount to allow efficient collection of bins and avoid injury to users of the road while refuse trucks are operating. Adding this clause to the definition will ensure that this element of the road reserve is considered. | Insert a definition for 'ancillary transport network infrastructure' as follows: " Ancillary transport network infrastructure means infrastructure located within the road reserve that supports the transport network and includes: ... j. space for Council kerbside waste bins. " |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S247.003 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Amend | Requests that a definition should be added to the PDP to recognise that cleanfills and landfills are important uses in the rural area. The definition has the same meaning as that in the National Planning Standards. The definition will also allow for these activities to be defined differently from industrial activities. | Insert new definition for 'cleanfill area' as follows: " Cleanfill area Means an area used exclusively for the disposal of cleanfill material. " |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S247.004 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Amend | This definition should be added to the district plan to recognise that cleanfills and landfills are important uses in the rural area. The definition has the same meaning as that in the National Planning Standards. | Insert new definition for 'Cleanfill material' as follows: " Cleanfill material means virgin excavated natural materials including clay, gravel, sand, soil and rock that are free of: a. combustible, putrescible, degradable or leachable components; b. hazardous substances and materials; c. products and materials derived from hazardous waste treatment, stabilisation or disposal practices; d. medical and veterinary wastes, asbestos, and radioactive substances; e. contaminated soil and other |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | contaminated materials; and f. liquid wastes." |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S247.005 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Amend | Insert a definition for composting in order to provide for the activity of composting of household food waste on a town-wide scale. The definition is taken from the Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region. It also needs to be clarified whether organic food waste composting is defined as rural industry. | Insert new definition for 'Organic Composting' as follows: " Organic Composting Any combination of solid or semi-solid vegetable and animal waste that has fully decomposed and matured to a stable product. For the purposes of the Plan, compost does not contain human sewage." |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S247.006 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Oppose in part | <p>The definition for infrastructure under the RMA excludes waste processing and disposal facilities, however the Natural and Built Environment Act includes 'district or regional resource recovery or waste disposal facilities.' The PDP should therefore include district and regional waste facilities as part of the infrastructure definition to acknowledge that they are an essential part of the services needed. This will also align it with the definition in Proposed Plan Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement and operative Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region.</p> <p>Amending the definition will also ensure that the appropriate objectives and policies come into play in the Strategic Directions chapter, particularly INF-O1. Without this amendment, none of the objectives and policies will operationally apply to any regional landfills, district refuse transfer stations, or recycling facilities.</p> | Amend the definition for 'infrastructure' as follows: "Has the same meaning as in section 2 of the RMA, as set out below: i) anything described as a network utility operation in regulations made for the purposes of the definition of network utility operator in section 166. m) district or regional resource recovery or waste disposal facilities." |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S247.007 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Amend | Amend so that (i) - (ix) are listed as (b) - (j) to ensure these activities are not a subset of (a). There should be an exclusion for recycling facilities where cardboard, glass, and Class 1, 2, and 5 plastics are collated and packaged. | Amend definition for 'Noxious or offensive activity' as follows: "Means an industrial activity involving: a. blood or offal treating; bone boiling or crushing; dag crushing; fellmongering; fish |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>These facilities deal with inert substances and have little odour. If any odour did result, the last clause would apply.</p> | <p>cleaning or curing; gut scraping and treating; and tallow melting; b. i. flax pulping; flock manufacture or teasing of textile materials for any purpose; and wood pulping; c. ii. storage and disposal of sewage, septic tank sludge, or refuse (excluding municipal recycling processing facilities); d. iii. slaughtering of animals; storage, drying or preserving of bones, hides, hoofs or skins; tanning; and wool scouring; e. iv. any other processes involving fuel burning equipment, which individually or in combination with other equipment, have a fuel burning rate of up to 1000 kg/hr; f. v. burning out of the residual content of metal containers used for the transport or storage of chemicals; g. vi. the burning of municipal, commercial or industrial wastes, by the use of incinerators for disposal of waste; h. vii. any industrial wood pulp process in which wood or other cellulose material is cooked with chemical solutions to dissolve lining, and the associated processes of bleaching and chemical and by-product recovery; i. viii. crematoriums; and j. ix. any industrial activity which involves the discharge of odour or dust beyond the site boundary"</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Interpretation | Definitions | S247.008 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support | Definition is supported, however it needs to be clarified whether organic food waste composting is defined as rural industry. | Amend definition for 'Rural Industry' to clarify whether organic food waste composting is included. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S247.009 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support | Definition is supported. | Retain definition for 'sensitive activities' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S247.010 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support in part | It is suggested that (i) - (ix) are listed as (b) - (j) to ensure these activities are not a subset of (a). The inclusion of the industries as stated is appropriate and allows for the incidental temporary storage of hazardous substances to be excluded. | Amend the definition for 'significant hazardous activity', to change the list numbering as follows: "a. Manufacturing of hazardous substances and associated storage (including industries manufacturing agrochemicals, fertilisers, acids/alkalis or paints) b. Oil and gas exploration and extraction facilities c. Purpose built bulk storage facilities for the storage of hazardous substances (other than petrol, diesel, or LPG) d. The storage/use of more than 100,000 litres of petrol e. The storage/use of more than 100,000 litres of diesel f. The storage/use of more than 6 tonnes of LPG g. Galvanising plants h. Electroplating and metal treatment facilities i. Tanneries j. Timber treatment k. Freezing works and rendering plants l. Wastewater treatment plants m. Metal smelting and refining (including battery refining or recycling) n. Milk treatment plants o. Fibreglass manufacturing p. Polymer foam manufacturing ; and q. Landfills |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | For the avoidance of doubt, ..." |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S247.011 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support | This definition is supported and its inclusion provides for landfills being a different waste activity, given their different properties. | Retain the definition for 'waste management facility' as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O5 | S247.012 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support in part | The objective does not include rural industry or waste facilities which have buffer distance requirements that can only be satisfied in a rural environment. These activities are particularly susceptible to encroachment from lifestyle development. | Amend RE-O5 as follows: "Opportunities for rural lifestyle subdivision and development are only provided in parts of the rural environment where they do not conflict with enabling primary production or activities and infrastructure that need to be located in the rural environment , and protecting the productive capacity of land." |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O4 | S247.013 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support in part | The proposed addition of 'local infrastructure' would include district or regional resource recovery or waste disposal facilities which are essential to urban growth and development, if not defined as infrastructure as under the Definitions. District or regional waste processing and disposal facilities should be listed as infrastructure and therefore considered as infrastructure under this objective. | Amend UFD-O4 as follows: "Urban growth and development is integrated with the efficient provision, including the timing and funding, of infrastructure (including local infrastructure) , schools, and open spaces." |
| Strategic Direction | INF-O1 | S247.014 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support in part | The additional wording will support infrastructure not defined as such in the definition but defined under the NPS-UD. These other types of infrastructure which includes waste infrastructure owned by Councils) are critical to the fabric of a successful district. Waste infrastructure in particular, can be subject to reverse sensitivity. | Amend INF-O1 as follows: "The benefits of infrastructure (including resource recovery and waste disposal facilities) are recognised, while ensuring its adverse effects are well managed, and infrastructure is protected from incompatible land use, subdivision and development, including reverse sensitivity effects." |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | HAZ-P1 | S247.015 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support | Support policy. | Retain HAZ-P1 as notified. |
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | HAZ-P2 | S247.016 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support | Support Policy. | Retain HAZ-P2 as notified. |
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | HAZ-R1 | S247.017 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support | The proposed rule is considered appropriate. | Retain HAZ-R1 as notified. |
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | HAZ-R2 | S247.018 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support in part | It would be beneficial for the distance for sensitive activities to be increased. | Amend HAZ-R2 as follows: 1. Activity status: Non-complying Where: a. The sensitive activity is located within 500m 250m of a significant hazardous facility |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O1 | S247.019 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support in part | The proposed objective recognises those activities that are not primary production that have a need to be in the zone, however a functional need test is often too difficult for infrastructure providers (provided regional waste facilities are included in the definition) and needs to be deleted to ensure that essential infrastructure can be provided. | Amend GRUZ-O1 as follows: The General Rural Zone is used primarily for primary production, activities that support primary production, and other activities that have an functional need or operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O2 | S247.020 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support in part | The proposed amendment is to acknowledge that not all noise, etc, effects are derived from primary production activities. Some of these effects result from rural industry and other activities which need to be allowed for. | Amend GRUZ-O2 as follows: The predominant character of the General Rural Zone are maintained and enhanced, which include: a. areas of... c. a range of noises, smells, light overspill, and traffic, often on a cyclic and seasonal basis, generated from the production, manufacture, processing and/or transportation of raw materials predominantly derived |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | from primary production and ancillary activities; d. ... |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O4 | S247.021 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support in part | This objective is supported with the proposed amendment which ensures that essential infrastructure can be provided. | Amend GRUZ-O4 as follows: Primary production activities are enabled, and other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone are enabled where they are not incompatible with primary production activities. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O5 | S247.022 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support in part | The proposed additional text will strengthen the objective to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on those rural land uses described, which need protection from encroaching subdivision and sensitive activities. These land uses include regional infrastructure. | Amend GRUZ-O5 as follows: Sensitive activities are restricted through designed and located to avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects and incompatibility with primary production, other land uses activities and key transport corridors in the General Rural Zone. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P2 | S247.023 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Neutral | No reason stated. | No decision requested. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P3 | S247.024 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support in part | The elements of rural character detailed in the policy do not include waste infrastructure as types of activities which have an operational need to be in the rural environment. None of the policies give clear direction on these activities apart from the reverse sensitivity policy. There is also concern that only 'managing' residential development will lead to cumulative impacts on working rural land uses. | Amend GRUZ-P3 as follows: Provide for subdivision, use, and development where it does not compromise the purpose, character, and amenity of the General Rural Zone, by: ... d. managing the location, scale and effects of other activities which have an operational need to be located in the General Rural Zone; ed. providing |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | for varying forms, scale, and separation of structures associated with primary production activities; fe. controlling managing the density and location of residential development; gf. ensuring allotments can be self-serviced; hg. retaining a clear delineation and contrast between the Wairarapa's rural areas and urban areas; and ih. avoiding, remedying, or mitigating reverse sensitivity effects. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P5 | S247.025 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support in part | The proposed policy is also suitable for cleanfill activities and should be expanded to include this activity. | Amend GRUZ-P5 as follows: GRUZ-P5 Quarrying and cleanfill activities Manage quarrying activities and cleanfill activities within the General Rural Zone by: a. enabling farm quarries; and b. providing for other quarrying activities and cleanfill activities where it can be demonstrated that: ... |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P6 | S247.026 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support in part | This policy leaves out the establishment of new waste management facilities and landfills apart from avoiding their establishment in proximity to urban areas. An important control for the managing effects of any fill or waste management activity are separation distances. | Amend GRUZ-P6 as follows: Avoid or mitigate the potential for reverse sensitivity effects by: ... c. ensuring adequate separation distances between existing sensitive activities and new intensive primary production activities, quarrying activities, landfills, cleanfills, waste management |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | activities and rural industry; and ... |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R18 | S247.027 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support | As the standard seeks to control the size of buildings, this rule is supported considering that most waste facilities do not require buildings larger than 2000m ² . | Retain GRUZ-R18 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S3 | S247.028 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support in part | The proposed amendment should apply to new dwellings in close proximity to existing landfills and waste management activity (such as food waste composting) to ensure that reverse sensitivity effects on these regional facilities do not occur. | Amend GRUZ-S3(2)(d) as follows: ... d. 500m of an intensive primary production activity or landfill or waste management activity under separate ownership. ... |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-O1 | S247.029 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support | Support objective. | Retain GIZ-O1 as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-O2 | S247.030 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support | The objective provides a good description of what is expected in the GIZ. Retain as notified. | Retain GIZ-O2 as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-O3 | S247.031 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support in part | Adding sensitive activities to the objective will strengthen purpose of the zone. Sensitive activities have the most potential to cause reverse sensitivity effects to industrial activities. | Amend GIZ-O3 as follows: The role and function of the General Industrial Zone is not compromised by non-industrial or incompatible or sensitive activities. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-P3 | S247.032 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support | Requiring an operational need for goods and services to be located in the Industrial zone will discourage certain retail from establishing. Retain as notified. | Retain GIZ-P3 as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-P5 | S247.033 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support | The parameters for the establishment of residential and sensitive activities in this zone need to be tightened to ensure that these activities do not cause reverse sensitivity effects, which is the main premise for the zone. | Amend GIZ-P5 as follows: Avoid Restrict activities that could be sensitive to the effects of industrial activities from being located within, or in close |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | | proximity to, the General Industrial Zone |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-R6 | S247.034 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Oppose | Limiting the establishment of residential accommodation with a discretionary activity status will ensure that suitably narrow exceptions for residential activity will occur. The rule is currently too weak and will lead to cumulative residential activities establishing, negating the purpose of the zone for industrial activities. | Amend GIZ-R6 as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Discretionary Where: a. The residential activity is ancillary to an industrial activity on the site; b. There is no more than one residential unit per site; and c. The occupier of the residential unit works on the same site. 2. Activity status: Non-complying Discretionary... |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-R7 | S247.035 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support | The proposed gross floor area threshold is considered suitable to avoid reverse sensitivity effects. | Retain as notified, specifically GIZ-R7(a). |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | New provision request | S247.036 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Amend | Given the proposed density of 1 unit per 200m ² in the Medium Density Residential Precinct, the space allocated for waste management is often not thought about or not designed for given the tight building envelopes required for this density. Bin storage that is not designed for can generate adverse effects on amenity and the health and safety of residents, road corridor users and collection staff. Proposed standard allows for bin storage of a sufficient size, and in a location that will be screened from the road or access to the site. The standard requires bins to be accessible do that when moving from their storage location to the kerbside, the access is without steep gradients or stairs and is wide enough for bin access. The standard will ensure that | Insert new provision as follows: GRZ-SX Waste Management 1. Where individual bins are used, a minimum storage space for bins of 1.4m² per dwelling is provided. The bins must be visually screened, be accessible for residents to get to the kerb without stairs or steep gradients. 2. Where kerbside collection is employed, a kerbside space of 1m per dwelling is available without impeding the footpath. Activity Status where compliance not achieved: Restricted Discretionary. Matters of discretion are restricted to:? |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | bins do not obstruct driveways or be located on the footpath. | |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S247.037 | Enviro NZ Services Ltd | Support | Insert a new definition to recognise that cleanfills and landfills are important uses in the rural area. The definition has the same meaning as that in the National Planning Standards. The definition will also allow for these activities to be defined differently from industrial activities. | Insert a new definition: Landfill Means an area used for, or previously used for, the disposal of solid waste. It excludes cleanfill areas. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | | S76.001 | Erina Te Whaiti | Support in part | Rezoning to MPZ has taken place without knowledge/approval of all landowners as only ratepayers have been contacted. | Amend to allow flexibility or establish a process to allow owners of whenua Māori to opt-out or opt-in to the MPZ. |
| Tangata Whenua | Statutory Relationships | S76.002 | Erina Te Whaiti | Oppose in part | There are multiple owners of the land but Iwi do not govern those properties. | Amend to ensure that Statutory Boards do not speak on behalf of individual owners of whenua Māori land. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | | S76.003 | Erina Te Whaiti | Amend | Unclear what the process/who is responsible for determining whakapapa connection. | Amend so there is clarity and a process for determining whakapapa connections for land owned by Wairarapa Māori being rezoned MPZ. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S139.001 | ET Quests Limited | Oppose | Opposed to the proposed zoning of 248 High Street as General Residential Zone (GRZ) and wants this changed to Mixed Use Zone (MUZ), which will enable either extension of the existing visitor accommodation on the site, or the ability to establish new commercial activities. Under the Operative Plan, these activities are Permitted, but would default to a Discretionary activity under the proposed GRZ. The MUZ is more suited to the site as visitor accommodation (existing) would be a permitted activity and is specifically provided for under Policy MUZ-P1. In addition, the submitter considers the MUZ would better align with the existing and well-established zoning under the Operative Plan and provides for reasonable potential future uses. | Amend the proposed zoning of the site located at 248 High Street (Lot 41 DP320512) from GRZ - General Residential Zone to MUZ - Mixed Use Zone. |
| Whole Plan | | S214.001 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter seeks that the Combined District Plan contains a resource management policy framework that enables primary | Retain the proposed direction for rural industry, farming, and rural environments in the proposed district plan subject to the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | production activities in rural areas to occur as existing uses, and with few barriers where it is sought to establish new primary production activities. The Councils appear to have focused on the essential matters for its district which includes rural industry and the rural environment. The submitter is generally supportive of the direction that has been set in respect of rural industry, farming, and the rural environment. Some amendments are sought in our submission and are intended to provide clarity to some provisions and strengthen others. | amendments sought in this submission. Amend to comprehensively address the issue of public access to the Coast and the related health and safety issues that result from this access particularly where access is across or adjacent to private property. Amend as required as a result of the relief sought. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S214.002 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter support, where possible and applicable, the use of RMA, National Planning Standards and National Policy Statement definitions.</p> <p>The submitter supports the proposed definitions for the following terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conservation activities; - Farm Quarry; - Rural airstrip; - Hazard sensitive activities; - Productive capacity; - Seasonal worker accommodation; and - Significant hazardous facility. | Retain definitions for 'conservation activities', 'farm quarry', 'rural airstrip', 'hazard sensitive activities', 'seasonal worker accommodation', and 'significant hazardous facility'. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S214.003 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | <p>The submitter seeks the inclusion of a definition for 'Ancillary rural earthworks' in the Combined District Plan.</p> <p>Activities ancillary to primary production, which support primary production, should not have to apply for resource consent. The definition should encompass the activities listed below along with any related definitions that are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The tilling or cultivation of soil for the establishment and maintenance of crops and pasture; - Harvesting of crops; - The planting and removal of trees (e.g. Pest | Insert new definition for 'ancillary rural earthworks' as follows: ANCILLARY RURAL EARTHWORKS means:- any earthworks or disturbance of soil associated with cultivation, land preparation (including the establishment of sediment and erosion control measures), for planting and growing operations of crops and pasture;- the harvesting of agricultural and horticultural crops (farming) and forests (forestry); and planting |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>Species, willows), and riparian planting;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The digging of offal pits; - Burying dead stock and plant waste; - Digging post holes and drilling bores; - Installing and maintaining services such as water pipes and troughs; and - Farm quarries where excavated material is not removed from the farm site. | <p>trees, removing trees and horticultural root ripping; - the maintenance and construction of facilities typically associated with farming and forestry activities. This includes (but is not limited to): farm/forestry tracks, roads, vehicle maneuvering areas and landings, stock marshalling yards, stock races, silage pits, offal pits, farm effluent ponds, feeding pads, digging post holes, fencing and sediment control measures, drilling bores, the installation and maintenance of services such as water pipes and troughs, off-stream farm water storage dams, hard stand areas for stock, fertiliser storage pads, airstrips and helipads; and - Farm quarries where quarry winnings are only used within the farm quarry; and</p> |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S214.004 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports in part the proposed definition for 'Agricultural aviation'. Aviation is used in primary production for a variety of reasons including stock management, crop monitoring, aerial spraying etc. Aviation is also used for ancillary activities to primary production such as transporting fencing equipment to remote places on the farm etc. The submitter would like to see provision for ancillary activities to primary production in the definition for 'Agricultural aviation'.</p> | <p>Amend 'agricultural aviation' definition as follows: Means intermittent operation of an aircraft from a rural airstrip or helicopter landing area for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • primary production, biosecurity, or conservation activities including stock management, lifting offencing materials, pest control, the application of fertiliser, agrichemicals, vertebrate toxic agents, frost management and associated refuelling. and other activities |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | ancillary to primary production;and• Biosecurity activities; and • Conservation activities. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S214.005 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports defining 'Environmental Compensation'. However, the current definition seems to be grammatically incorrect and should read "unavoided, unremedied and unmitigated...". | Amend the definition for 'environmental compensation' as follows: Means any action (works, services, protection, restoration,enhancement, or restrictive covenants) as compensationfor unavoidable, unremedied , and unmitigated adverseeffects of the activity for which consent is being sought,including actions that provide measurable biodiversityoutcomes that address residual adverse biodiversity effectsarising from project development and which do not meetthe thresholds of a biodiversity offset. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S214.006 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports in part the definition for 'Less Hazard Sensitive Activities'. They seek that the definition includes buildings associated with primary production activities to reflect the low level of risk these activities pose to people and property. | Amend the definition of 'less hazard sensitive activities' as follows: Means activities that are less sensitive to natural hazards whichare: a. Accessory buildings used for non-habitable purposes; b. Park management activity; and c. Buildings and structures associated with temporaryactivities; d. Non-habitable buildings and structures associated withprimary production activities; and e. Rural industry activities. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| Interpretation | Definitions | S214.007 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports in part the inclusion of 'National Grid Subdivision Corridor' as a means of safety and reverse sensitivity effects. They urge Council to be cautious and not to extent these corridors any further than what is minimally necessary, especially on private property. | Retain definition of 'National grid subdivision corridor' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S214.008 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose in part | The submitter opposes defining 'Potentially hazard sensitive activities' to include buildings associated with primary production activities and rural industry activities. Where respective activities are non-habitable, these do not pose a 'potential' level of risk to people and communities. These activities should be included in the definition of 'Less hazard sensitive activities' and should be allowed to located and exist within natural hazard areas. | Amend the definition of 'potentially hazard sensitive activities' as follows: Means activities that are potentially sensitive to natural hazards, which are: a. Buildings associated with primary production; a. Commercial activities b. Industrial activities c. Rural industry activities |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S214.009 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | There is no definition of 'reverse sensitivity' in the PDP. Reverse sensitivity is an important resource management issue for people who operate activities vulnerable to legal complaints from sensitive activities located in rural areas. The submitter seeks a definition of 'reverse sensitivity' to assist with interpretation of objectives, policies, and rules in the PDP. | Insert new definition for 'reverse sensitivity' as follows: Reverse sensitivity Means the potential for the operation of an existing lawfully established activity to be compromised, constrained, or curtailed by the establishment or alteration of another activity which maybe sensitive to the actual, potential, or perceived environmental effects generated by an existing activity. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S214.010 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The 'special amenity landscape' definition serves no practical purpose, and together with Schedule 8 of the PDP, should be deleted. | Delete the 'special amenity landscape' definition. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Interpretation | Definitions | S214.011 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The submitter opposes the 'surface waterbody' definition. The term 'waterbody' is already defined in the PDP making this definition an unnecessary duplication. | Delete the definition for 'surface waterbody'. |
| Strategic Direction | CCR-O1 | S214.012 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports in part strategic direction CCR-O1. In a changing regulatory environment with national targets to achieve a low carbon future it is important that those persons exercising functions and powers under the RMA assist the community to transition to a low carbon future. Many activities in rural areas are significantly impacted by climate change regulations which can have consequences on the local, regional, and national economy. | Amend as follows: The Wairarapa develops and functions in a way that assists thecomunity in the transition to a low-carbon future. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O1 | S214.013 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports RE-O1 which recognises the important contribution that the rural environment has to the region's economic and social wellbeing. | Retain RE-O1 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | New provision request | S214.014 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter acknowledges that everyone must adapt to ensure sustainable management of natural and physical resources in accordance with the purpose of the RMA. The submitter seeks the inclusion of an additional Strategic Direction Objective to recognise the importance of providing for and supporting land practice change to address | Insert new objective as follows: RE-OXPrimary production activities are supported to adapt to changerequired by regulatory and consumer demands. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O2 | S214.015 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports UFD-O2 which sets the direction for urban growth in the Wairarapa's urban areas. Efficient and effective planning for urban growth is important to ensure minimal loss of versatile soils. | Retain UFD-O2 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O3 | S214.016 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | Sufficient development capacity for recreational needs is beyond scope of the territorial authorities function under section 31(1)(a) of the RMA which is to ensure that there is sufficient development capacity to meet the expected demands of the district in respect of housing and business land. The submitter acknowledges that the NPS-UD definition of 'community services' includes | Amend UFD-O3 as follows: There is sufficient development capacity to meet the Wairarapa'shousing, commercial, industrial, educational and recreational needs within the Masterton urban area. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | community facilities, educational facilities and those commercial activities that serve the needs of the community. However, Policy 5 of the NPS-UD only requires the district plan to enable 'community services' in Tier 3 urban environments, which only applies to Masterton. South Wairarapa District Council and Carterton District Council have already determined they are not Tier 3 urban environments, as they have not deleted the requirements for on-site parking in their district jurisdictions in accordance with Clause 3.38 of the NPS-UD. | |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P2 | S214.017 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports ENG-P2 in part. It is possible that this policy enables small-scale renewable electricity generation to occur on highly productive land. Where this occurs, the policy should ensure that the productive capacity of highly productive land is not impacted. The policy needs to give effect to clause 3.9 of the NPS-HPL. This requires a policy which ensures that small-scale use and development of highly productive land has no impact on the productive capacity of the land and must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimise or mitigate any actual loss or potential cumulative loss of the availability and productive capacity of highly productive land in the Wairarapa district; and - Avoid if possible, or otherwise mitigate, any actual or potential reverse sensitivity effects on land-based primary production activities from the use or development. | Amend ENG-P2 as follows: Enable small-scale renewable electricity generation where it is of a form and scale that supports the productive capacity of highly productive land and: avoids, remedies, or mitigates its adverse effects including: a. minimises or mitigates any actual loss or potential cumulative loss of the availability and productive capacity of highly productive land in the Wairarapa District; and b. avoid, or otherwise mitigate any actual or potential reverse sensitivity effects on land based primary production activities; and c. avoid, remedies, or mitigates other adverse effects. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P3 | S214.018 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose in part | The submitter is concerned the current wording 'Encourage community-scale renewable electricity generation' goes too far in compelling these renewable electricity generation activities. Using the word 'encourage' suggests the PDP will actively promote and incentivise community-scale | Amend ENG-P3 as follows: Encourage Support consideration of community-scale renewable electricity generation. (c) the ability to protecting the productive capacity of highly productive |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>renewable electricity generation activities. However, this could place an excessive burden on local governments and utilities to realise such proposals. Recommend changing the policy language to 'Support consideration of community-scale renewable electricity generation.' This revised wording would provide for these community-scale renewable electricity generation activities without obligating local authorities to advocate and marshal their establishment. It provides flexibility for communities to develop renewables at their own pace rather than mandating overt encouragement from governing bodies.</p> <p>Reservations regarding the phrasing of ENG-P3(c). The existing language, specifically "the ability to protect the productive capacity of highly productive land" is ambiguous and has the potential to be contradictory to the Objective and policies outlined in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL). Suggest rephrasing the clause to align with the NPS-HPL more clearly.</p> | land; |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P4 | S214.019 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter seeks the amendment of ENG-P4(j) so that the phrasing more accurately aligns with the NPS-HPL. Seeks a definition of 'Reverse Sensitivity' to assist with the interpretation of objectives, policies, and rules in the PDP. | Amend ENG-P4(j) as follows: j. Potential effects on the productive capacity of land, including the ability to protect the ability to protecting the productive capacity of highly productive land. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P5 | S214.020 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports ENG-P5 as it recognises the need to manage new development and land use activities near existing renewable electricity generation activities to minimise reverse sensitivity effects. | Retain ENG-P5 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R1 | S214.021 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the rules outlined in the ENG-Energy chapter of the PDP. They specifically endorse the heightened activity | Retain ENG-R1 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | status for the General Rural Zone. This is consistent with the overarching Objective of the NPS-HPL, while concurrently acknowledging the benefits to be derived from the use and development of renewable energy under section 7(j) of the RMA and the NPS-REG. | |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O2 | S214.022 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports NU-O2 as currently proposed. This objective recognises that network utilities can have adverse effects on the environment. The objective achieves an appropriate balance between addressing impacts on the environment and recognising the functional and operational needs of network utilities. | Retain NU-O2 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O3 | S214.023 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | Existing network utilities (within Network Utility Corridors) and Designated Network Utility Land should be protected only within Network Utility Corridors. Extending protection of network utilities beyond the Network Utility Corridor is unnecessary and provides no certainty for private landowners as to what they are entitled to do on their own land. If network utility operators wish to negotiate additional 'protection' outside the Network Utility Corridors and Designated Network Utility land, then they are free to negotiate this with private landowners. The PDP should not be used as a mechanism to circumvent negotiation and agreement with private landowners. | Amend NU-O3 as follows: The safe function and operation of network utilities is protected from the adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects of incompatible subdivision use and development within existing network utility corridors or within designated network utilityland. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O4 | S214.024 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The National Grid should be protected only within the National Grid Corridor. Extending protection of network utilities beyond these areas is unnecessary and provides no certainty for private landowners as to what they are entitled to do on their own land. If network utility operators wish to negotiate additional 'protection' outside National Grid Corridors, then they are free to negotiate access arrangements with private landowners. | Amend NU-O4 as follows: Subdivision, use and development within the national grid corridor is managed to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on the National Grid and ensure that the operation, maintenance, repair, upgrading and development of the National Grid is not compromised. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | The PDP should not be used as a mechanism to circumvent negotiation and agreement with private landowners. | |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P6 | S214.025 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | As stated in previous submission points by this submitter, protection for the National Grid should not extend beyond the National Grid Corridor. | Amend NU-P6 as follows: Manage subdivision, use and development near within the National Grid Corridor to: a. avoid the establishment or expansion of sensitive activities; b. Ensure that the safe and efficient operation, maintenance, repair, upgrading, removal, and development of the National Grid is not compromised; and c. Ensure that reverse sensitivity effects on the National Grid are avoided. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R1 | S214.026 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the intent of the rules for network utilities but queries why there is no consideration required of the potential adverse effects that network utilities, their establishment, operation and upgrading can have on existing lawfully established activities in the rural environment. The Councils appear to have focused primarily on reverse sensitivity impacts related to network utilities, potentially to the detriment of other duly established activities.</p> <p>The Councils, by classifying many network utility activities as permitted activities, have not considered reverse sensitivity impacts on existing rural activities. This places an additional burden on landowners in the rural environment to work out how they can continue their operations around the restrictions network utilities bring with them.</p> | Amend the Permitted activity status for rules which allow network activities to occur which will adversely impact on existing rural activities and operations. Insert new matter of discretion for Restricted Discretionary and Discretionary activities as follows: The potential adverse effects on the operation of existing farming and rural activities located in the general rural and rural lifestyle zones. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| TR - Transport | TR-O2 | S214.027 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | TR-O2 is supported by the submitter as it recognises and provides for adverse effects from transport to be avoided, remedied, or mitigated. | Retain TR-O2 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P6 | S214.028 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports TR-P6 as it provides for the management of adverse effects from transport on adjacent activities. However, the submitter proposes that the wording should encompass the effects management hierarchy similar to TR-O2. | Amend TR-P6 as follows: Provide for the development and safe operation of the transport network, including the state highway network and rail network, while managing avoiding, remedying, or mitigating the adverse effects of the development and use of roads, including state highways, on adjacent activities |
| CL - Contaminated Land | | S214.029 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the planning approach adopted in response to contaminated land. | Retain Contaminated Land chapter as notified. |
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | | S214.030 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the planning approach adopted in response to Hazardous Substances. | Retain Hazardous Substances chapter as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-O2 | S214.031 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter does not understand how using natural features will reduce the susceptibility of people, communities, property, and infrastructure to damage from natural hazards. Using natural features is not a risk-based approach to managing the effects of natural hazards on people and communities. | Delete NH-O2. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P1 | S214.032 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports identifying and mapping areas affected by natural hazards provided a risk-based approach is used to identify these areas. They also encourage the Councils to engage with the relevant impacted landowners who are located within those areas. The submitter supports the management of subdivision use and development in these areas based on the sensitivity of the activities | Amend NH-P1 as follows: Identify and map areas affected by natural hazards using a risk-based approach and take a risk-based approach to the management of subdivision use and development based on: 1. the sensitivity of the activities to the impacts of natural hazards and 2. The hazard posed to people's lives and wellbeing and property |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>to the impacts of natural hazards posed to people's lives, wellbeing, and property.</p> <p>The submitter believes that NH-P1 would be better split into two separate policies.</p> | <p>by considering the likelihood and consequences of differing natural hazard events</p> |
| NH - Natural Hazards | New provision request | S214.033 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | <p>The submitter supports identifying and mapping areas affected by natural hazards provided a risk-based approach is used to identify these areas. They also encourage the Councils to engage with the relevant impacted landowners who are located within those areas.</p> <p>The submitter supports the management of subdivision use and development in these areas based on the sensitivity of the activities to the impacts of natural hazards posed to people's lives, wellbeing, and property.</p> <p>The submitter believes that NH-P1 would be better split into two separate policies.</p> | <p>Insert new policy as follows:NH-PX - Subdivision Use and Development of Natural Hazard areasTake a risk based approach to the management of subdivision, use, and development based on: 1. the sensitivity of the activities to the impacts of natural hazards; and 2. The hazard posed to people's lives and wellbeing and property by considering the likelihood and consequences of differing natural hazard events.</p> |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P2 | S214.034 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports in part NH-P2. They agree that hazard sensitive activities should not be located in high hazard areas and that hazard sensitive activities should be allowed in moderate hazard areas provided the requirements in NH-P3 are met.</p> <p>The submitter opposes defining potentially hazard sensitive activities to include buildings associated with primary production activities and rural industry activities. The respective activities are non-habitable and do not pose a 'potential' level of risk to people and communities. As such, they should be permitted to locate within all natural hazard areas.</p> | <p>Retain NH-P2 where the definition of 'potentially sensitive activities' is amended to exclude buildings associated with primary production and rural industry activities.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P5 | S214.035 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports this policy subject to the amended definition of 'potentially hazard sensitive activities'. | Retain NH-P5 where the definition of 'potentially sensitive activities' is amended to exclude buildings associated with primary production and rural industry activities. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P10 | S214.036 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter seeks to ensure that mitigation works involving private land within natural hazard areas undertaken by a statutory agency, or their nominated contractors or agents, are undertaken in a manner that is compliant with section 181 of the Local Government Act 2002. Seeks to clarify that this policy will not limit the landowners' rights to carry out natural hazard mitigation or stream and river management works on their land. | Amend NH-P10 as follows: Enable natural hazard mitigation or stream and river management works undertaken by a statutory agency or their nominated contractors or agents within hazard areas where these will significantly decrease the existing risk to people's safety and wellbeing, property, and infrastructure in accordance with powers in relation to construction of works on private land under the Local Government Act 2002. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R1 | S214.037 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports the purpose of this rule, but objects to the requirement that flood mitigation, or stream and river management works, are only permitted when done by or on behalf of a statutory agency or their nominated agent. There are often extenuating circumstances (e.g. extreme weather events) that see members of the community (e.g. farmers) having to undertake flood mitigation (e.g. drainage works) without permission from Council. | Amend NH-R1 so that flood mitigation, or stream and river management works, prior to extreme weather events is a permitted activity for landowners. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R3 | S214.038 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | One of the consequences of including buildings associated with primary production and rural industry activities in the definition of 'potentially hazard sensitive activities' is that farmers would have to comply with finished floor level requirements as stated in NH-R3. This is unreasonable for farmers and an onerous mitigation measure that is not relative to the risk to people's lives or wellbeing because of the non-habitable nature of these buildings. | Retain NH-R3 provided the buildings associated with primary production and rural industry activities are deleted from the definition of 'potentially hazard sensitive activities'. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| HH - Historic Heritage | | S214.039 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the objectives, policies, and rules in the Historic Heritage chapter. | Retain the Historic Heritage chapter as notified. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | | S214.040 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the objectives, policies, and rules in the Notable Trees chapter. | Retain the Notable Trees chapter as notified. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-O1 | S214.041 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | Recognition of sites and areas of significance to Māori may result in broad capture of private land with new SASM layers. Concerns regarding the broad remit of recognition provides no certainty for private landowners as to what they are entitled to do on their own land in this situation. If the Councils wish to negotiate protections for the newly recorded SASMs on private land, then they are free to negotiate with the landowner(s). Identification of SASMs would be a more appropriate objective. Then the process of negotiation over management of these sites could occur. | Amend as follows: Sites and areas of significance to Māori are recognised identified in order to enable the Council and Māori to make arrangements with landowners for such sites and areas to be protected and maintained; |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-O2 | S214.042 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | Exercise of kaitiakitanga by tangata whenua in relation to sites and areas of significance to Māori provides no certainty for private landowners as to what they are entitled to do on their own land. If the Councils wish to negotiate exercise of kaitiakitanga in relation to sites and areas of significance to Māori that might occur on private land, then they are free to negotiate with the landowner(s) to do so. The PDP should not be used as a mechanism to circumvent negotiation and agreement with private landowners. | Amend as follows: Tangata whenua can exercise kaitiakitanga in relation to sites and areas of significance to them in the Wairarapa, except for any such sites and areas that are identified on private land, unless the landowners have agreed that tangata whenua can exercise kaitiakitanga on such land... |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-O3 | S214.043 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | Protection of sites and areas of significance to Māori should not occur on private land without agreement of landowners. If the Councils wish to negotiate exercise of Kaitiakitanga on private land, then they are free to negotiate with the landowner(s). | Amend as follows: a. Sites and areas of significance to Māori are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, except for any such sites and areas that are identified on private land, unless the landowners have agreed to protect such sites from inappropriate subdivision use and development. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P2 | S214.044 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | Protection of sites and areas of significance to Māori should not occur on private land without agreement of landowners. If the Councils wish to negotiate exercise of Kaitiakitanga on private land, then they are free to negotiate with the landowner(s). | Amend as follows: Where agreement has been reached with landowners, protect and maintain sites and areas of significance to Māori by: a. Ensuring sites and areas of significance to Māori are not modified, destroyed, removed and/or visually encroached upon by inappropriate activities; b. Requiring activities on, or in proximity to sites and areas of significance to Māori to maintain the site or area's cultural, spiritual, and historical values, interests, or associations of importance to tangata whenua; and c. Enabling maintenance and restoration of sites and areas of significance to Māori where the cultural spiritual and historical values, interests, associations of importance to tangata whenua of the sites or area are protected; |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P3 | S214.045 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | Restrictions on earthworks within sites and areas of significance to Māori should not occur on private land without agreement of landowners. If the Councils wish to negotiate exercise of Kaitiakitanga on private land, then they are free to negotiate with the landowner(s). | Amend as follows: Allow for: a. Small-scale earthworks for burials within existing urupa; and b. Other earthworks on, or in proximity to sites and areas of significance to Māori only where it can be demonstrated that the identified values will be protected, having regard to: i. The extent of the earthworks ii. The manner in which the earthworks are |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|---|------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | <p>undertaken;</p> <p>iii. The monitoring of earthworks; and</p> <p>iv. The cultural, spiritual, and historical values, interests, associations of importance to tangata whenua of the site or area. This shall not apply to identified sites and areas of significance to Māori that are on private land unless agreement has been reached with landowners to restrict earthworks within such sites and areas.</p> |
| <p>SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori</p> | <p>SASM-P4</p> | <p>S214.046</p> | <p>Federated Farmers of New Zealand</p> | <p>Support in part</p> | <p>Restrictions of activities within sites and areas of significance to Māori should not occur on private land without agreement of landowners. If the Councils wish to negotiate exercise of Kaitiakitanga on private land, then they are free to negotiate with the landowner(s).</p> | <p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Allow the following activities to occur on, or in proximity to sites and areas of significance to Māori, while ensuring their design, scale and intensity will not compromise cultural, spiritual, and historical values, interests, or associations of importance to tangata whenua:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Land disturbance; b. Demolition or removal of existing buildings and structures where the structure is not or does not form part of the site or area; c. Alterations to existing buildings and structures; d. Operation, maintenance, and repair or upgrading of existing network utility structures; and e. Erection of signs. <p>This shall not apply to identified sites and areas of significance to Māori that are on private land unless agreement has been reached with landowners to restrict activities within such sites and areas.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P5 | S214.047 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | Restrictions of subdivision, use, and development within sites and areas of significance to Māori should not occur on private land without agreement of landowners. If the Councils wish to negotiate exercise of Kaitiakitanga on private land, then they are free to negotiate with the landowner(s). | <p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Only allow any other use and development on, or in proximity to sites and areas of significance to Māori where it can be demonstrated that the cultural, spiritual, and historical values, interests, or associations of importance to tangata whenua of the site or area are protected and maintained having regard to:</p> <p>a. Whether there are any alternative methods, locations, or designs that would avoid or reduce the impact on the values, interests, or associations of importance to tangata whenua associated with the site or area of significance;</p> <p>b. Outcomes articulated by tangata whenua through an assessment of environmental effects, cultural impact assessment, or iwi planning documents;</p> <p>c. The protection and maintenance or potential enhancement of the values, interests, or associations of importance to tangata whenua of the site or area of significance and the relationship of tangata whenua with their taonga, commensurate with the scale and nature of the proposal.</p> <p>d. How values of significance to tangata whenua, including tikanga, kaitiakitanga, and 43 atauranga Māori may be incorporated and</p> <p>e. For subdivision, ensure sufficient land is provided around the site or area of significance to Māori to protect values, interests, or associations of importance to tangata whenua and the remainder of the site is a size which continues to provide it with a suitable setting to the values, interests, or associations of importance to tangata whenua of the site or area. This shall not apply to identified sites and areas of significance to Māori that are on private land unless</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | agreement has been reached with landowners to implement these restrictions within such sites and areas. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P6 | S214.048 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | Restrictions of subdivision, use, and development within sites and areas of significance to Māori should not occur on private land without agreement of landowners. If the Councils wish to negotiate exercise of Kaitiakitanga on private land, then they are free to negotiate with the landowner(s). | Amend as follows: Ensure the adverse effects of activities on sites and areas of significance to Māori are managed by: a. Avoiding activities within sites and areas of significance to Māori unless there is a functional need to do so and no practicable alternative location; b. Avoiding significant and adverse effects on the site or area's cultural spiritual and historical values; and c. For other adverse effects: i. Where adverse effects cannot be avoided, they are minimised. ii. Where adverse effects cannot be minimised, they are remedied; and iii. Where more than minor residual adverse effects cannot be avoided, minimised, or remedied, the activity itself is avoided. This shall not apply to identified sites and areas of significance to Māori that are on private land unless agreement has been reached with landowners to implement such consideration and management of effects of activities within such sites and areas. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P7 | S214.049 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | Special restrictions on subdivision, use, and development activities within sites and areas of significance to Māori should not occur on private land without agreement from landowners. Where the Council have | Amend as follows: Where agreement has been reached with landowners to implement restrictions on subdivision, use and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>negotiated such restrictions within sites on private land (which has historically been alienated and acquired by the crown and on-sold to private owners) then they should support the landowners.</p> | <p>development activities within sites and areas of significance to Māori that are on private land, the Council shall support landowners to manage, maintain, preserve, and protect sites and areas of significance to Māori, including by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. increasing awareness, understanding, and appreciation within the local community of the presence and importance of sites and areas of significance to Māori; b. encouraging landowners to engage with local tangata whenua and/or manage and develop positive working relationships in respect of the ongoing management and/or protection of sites and areas of significance to Māori. c. promoting the use of matauranga Māori, tikanga and kaitiakitanga to manage, maintain, preserve, and protect sites and areas of significance to Māori through engagement and collaboration with tangata whenua; d. providing assistance to landowners to preserve, maintain, and enhance sites and areas of significance to Māori; and/or e. for sites in schedule 4, seeking to establish an extent through engagement and collaboration with tangata whenua. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | | |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R2 | S214.050 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | Support the permitted activity status for SASM-R2 in allowing for activities necessary for day-to day farming operations. | Retain SASM-R2 as notified. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-O1 | S214.051 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | <p>The submitter opposes ECO-O1. This objective imposes an undue burden on landowners concerning the maintenance and enhancement of indigenous species and habitats.</p> <p>The wording of this objective is inconsistent with the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity, which aims for the maintenance and achievement of no net loss in indigenous biodiversity.</p> <p>Recommend an amendment of the objective's emphasis, focusing on the maintenance or enhancement of habitats for indigenous species. This adjustment is necessary for two reasons: firstly, it may not always be practical to both maintain and enhance such habitats simultaneously. Secondly, it is important to recognise that only habitats can be maintained or enhanced through human endeavour, as the maintenance or enhancement of specific species is ultimately determined by natural processes beyond human control.</p> | Amend ECO-O1 as follows: Maintain and or enhance the biological diversity of habitats of indigenous species and habitats within the Wairarapa. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P2 | S214.052 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | <p>The submitter supports ECO-P2 which advocates collaboration with other agencies and organisations to undertake joint initiatives. Commend the Councils for recognising the importance of supporting landowners' initiatives in the protection and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity.</p> <p>Farmers play a vital role in maintaining and enhancing areas of indigenous biodiversity.</p> | Retain ECO-P2 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>Acknowledging and reinforcing the efforts of landowners in these initiatives is crucial. Their on-the-ground knowledge, commitment, and practical engagement are instrumental in achieving positive outcomes for biodiversity.</p> <p>Encourage active facilitation and recognition of the valuable contributions of landowners, fostering a collaborative approach that leverages their expertise and commitment in the shared goal of maintaining or enhancing indigenous biodiversity in the Wairarapa region.</p> | |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P3 | S214.053 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports ECO-P3 but requests that engagement with affected landowners also occurs during the identification and mapping of areas that are habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna in the Wairarapa.</p> <p>It is essential that affected landowners are part of the process in the identification and mapping of these areas so that they are aware of and have the ability to be involved with the determination of the area of the site.</p> | Amend ECO-P3 as follows: Identify those areas that are habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna in the Wairarapa and involve landowners in the process of identification and determination of these areas. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P4 | S214.054 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>Only sites where landowner(s) agreement has been reached should be included in Schedules 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 or 11. (Schedule 8, and all relevant provisions for that schedule, should be deleted).</p> <p>If the Councils wish to negotiate scheduling of habitats comprising indigenous vegetation or habitats of indigenous fauna on private land in the PDP, then the Councils are free to negotiate with landowner(s) to do so. The PDP should not be used as a mechanism to circumvent negotiation and agreement with private landowners.</p> | Amend ECO-P4 as follows: Protect those areas that are habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna in the Wairarapa from inappropriate subdivision, land use, and development by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. only providing for activities that demonstrate an operational need or functional need to be located in this area; 2. ensuring areas are not removed in whole or part; 3. requiring activities within or directly adjacent to these areas to avoid, remedy, or mitigate the adverse effects on the values of the area; and 4. managing effects of vegetation modification within the margins of any natural wetlands and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | rely upon Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Freshwater) Regulations 2020 in all other cases. This shall not apply to habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna that are on private land unless agreement has been reached with landowners to include such sites and areas in the schedule of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P5 | S214.055 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>A range of farm structures and facilities need to be included within the list of activities allowed under this policy in situations where scheduled habitats of significant indigenous vegetation or fauna are located on farmland.</p> <p>Existing farm access tracks and farm water supply pipelines in particular may need to be relocated to allow superior conservation solutions, albeit that any new replacement farm access tracks and pipelines may of necessity have to be wholly or partly within SNAs - depending on the location and situation.</p> | <p>Amend as follows: Enable the following activities relating to habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna in the Wairarapa where they contribute to the protection, maintenance, and enhancement of the areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. removal of broken branches, deadwood, diseased vegetation, or exotic species; 2. maintenance of the safety and efficiency of network utilities; 3. maintenance of existing access tracks for network utilities; 4. maintenance of existing farm buildings, farm access tracks, farm drains, culverts, gates and fence lines, farm stock water supply dams, pipes and troughs and firebreaks and the construction of new fence lines, farm water supply pipelines, farm tracks and firebreaks; 5. customary activities; and 6. conservation activities. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P6 | S214.056 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The submitter recognises the importance of ECO-P6 in managing effects on significant indigenous vegetation or habitat. Suggest refining the policy to focus primarily on threatened species, streamlining the approach for practicality. Emphasise the need for a balanced and flexible strategy, acknowledging the challenges landowners face in avoiding, remedying, or mitigating every adverse effect. The submitter proposes a revised policy that prioritises threatened species, ensuring effective biodiversity conservation while respecting practical constraints. | Amend ECO-P6 as follows: Manage the effects of subdivision, use, and development of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna in the Wairarapa by: 1. avoiding the loss or degradation of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna in preference to remediation or mitigation; 2. avoiding the loss of habitat that supports or provides a key life function for Threatened or At Risk indigenous species; and 3. requiring that any unavoidable more than minor adverse effects on areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna are remedied or mitigated. More than minor residual adverse effects on significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, outside the Coastal Environment, that cannot be avoided, remedied, or mitigated in accordance with clauses 1 - 3 above shall be offset, or if biodiversity offsetting cannot be reasonably achieved, shall be addressed through environmental compensation. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and | ECO-P8 | S214.057 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The submitter considers this policy unduly onerous. It will have the perverse effect of discouraging people from choosing to | Delete ECO-P8. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Indigenous Biodiversity | | | | | voluntarily plant indigenous vegetation and will encourage people to choose to plant exotic vegetation instead. This will have a counterproductive impact on indigenous biodiversity. | |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P9 | S214.058 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports ECO-P9 affirming the commitment to encourage the protection and restoration of natural habitats on private land. It is crucial to recognise that farmers are already proactively engaged in initiatives that contribute to positive conservation outcomes. This includes voluntary efforts to protect and restore natural habitats, highlighting a genuine commitment to environmental stewardship. | Retain ECO-P9 as notified. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-R1 | S214.059 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the permitted activity status outlined in ECO-R1 for the modification of indigenous vegetation within a Significant Natural Area, with particular appreciation for provisions v. and vi. These provisions permit the removal or trimming of vegetation branches as necessary to prevent interference with lawfully established structures, buildings, and fence lines.</p> <p>Recommend an expansion of the rule to encompass other lawfully established activities essential to the daily operations and maintenance of a farm, such as pasture, drains and farm tracks. This inclusive approach ensures that the rule adequately addresses the practical needs of farmers while maintaining the necessary balance for environmental conservation within Significant Natural Areas.</p> | Amend ECO-R1 as follows: v. required to remove or trim branches of vegetation to the extent necessary to avoid them interfering with lawfully established pasture, drains, farm tracks , structures, buildings, fence lines, network utilities, existing roads or access tracks; |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-R2 | S214.060 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the permitted activity status outlined in ECO-R2 for the modification of indigenous vegetation outside a Significant Natural Area. | Retain ECO-R2 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P1 | S214.061 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose in part | The PDP uses a definition of 'Surface waterbody' that captures artificial drains. This will result in needless delays and costs from capturing day-to-day maintenance of artificial channels and drains in resource consent processes. Artificial channels and drains should be exempt from this policy. | Amend NATC-P1 as follows: Manage the design, location, and scale of subdivision, use and development adjoining surface waterbodies so they preserve the special qualities and natural character of surface waterbodies (not including artificial channels and drains) . |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P3 | S214.062 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports allowing earthworks within 25m of significant waterbodies where they are for the purpose of maintenance works on infrastructure such as maintaining drains, man-made dams, access tracks or roads. | Retain NATC-P3 as notified. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P5 | S214.063 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose in part | The PDP uses a definition of 'surface waterbody' that captures artificial drains. This will result in needless delays and costs from capturing day-to-day maintenance of artificial channels and drains in resource consent processes. Artificial channels and drains should be exempt from this policy. | Amend NATC-P5 as follows: Discourage buildings and structures within 10m of surface waterbodies (not including artificial channels and drains) within the General Rural Zone, 5m of any surface waterbody in any other zone and 25m of significant waterbodies across all zones and only allow buildings and structures within these setbacks where: a. there is a functional need or operational need for their location within the setback; b. the location, intensity, scale, design, and form of the building or structure preserves natural character values; and c. any potential cumulative effects on natural character values are minimised. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-O2 | S214.064 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | There is no need to recognise or manage 'special amenity landscapes' as a separate phenomenon. Amenity values (which include amenity within landscape settings) can be appropriately managed through other plan provisions, such as appropriate development standards for appearance, bulk, height, location, and setbacks of structures within appropriate Zone Framework rules. Regulatory frameworks should err on the side of a 'less restrictive regime' where the purposes of the Act and the objectives of the plan can be met (following the principle in Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc v Whakatane District Council [2017] NZEnvC 51 at [59]). | Delete NFL-O2. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P2 | S214.065 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The submitter considers that there is no need to recognise or manage 'special amenity landscapes' as a separate phenomenon. Amenity values (which include amenity within landscape settings) can be appropriately managed through other plan provisions, such as appropriate development standards for appearance, bulk, height, location, and setbacks of structures within the appropriate Zone Framework rules. Regulatory frameworks should err on the side of a 'less restrictive regime' where the purposes of the Act and the objectives of the plan can be met (following the principle in Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc v Whakatane District Council [2017] NZEnvC 51 at [59]). | Delete NFL-P2. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P3 | S214.066 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The submitter opposes NFL-P3 as rural production activities and ancillary farm buildings situated within rural areas should not be caught in resource consent process under a landscape management regime. This would result in unnecessary costs and delays for little or no environmental benefit. | Amend NFL-P3 as follows: Only allow subdivision, use, and development within an identified Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape where it: a. avoids significant adverse effects and avoids, remedies, or mitigates any other adverse effects on the identified characteristics and values of the Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape; b. is demonstrated it is appropriate by: |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|---|---------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>i. having an operational need or functional need to be located in this area;</p> <p>ii. minimising earthworks and changes to the landform;</p> <p>iii. reducing the scale and prominence of any buildings or structures, including any proposed building platforms, and integrating landform and context into the design and through the use of naturally occurring building platforms and sympathetic materials;</p> <p>iv. avoiding or minimising the removal of any indigenous vegetation;</p> <p>v. enabling the repair, maintenance, and removal of existing infrastructure; and</p> <p>vi. enabling the continuation, or enhancing, of tangatawhenua cultural and spiritual values and customary activities; and vii. enables rural production activities (including ancillary farm buildings) to operate efficiently and to make effective use of the land resource of the General Rural Zone.</p> |
| <p>NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes</p> | <p>NFL-P5</p> | <p>S214.067</p> | <p>Federated Farmers of New Zealand</p> | <p>Oppose</p> | <p>The submitter opposes NFL-P5 because rural production activities and ancillary farm buildings situated within rural areas should not be caught in resource consent process under a landscape management regime. This would result in inefficient and unnecessary costs and delays for little or no environmental benefit.</p> | <p>Amend as follows: Allow subdivision, use, and development within an Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes where it is associated with conservation activities or rural production activities and ancillary farm buildings, or:</p> <p>a. it relates to the maintenance, repair, or removal of existing infrastructure;</p> <p>b. there is a functional need or operational need for the activity to be located in the Outstanding Natural Features or Landscapes;</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | | <p>c. the form, scale, and nature of the activity will not detract from the characteristics and values of the Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes by:</p> <p>i. integrating landform and context into the design and through the use of naturally occurring building platforms and sympathetic materials;</p> <p>ii. limiting the prominence or visibility of built form, including by integrating it into the natural landform; and</p> <p>iii. restoring or reinstating areas of earthworks and replanting areas of modification of vegetation; and</p> <p>d. the activity is consistent with Policies NFL-P3 and NFL-P4.</p> |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-S1 | S214.068 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The submitter opposes NFL-S1 as rural production activities situated within rural areas should not be caught in resource consent process under an earthworks management regime. This would result in inefficient and unnecessary costs and delays for little or no environmental benefit. | <p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Earthworks must not exceed:</p> <p>a. a maximum cut or fill height greater than 1.5m above ground level; and</p> <p>b. a maximum area of 50m² per site.</p> <p>This standard does not apply to: Earthworks associated with maintaining existing farmtracks, water supply pipelines, farm water supply dams, farm drains, livestock mustering yards, farm vehicle hard stand areas, airstrips, silage pits, fence lines, and access ways are exempt from the above area standards but must comply with NFL-S1(1)(a).</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-S2 | S214.069 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The submitter opposes NFL-S2 as rural production activities situated within rural areas should not be caught in resource consent process under an indigenous vegetation clearance/modification regime. This would result in inefficient and unnecessary costs and delays for little or no environmental benefit. | Amend NFL-S2 as follows: This standard does not apply to modification of indigenous vegetation that is: a. 3m either side of, or within, an existing formed road, stock crossing, or accessway; b. 3m either side of a fence, or other lawfully established structure; or c. within 10m of an existing lawfully established residential unit. d. vegetation clearance of indigenous vegetation associated with, maintenance of pasture, existing farm tracks, water supply pipelines, farm water supply dams, farm drains, livestock mustering yards, farm vehicle hard stand areas, airstrips, silage pits, fence lines, are exempt from the above standards. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-S3 | S214.070 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The submitter opposes NFL-S3 as rural production buildings and structures situated within rural areas should not be caught in resource consent process under a landscape management regime. This would result in inefficient and unnecessary costs and delays for little or no environmental benefit. | Amend NFL-S3 as follows: Buildings and structures within an Outstanding Natural Features and Landscape must meet the following standards: a. the gross floor area of any building or structure on a site must not exceed 50m ² per site b. the building or structure must not exceed one storey and must not exceed a maximum height of 5m; c. Maximum of one residential unit per a site; d. any roof cladding must be of matt finish in a natural range of browns, greens, and greys to complement the tones found in the natural surroundings, with the colour having a light reflectivity value (LRV) percentage between 5 |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | and 25%; and e. cladding is limited to natural materials and/or recessive colours with light reflectivity value (LRV) of 35% or less Except that: a. This standard shall not apply to buildings and structures ancillary to rural production activities, such as fences and gates, storage barns, farm implement sheds, livestock shelters for mustering areas, dairy sheds, shearing/wool sheds, and herd homes. |
| PA - Public Access | PA-O1 | S214.071 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports PA-O1 as currently proposed in the PDP. However, there is a need for an additional objective that provides recognition of private property rights as well as the impacts public access may have on the amenity value of selected landscapes and areas.</p> <p>The landowners' private property rights are a key area of focus which needs to be considered within this chapter.</p> | <p>Amend PA-O1 as follows: Public access to and enjoyment of the coast, rivers, lakes and natural inland, wetlands and their margins is maintained and enhanced where appropriate and in a manner that:</p> <p>a. preserves their natural character, indigenous biodiversity, landscape, historic heritage, and cultural values; and</p> <p>b. minimises incompatibility of providing public access with adjoining activities.</p> |
| PA - Public Access | New provision request | S214.072 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | <p>The submitter supports PA-O1 as currently proposed in the PDP. However, there is a need for an additional objective that provides recognition of private property rights as well as the impacts public access may have on the amenity value of selected landscapes and areas.</p> | <p>Insert new objective as follows: Practical and safe public access to and along the margins of lakes and rivers and the coastal environment is provided in a way that respects private property and does not result in adverse effect on</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | The landowners' private property rights are a key area of focus which needs to be considered within this chapter. | natural character, landscape, indigenous biodiversity, historical heritage, or cultural values. |
| PA - Public Access | PA-P2 | S214.073 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The submitter requests PA-P2 is amended so that public access is compatible with these existing lawfully established activities. | Amend as follows: Enable activities within the coast, rivers, lakes, and wetlands and their margins that do not restrict or prevent public access to, or adjacent to the coast and surface water bodies. Ensure public access to or adjacent to the coast and surface water bodies are compatible with existing lawfully established activities within the coast, rivers, lakes and wetlands and their margins. |
| PA - Public Access | PA-P3 | S214.074 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | Restrictions of public access to the Coastal Marine area are important to protect natural habitats, activities of cultural value to Māori, and public health and safety. Policy 19(3) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 lists circumstances where public access to the coastal marine area can be restricted. One of these includes exceptional circumstances sufficient to justify the restriction. The submitter seeks that exceptional circumstances to justify the restriction should be included in PA-P3. Landowners, when negotiating public access over their private land, should have this avenue to justify restriction of public access over their land. | Amend as follows: Ensure use, subdivision, and development of the coastal environment provides for, or enhances, public access where appropriate to and along the Coastal Marine Area. Access should only be restricted for the following reasons: a. to protect natural habitats; b. to protect sites and activities of cultural value to Māori c. to protect historic heritage features and areas; or d. to protect public health and safety; or e. in exceptional circumstances sufficient to justify the restriction. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|--|---|
| PA - Public Access | New provision request | S214.075 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The policy framework needs to include direction for private property to ensure that public access does not cause damage or create security risks. Farmers provide more public access across their private property than other landowners (such as residential or industrial). Farmers are familiar with the adverse effects that result from public access such as rubbish, weed incursions, and nuisance effects on their homes and places of work. | Insert new policy as follows: To provide information and education to the public regarding where public access is available, and that access over private land is only by the permission of the landowner |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O1 | S214.076 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The purpose of subdivision is not to create lots for natural features and landscapes, waterbodies, indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage, or SASMs (although lots may end up encompassing some such areas). This objective is heavily 'urban-centric' and it either needs to be more generic, or it needs to include a range of other considerations besides merely urban ones, or special area overlays. | Amend SUB-O1 as follows: Subdivision and developments create allotments and patterns of land use and development that: a. Provide for the anticipated purpose, character, and amenity of each zone and the qualities and values of the site(s) including natural features and landscapes, waterbodies, indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage, and sites and areas of significance to Māori. b. Provide for a variety of housing types that cater for the range of community needs, such as affordability, accessibility, and lifestyle; c. Are well functioning, accessible, integrated and connected with adjoining neighbourhoods; d. Provide accessible and well designed open space areas; e. Protect cultural, heritage, and natural values; and respond to the risks of natural hazards and is resilient to climate change |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O2 | S214.077 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The submitter opposes the draft wording of SUB-O2. Suggest wording that does not imply that 'servicing' is a ubiquitous requirement regardless of context. | Amend SUB-O2 as follows: Subdivision and developments are serviced to provide for the likely or anticipated use of the land while avoiding, remedying, or mitigating adverse effects on the environment by ensuring: a. Subdivisions within the urban boundary connect to reticulated water and wastewater services (and reticulated stormwater services where they are available or provide for on-site stormwater disposal) with sufficient capacity to accommodate proposed or anticipated development; and b. Subdivisions in Rural Zones can be appropriately serviced via on-site measures. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P2 | S214.078 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | Infrastructure will not always be available for all types of subdivision (e.g. for rural lot subdivision in remote rural areas), nor will it always be appropriate to require all types of infrastructure for all types of subdivision. | Amend SUB-P2 as follows: Require subdivision to be located where appropriate infrastructure for new subdivision is available, or to provide infrastructure in an integrated and comprehensive manner by: a. ensuring appropriate infrastructure has the capacity to accommodate the development or anticipated future development of the land in accordance with the purpose of the zone, is in place at the time of subdivision or |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------|--|
| | | | | | | <p>development and integrates with existing and planned infrastructure.</p> <p>b. Requiring connections to Council's reticulated systems within the urban boundary to meet the performance criteria of the relevant Council;</p> <p>c. Ensuring allotments outside the urban boundary are of a sufficient size and shape where appropriate soil conditions to accommodate on-site wastewater, stormwater, and water supply infrastructure, and that there is sufficient water supply capacity for firefighting purposes;</p> <p>d. Ensuring roads and any vehicle access to sites meet minimum design standards to allow for safe and efficient traffic movements and can safely accommodate the intended number of users and the intended functioning of the road or access;</p> <p>e. Providing for transport network connections within and between communities;</p> <p>f. Where consistent with the zone, providing for a variety of travel modes that reflect the purpose, character, and amenity values of the zone, including walking, cycling, and access to public transport; and</p> <p>g. Achieving safe and efficient access onto and from state highways.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|--|---|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P5 | S214.079 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | <p>The submitter opposes SUB-P5. Amenity values should not be a consideration for subdivision in rural areas, lest it be used as an excuse to impose unreasonable reverse sensitivity restrictions against primary production activities.</p> <p>Similarly, 'predominance of vegetation' and provision for 'varying forms, scale and separation of structures associated with primary production activities' are not relevant considerations for subdivision in rural areas.</p> | <p>Amend SUB-P5 as follows: Provide for subdivision, use and development where it does not compromise the purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Enabling and promoting openness and predominance of vegetation; b. Enabling and promoting a productive working landscape c. Enabling primary production and ancillary activities; d. Providing for varying forms, scale and separation of structures associated with primary production activities; e. Managing the density and location of residential development; f. Ensuring allotments can be self-serviced; g. Retaining a clear delineation and contrast between the district's rural areas and urban areas; and h. Avoiding, remedying, or mitigating reverse sensitivity effects. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R1 | S214.080 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | <p>The submitter supports boundary adjustments enabled as a controlled activity. This allows rural landowners to efficiently reallocate ownership of farmland, according to changing circumstances. As no additional lots are being created in boundary adjustments, the overall intensity of land ownership and the cumulative effects of transport networks and</p> | <p>Retain SUB-R1 as notified.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | services remains unchanged. Therefore, effects of boundary adjustments are minor. | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R5 | S214.081 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | <p>The submitter opposes SUB-R5. A farmer should not be forced to dispose of 40ha if they only need to dispose of 20ha.</p> <p>The requirement for 'no vacant lots to be created' is meaningless in a rural setting. It is highly efficient for new lots to be vacant so that they can be put to maximum productive potential.</p> <p>Direct access to state highways should not be intensified as a result of new subdivision. However, where an existing access is from a state highway, the effects of that are the same or similar as prior to subdivision and therefore the use of such existing access should be permitted to continue.</p> | <p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity Status: ControlledWhere:</p> <p>a. There is no more than one additional allotment created;</p> <p>b. The subdivision is of land around an existing lawfullyestablished residential unit</p> <p>c. The additional allotment is no less than 0.5ha</p> <p>d. The balance area remaining from the record of titlesubject to subdivision is no less than 40ha 20ha; e. No vacant allotments are created following thesubdivision</p> <p>f. Compliance is achieved with:</p> <p>i. SUB-S1 ii. SUB-S2iii. SUB-S3iv. SUB-S4v. SUB-S5vi. SUB-S6vii. SUB-S7viii. SUB-S8ix. SUB-S9</p> <p>g. The subdivision complies with or does not increase anyexisting or previously approved non-compliance withthe underlying zone standards:</p> <p>h. There is no new direct access to State Highway 53, anyLimited Access Road direct access to State Highway 2.</p> <p>i. There is no new direct access to State highway 2</p> |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R12 | S214.082 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the restricted discretionary status for subdivision within the coastal environment. The submitter does not support the minimum allotment size of 40ha. A farmer should not have to dispose of 40ha if they only need to dispose 20ha.</p> <p>For subdivision in proximity to existing</p> | <p>Amend SUB-R12 as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity Status: Restricted DiscretionaryWhere:</p> <p>a. a proposed building platform is identified for eachproposed allotment that is capable of accommodatinga building that complies with the permitted activitystandards of the underlying zone;</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | subdivided and developed land at Cape Palliser, Castlepoint, Flat Point, Mataikona, Ngawai, Otahome, Riversdale, and Whangaimoana, there should be recognition that cumulative effects of further subdivision within the coastal environment are less likely to present problems. In these areas, allowing further appropriate subdivision could strengthen isolated rural communities and there should be a matter of discretion to consider the merits of this. | <p>b. A building platform is not located in an area of Outstanding Natural Character, Very High and High natural Character, or Foreshore Protection Area; and</p> <p>c. Any allotments created have minimum allotment size of 40ha 20ha</p> <p>Matters of discretion:</p> <p>... 8. the extent to which appropriate subdivision could strengthen isolated rural communities where cumulative effects of further subdivision and development within the coastal environment will be minor due to proximity to existing subdivided and developed land at cape Palliser, Castlepoint, Flat Point, Mataikona, Ngawi, Otahome, Riversdale and Whangaimoana.</p> |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB - Table 1 | S214.083 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The submitter considers that 40ha is too large an area for efficient rural property management. A farmer should not have to dispose of 40ha if they only need to dispose 20ha. | Amend as follows: GRUZ: General Rural Zone 40ha 20ha |
| FC - Financial Contributions | | S214.084 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the overall intent of the FC- Financial Contributions Chapter. Placing responsibility on those developing and subdividing to fund infrastructure upgrades and community facilities needed to service growth is an equitable policy. Endorse flexibility into the policy to waive or reduce contributions where pursuing full cost recovery would not serve the wider community interest or would be unfair. This is important for situations like a farmer subdividing off a small section for retirement | Retain the Financial Contributions chapter as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | or to release some necessary capital. Setting reasonable caps on reserve and transport contributions per allotment and allowing annual adjustments of district wide infrastructure contributions should help avoid disincentivising appropriate growth. | |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-01 | S214.085 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) requires recognition of the characteristics and qualities that contribute to natural character of the coastal environment and protection of those from inappropriate subdivision, use and development while encouraging restoration of the coastal environment. There is no requirement to 'enhance' such characteristics, therefore this should not be a goal of the PDP. | Amend CE-01 as follows: The qualities that contribute to the coastal environment including natural character, landscape, historic, cultural and ecological values are maintained and, where appropriate, restored or enhanced . |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-02 | S214.086 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) requires recognition of the characteristics and qualities that contribute to natural character of the coastal environment and protection of those from inappropriate subdivision, use and development while encouraging restoration of the coastal environment. There is no requirement to 'enhance' such characteristics, therefore this should not be a goal of the PDP. | Amend CE-02 as follows: The natural character of the coastal environment is preserved, including: 1. Protecting the qualities, characteristics and values of areas of Outstanding Natural Character and Very High and High Natural Character in the landward extent of the coastal environment; and 2. Maintaining and where appropriate enhancing restoring natural character in all other areas of the coastal environment. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-05 | S214.087 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter has concerns that the objectives and policies do not recognise and provide for: - the functional need of certain activities to be in areas where the resource is located; and - existing lawfully established activities to continue to operate. It is important that there is a framework that allows for the on-going operations of farms | Amend CE-05 as follows: People and communities are able to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being, recognising that the protection of natural character and indigenous biodiversity, public access, or cultural values does not preclude subdivision, use or development, where this does not compromise these values. Existing lawfully |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | which means it needs to be specifically spelt out in relevant objectives and policies. There also needs to be recognition and provision for activities with a functional need to be able to locate in coastal hazard areas. | established activities can continue to operate and that the functional need of certain activities to be in areas where the resource is located is recognised and provided for. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P1 | S214.088 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | Identifying the extent of the coastal environment is important to farmers whose properties may form part of the coastal environment. Land identified as part of the coastal environment is subject to objectives, policies, and rules for the purpose of recognising and providing for the preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment. Support CE-P1 and the characteristics upon which the extent of the coastal environment is identified. These are consistent with Policy 1 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010. Support planning maps to clearly depict to stakeholders the extent of the coastal environment. | Retain CE-P1 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P4 | S214.089 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | Farmers own or use land that forms part of the coastal environment. Existing agricultural activities may be managed by this policy. Concerns regarding the methods in this policy to ensure that the form, scale, and nature of the activity will not detract from the natural character of the coastal environment. Particular concerns with maintaining and enhancing public access. Public access can and does occur over private property. This raises issues of security and safety for private landowners. Farmers have and still are experiencing public access users leaving gates open and/or straying off the public access paths. A balance needs to be obtained so that private landowners, particularly in rural environments are not | Amend CE-P4 as follows: Manage subdivision, use and development within the coastal environment to ensure: a. there is a functional need or operational need for the activity to be located in the coastal environment; and b. The form, scale and nature of the activity will not detract from the natural character of the coastal environment by: ... vi. maintaining and enhancing public access while also ensuring that adverse effects on private land are minimised, maintaining customary access and recreational use. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | adversely impacted on by members of the public and other parties seeking access. Any policy that seeks to maintain and enhance public access needs to recognise that public access does occur over private land and the adverse effects that may result need to be addressed. Council also needs to consider how access to the sites can be controlled so that private landowners are still able to continue with their existing and lawfully established activities and operations. | |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-S1 | S214.090 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The Standards in this rule are urban centric, overly restrictive, and not appropriate for the full range of rural production activities within wide-open spaces of rural areas. Considerably more development and earthworks can be tolerated without having adverse effects on the environment. CE-S1 risks capturing routine farm activities in a resource consent process resulting in onerous costs and delays for little or no environmental benefit. Therefore, more exceptions for rural earthworks are warranted. | Amend CE-S1 as follows: 1. Earthworks within the coastal environment must not exceed: a. A maximum cut or fill height greater than 3m aboveground level; and b. A maximum area of 500m ² per site. 2. Earthworks within areas of very high and high natural character must not exceed: a. a maximum cut or fill height of 1.5m above ground level and b. A maximum area of 50m ² per site. This Standard does not apply to: a. Earthworks associated with maintaining existing farmtracks, water supply infrastructure, farm water supply dams, farm drains, livestock mustering yards, farm vehicle hard stand areas, airstrips, sileage pits, fence lines and access ways are exempt from the above standards but must comply with NFL-S1(1)(a) and NFLS1(2)(a). |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-S2 | S214.091 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The Standards in this rule are urban centric, overly restrictive, and not appropriate for the full range of rural production activities in the wide-open spaces of rural areas. | Amend CE-S2 as follows: Modification of indigenous vegetation must not exceed, in total area, 50m ² in any 12 month period. This standard does not apply |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | Considerably more development and clearance of indigenous vegetation can be tolerated without having adverse effects on the environment. CE-S2 risks capturing routine farm activities in a resource consent process resulting in onerous costs and delays for little or no environmental benefit. Therefore, more exceptions for rural indigenous vegetation clearance are warranted. | to modification of indigenous vegetation that is: a. 3m either side of, or within, an existing formed road, track, stock crossing or accessway; b. 3m either side of a fence, or other lawfully established structure; or c. Within 10m of an existing lawfully established residential unit. Except that: a. Vegetation clearance of indigenous vegetation associated with the maintenance of pasture, existing farm tracks, farm water supply pipelines, farm water supply dams, farm drains, livestock mustering yards, farm vehicle hard stand areas, airstrips, silage pits, fence lines and access ways are exempt from the above area standards. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-S3 | S214.092 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The Standards in this rule are urban centric, overly restrictive, and not appropriate for the full range of rural production buildings and structures in the wide-open spaces of rural areas. Considerably more development can be tolerated without having adverse effects on the environment. CE-S3 risks capturing routine farm buildings and structures in a resource consent process resulting in onerous costs and delays for little or no environmental benefit. Therefore, more exceptions for rural production buildings are warranted. | Amend as follows: 1. Buildings and structures within the coastal environment must meet the following building standards: a. the gross floor area of any individual building or structure on a site must not exceed 200m ² ; b. The building or structure must not exceed a maximum height of 7m; c. Maximum of one residential unit per site; d. Any roof cladding must be of matt finish in a natural range of browns, greens, and greys to complement the tones found in the natural surroundings, with the colour having a light reflectivity value (LRV) percentage between 5 and 25% and. Cladding is limited to natural materials and/or recessive colours with light reflectivity value (LRV) of 35% or less. 2. Buildings and structures within the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>Foreshore Protection Area must meet the following standards:</p> <p>a. the gross floor area of the building or structure on a site must not exceed 15m²;</p> <p>b. The building or structure must not exceed a maximum height of 3m and;</p> <p>c. The building or structure must only be used for nonhabitable purposes.</p> <p>3. Buildings and structures within an area identified as Very High and High Natural Character and Landscape must meet the following standards:</p> <p>a. the gross floor area of the building or structure on a site must not exceed 50m²;</p> <p>b. The building or structure must not exceed a maximum height of 5m.</p> <p>Standard CE-S3(1) does not apply to the Settlement Zone Except that: Buildings or structures associated with rural production activity, such as fences and gates, storage barns, farm implement sheds, livestock shelters for mustering areas, dairy sheds, shearing/wool sheds, and herd homes are exempt from the above standards.</p> |
| LIGHT - Light | LIGHT-P3 | S214.093 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports LIGHT-P3. This policy sufficiently provides for the use of light to aid primary production activities that occur in the morning and late at night. Use of artificial light is also important for security purposes. | Retain LIGHT-P3 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-O2 | S214.094 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports NOISE-O2. | Retain NOISE-O2 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P1 | S214.095 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The management of noise should reflect the predominant land use within each zone. It would be perverse for rural production activities that are characteristically noisy, such as operation of frost fans or bird-scaring devices, to be prevented from occurring in | Amend NOISE-P1 as follows: Enable the generation of noise from activities that: 1. maintain the predominant land-use character and amenity values of the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|------------|--|---|
| | | | | | rural areas on account of the sensitivity of nearby rural residential land uses that have chosen to live in remote rural areas | receiving environment by appropriately controlling the types of activities and the levels of noise permitted in each zone; and 2. Does not compromise the health, safety and wellbeing of people and communities |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P2 | S214.096 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Not Stated | The management of noise should reflect the predominant land use within each zone. It would be perverse for rural production activities that are characteristically noisy, such as operation of frost fans or bird-scaring devices, to be prevented from occurring in rural areas on account of the sensitivity of nearby rural residential land uses that have chosen to live in remote rural areas. | Amend NOISE-P2 as follows: Provide for other activities that generate noise, where these avoid, remedy, or mitigate any adverse effects, having regard to: 1. the extent to which it avoids conflict with existing noise sensitive activities; 2. whether the level of effects is compatible with the character and amenity of the location and adjacent established activities and their operation; 3. the compatibility of the noise with other noise generated from permitted zone activities and other activities not controlled by the Plan, within the receiving zone; 4. the degree to which the noise breaches the permitted noise standards for the receiving zone(s). 5. Whether adverse effects can be internalised to the site where the noise is generated and the extent to which they can be minimised at site boundaries; |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | <p>6. the frequency, intensity, duration, and offensiveness of the noise generated;</p> <p>7. any adverse effects on the health, safety and wellbeing of people and communities within the surrounding area, including sleep disturbance and annoyance.</p> <p>8. whether the activity adopts the best practicable option to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects and the appropriateness of potential mitigation measures to control and monitor the noise levels in addition or as alternatives to the best practicable option through noise management plans or other methods; and</p> <p>9. potential positive effects associated with the activity.</p> |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P8 | S214.097 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports NOISE-P8. | Retain NOISE-P8 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | | S214.098 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the list of activities that are not subject to the rules and standards in the NOISE - Noise Chapter. We particularly support where Council has included agricultural aviation and helicopter landing areas. | Retain the list of activities that are not subject to the rules and standards in the NOISE-Noise Chapter as proposed. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | New provision request | S214.099 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | Overall, the chapter appears reasonably balanced. While the submitter supports the general intent, they want to ensure rural character and productive values on the fringe of residential and rural zones are appropriately recognised and protected. | Insert new objective as follows: GRZ- OX Avoid reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established rural activities where residential development adjoins rural sites. Where residential |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>It is evident from the PDP mapping that the General Residential Zone directly adjoins the General Rural Zone across a significant portion of the region, lacking a buffer zone in between.</p> <p>This raises the concern that the plan does not contain adequate provisions to manage reverse sensitivity effects, whereby residential activities within the urban area can affect the operation of adjoining rural activities. This could unduly constrain existing or future primary production when there is future development of the General Residential Zone.</p> | development adjoins rural sites recognise and provide for the consideration of effects on rural character, amenity, and operations. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O3 | S214.100 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports GRUZ-O3. However, this objective should give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land to ensure that the productive use of highly productive land and resources is supported. | Amend GRUZ-O3 as follows: The productive capacity of highly productive land and resources of the General Rural Zone is supported through enabling a range of primary production oriented and resource dependent activities that depend on the highly productive land resource, and avoiding activities that constrain productive capacity of highly productive land. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O5 | S214.101 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports this objective. Primary production activities have a functional need to locate in the General Rural Zone and therefore should have priority protection from reverse sensitivity effects from sensitive activities. | Retain GRUZ-O5 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O6 | S214.102 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter seeks a minor amendment to GRUZ-O6. | Amend GRUZ-O6 as follows: a. Rural lifestyle subdivision and development is managed in a way that avoids additional fragmentation of highly productive land and its productive potential capacity. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | b. Opportunities for rural lifestyle subdivision and development in appropriate locations within the General rural Zone is provided for, insofar as GRUZO6(a) is met. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P1 | S214.103 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | This policy needs to reflect the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL). There needs to be a strong emphasis on enabling primary production activities that rely on the Highly Productive Land resource, and a strong and direct emphasis on avoiding rural lifestyle development on such land. | Amend GRUZ-P1 as follows: a. Enable primary production activities and ancillary activities that are compatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone productive capacity of Highly Productive Land; b. Provide for allow, where appropriate, other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located in the General Rural Zone that are not incompatible with primary production. c. Provide for Avoid rural lifestyle subdivision and development of Highly Productive Land in appropriate locations where GRUZ P1(a) and GRUZ P1(b) are enabled or provided for. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P3 | S214.104 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | This policy needs to reflect the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. 'Promoting openness and predominance of vegetation' is unnecessarily constraining on productive use of Highly Productive Land and should not be a policy requirement. There needs to be a strong emphasis on enabling primary production activities that rely on the | Amend GRUZ-P3 as follows: a. Enabling and promoting openness and predominance of vegetation; b. Enabling and promoting a productive working landscape c. Enabling primary production and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | Highly Productive Land resource, and a strong and direct emphasis on avoiding rural lifestyle development on such land. | <p>ancillary activities;</p> <p>d. Providing for varying forms, scale, and separation of structures associated with primary production activities;</p> <p>e. Managing the density and location of avoiding residential development that does not have a functional need to locate in the General Rural Zone;</p> <p>f. Ensuring allotments can be self-serviced;</p> <p>g. Retaining a clear delineation and contrast between the Wairarapa's rural areas and urban areas; and</p> <p>h. Avoiding, remedying, or mitigating reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities.</p> |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P4 | S214.105 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | This policy needs to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL). | <p>Amend GRUZ-P4 as follows:</p> <p>Avoid subdivision in the General Rural Zone that will result in sites that are of a size, scale, or location that is contrary to enabling productive use of Highly Productive Land and the anticipated purpose, character, and amenity values of the zone, by:</p> <p>a. Limiting small lot subdivision within the General Rural Zone to areas where there is no Highly Productive Land, or limited productive potential and where it does not compromise the use of land for primary production activities; and</p> <p>b. Recognising avoiding the cumulative</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | | effects associated with small lot subdivision on the productive use and potential of Highly Productive Land within the General Rural Zone. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R6 | S214.106 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports GRUZ-R6 which permits agricultural aviation in the General Rural Zone. | Retain GRUZ-R6 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S4 | S214.107 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports that this standard does not apply to buildings used for seasonal worker accommodation. It is important that for very large sites, particularly sheep farms in remote hill country areas, to have additional seasonal worker accommodation. | Retain GRUZ-S4 as notified. |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | | S214.108 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports policies and rules in this chapter that have the effect of minimising adverse effects of the Mixed Use Zone and activities in it on adjacent rural land. | Retain Mixed Use Zone chapter as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-O2 | S214.109 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports GIZ-O2 which recognises the importance of maintaining amenity values of areas adjacent to the General Industrial Zone. This contributes to amenity protections at the rural-industrial interface by requiring visual screening and planting to mitigate potential impacts on adjoining rural zones. Consider it appropriate that industrial visual effects are internalised, and rural character is preserved across zone boundaries. | Retain GIZ-O2 as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-P4 | S214.110 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports GIZ-P4 which serves to minimise adverse effects from industrial activities on other zones, including rural areas. Specifically, they endorse the requirements to: - Screen industrial activities where adjoining rural zones - Landscape boundaries in the Waingawa Industrial Area that interface with rural sites | Retain GIZ-P4 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>- Screen outdoor storage and service areas visible from public roads or rural land</p> <p>These mechanisms will help to internalise effects within industrial zones and avoid encroachment of nuisance effects such as noise, dust, and visual clutter into rural environments. Managing these potential impacts on rural amenity and character is vital to prevent reverse sensitivity risks constraining primary production activities.</p> <p>Consider GIZ-P4 takes appropriate steps to resolve interface issues with rural land and should be retained as proposed. The policy has potential to be strengthened further through consistent standards specific to the rural boundary</p> | |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | New provision request | S214.111 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | <p>The submitter is concerned the General Industrial Zone Chapter does not contain adequate provisions to manage reverse sensitivity effects on established rural production activities where zones interface. Permitted activities and relatively permissive standards could allow effects such as noise, odour, and light spill to extend into rural areas.</p> <p>This could unduly constrain existing or future primary production activities on the fringes of industrial areas. Rural land can provide important opportunities for food production, agricultural processing and other complementary activities that support the local economy.</p> | Insert new policy as follows: GIZ-PX Reverse Sensitivity Protect lawfully established rural production activities from reverse sensitivity effects by requiring industrial sites adjoining any Rural Zone to mitigate adverse noise, odour, shading, glare, and other effects to the extent they extend beyond the site; |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-O1 | S214.112 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | <p>The submitter supports the FUZ- Future Urban Zone Objectives to enable existing rural uses while restricting urban development until areas are comprehensively planned and rezoned.</p> | Retain FUZ-O1 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|--|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-P1 | S214.113 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the overall policy framework of the Future Urban Zone Chapter. The Policies clearly enable ongoing rural production activities while restricting urban development that would counter the policies of General Rural Zone, as well as FUZ-P2 and FUZ-P3 managing and avoiding incompatible activities. | Retain FUZ-P1 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-P2 | S214.114 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports the intent of MPZ-P2 but would like to see consideration given to potential reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established adjoining rural activities. | Amend MPZ-P2 as follows: any potential conflict between activities within the zone or atzone interfaces, including reverse sensitivity effects on the operations of activities in adjoining rural zones , can be avoided, remedied, or mitigated; |
| SCHED4 - Schedule of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | S214.115 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The submitter notes that the PDP carries over the existing schedule of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori from the Operative Wairarapa Combined District Plan. The submitters position is that sites and areas of significance to Māori that are located on, or form part of private land, are not included in SCHED-4 unless the landowner(s) have agreed. | Delete from SCHED4 any site on private land where an agreement with the landowner has not been reached. |
| SCHED5 - Schedule of Significant Natural Areas | Significant Natural Areas | S214.116 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The submitters position is that only sites where landowner(s) agreement has been reached, should be included in SCHED-5, SCHED-6, SCHED-7, SCHED-9 and SCHED-10. If the Councils wish to negotiate scheduling significant natural areas, recommended areas for protection, Outstanding Natural Landscape and Features, Outstanding Natural Character Areas, and Very High and High Natural Character Areas, on private land in the PDP, then the Councils are free to | Delete sites identified in SCHED5 where the landowner(s) agreement has not been reached. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|---|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | negotiate with landowner(s) to do so. The PDP should not be used as a mechanism to circumvent negotiation and agreement with private landowners. | |
| SCHED6 - Schedule of Recommended Areas for Protection | Recommended Areas for Protection | S214.117 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | <p>The submitters position is that only sites where landowner(s) agreement has been reached, should be included in SCHED-5, SCHED-6, SCHED-7, SCHED-9 and SCHED-10.</p> <p>If the Councils wish to negotiate scheduling significant natural areas, recommended areas for protection, Outstanding Natural Landscape and Features, Outstanding Natural Character Areas, and Very High and High Natural Character Areas, on private land in the PDP, then the Councils are free to negotiate with landowner(s) to do so. The PDP should not be used as a mechanism to circumvent negotiation and agreement with private landowners.</p> | Delete sites identified in SCHED6 where the landowner(s) agreement has not been reached. |
| SCHED7 - Schedule of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features | Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes | S214.118 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | <p>The submitters position is that only sites where landowner(s) agreement has been reached, should be included in SCHED-5, SCHED-6, SCHED-7, SCHED-9 and SCHED-10.</p> <p>If the Councils wish to negotiate scheduling significant natural areas, recommended areas for protection, Outstanding Natural Landscape and Features, Outstanding Natural Character Areas, and Very High and High Natural Character Areas, on private land in the PDP, then the Councils are free to negotiate with landowner(s) to do so. The PDP should not be used as a mechanism to circumvent negotiation and agreement with private landowners.</p> | Delete sites identified in SCHED7 where the landowner(s) agreement has not been reached. |
| SCHED9 - Schedule of Outstanding | Outstanding Natural Character | S214.119 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The submitters position is that only sites where landowner(s) agreement has been reached, should be included in SCHED-5, SCHED-6, SCHED-7, SCHED-9 and SCHED- | Delete sites identified in SCHED9 where the landowner(s) agreement has not been reached. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| g Natural Character Areas | | | | | 10. If the Councils wish to negotiate scheduling significant natural areas, recommended areas for protection, Outstanding Natural Landscape and Features, Outstanding Natural Character Areas, and Very High and High Natural Character Areas, on private land in the PDP, then the Councils are free to negotiate with landowner(s) to do so. The PDP should not be used as a mechanism to circumvent negotiation and agreement with private landowners. | |
| SCHED10 - Schedule of Very High and High Natural Character Areas | Very High and High Natural Character | S214.120 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The submitters position is that only sites where landowner(s) agreement has been reached, should be included in SCHED-5, SCHED-6, SCHED-7, SCHED-9 and SCHED-10. If the Councils wish to negotiate scheduling significant natural areas, recommended areas for protection, Outstanding Natural Landscape and Features, Outstanding Natural Character Areas, and Very High and High Natural Character Areas, on private land in the PDP, then the Councils are free to negotiate with landowner(s) to do so. The PDP should not be used as a mechanism to circumvent negotiation and agreement with private landowners. | Delete sites identified in SCHED10 where the landowner(s) agreement has not been reached. |
| SCHED8 - Schedule of Significant Amenity Landscapes | Special Amenity Landscapes | S214.121 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The submitter seeks that this schedule be deleted from the PDP. It serves no practical purpose. | Delete SCHED8. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O2 | S214.122 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports a strategic direction objective that focuses on protecting the productive capacity of primary production activities in the General Rural Zone. This recognises that primary production activities | Retain RE-O2 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | and their productive capacity need to be protected from any negative effects from sensitive or incompatible activities that seek to establish adjacent to them. | |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O3 | S214.123 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports RE-O3 which identified the need to protect highly productive soils from inappropriate development. | Retain RE-O3 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O4 | S214.124 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports maintaining and enhancing the character of the rural environment. | Retain RE-O4 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O5 | S214.125 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports RE-O5 as it sufficiently balances enabling rural lifestyle subdivision with enabling primary production and protecting the productive capacity of land. | Retain RE-O5 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R2 | S214.126 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the rules outlined in the ENG-Energy chapter of the PDP. They specifically endorse the heightened activity status for the General Rural Zone. This is consistent with the overarching Objective of the NPS-HPL, while concurrently acknowledging the benefits to be derived from the use and development of renewable energy under section 7(j) of the RMA and the NPS-REG. | Retain ENG-R2 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R3 | S214.127 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the rules outlined in the ENG-Energy chapter of the PDP. They specifically endorse the heightened activity status for the General Rural Zone. This is consistent with the overarching Objective of the NPS-HPL, while concurrently acknowledging the benefits to be derived from the use and development of renewable energy under section 7(j) of the RMA and the NPS-REG. | Retain ENG-R3 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R4 | S214.128 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the rules outlined in the ENG-Energy chapter of the PDP. They specifically endorse the heightened activity status for the General Rural Zone. This is consistent with the overarching Objective of the NPS-HPL, while concurrently acknowledging the benefits to be derived from the use and development of renewable | Retain ENG-R4 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | energy under section 7(j) of the RMA and the NPS-REG. | |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R5 | S214.129 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the rules outlined in the ENG-Energy chapter of the PDP. They specifically endorse the heightened activity status for the General Rural Zone. This is consistent with the overarching Objective of the NPS-HPL, while concurrently acknowledging the benefits to be derived from the use and development of renewable energy under section 7(j) of the RMA and the NPS-REG. | Retain ENG-R5 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R6 | S214.130 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the rules outlined in the ENG-Energy chapter of the PDP. They specifically endorse the heightened activity status for the General Rural Zone. This is consistent with the overarching Objective of the NPS-HPL, while concurrently acknowledging the benefits to be derived from the use and development of renewable energy under section 7(j) of the RMA and the NPS-REG. | Retain ENG-R6 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R7 | S214.131 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the rules outlined in the ENG-Energy chapter of the PDP. They specifically endorse the heightened activity status for the General Rural Zone. This is consistent with the overarching Objective of the NPS-HPL, while concurrently acknowledging the benefits to be derived from the use and development of renewable energy under section 7(j) of the RMA and the NPS-REG. | Retain ENG-R7 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R8 | S214.132 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the rules outlined in the ENG-Energy chapter of the PDP. They specifically endorse the heightened activity status for the General Rural Zone. This is consistent with the overarching Objective of the NPS-HPL, while concurrently acknowledging the benefits to be derived from the use and development of renewable energy under section 7(j) of the RMA and the NPS-REG. | Retain ENG-R8 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R2 | S214.133 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the intent of the rules for network utilities but queries why there is no consideration required of the potential adverse effects that network utilities, their establishment, operation and upgrading can have on existing lawfully established activities in the rural environment. The Councils appear to have focused primarily on reverse sensitivity impacts related to network utilities, potentially to the detriment of other duly established activities.</p> <p>The Councils, by classifying many network utility activities as permitted activities, have not considered reverse sensitivity impacts on existing rural activities. This places an additional burden on landowners in the rural environment to work out how they can continue their operations around the restrictions network utilities bring with them.</p> | Amend the Permitted activity status for rules which allow network activities to occur which will adversely impact on existing rural activities and operations. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R3 | S214.134 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the intent of the rules for network utilities but queries why there is no consideration required of the potential adverse effects that network utilities, their establishment, operation and upgrading can have on existing lawfully established activities in the rural environment. The Councils appear to have focused primarily on reverse sensitivity impacts related to network utilities, potentially to the detriment of other duly established activities.</p> <p>The Councils, by classifying many network utility activities as permitted activities, have not considered reverse sensitivity impacts on existing rural activities. This places an additional burden on landowners in the rural environment to work out how they can continue their operations around the restrictions network utilities bring with them.</p> | Amend the Permitted activity status for rules which allow network activities to occur which will adversely impact on existing rural activities and operations. Insert new matter of discretion for Restricted Discretionary and Discretionary activities as follows: The potential adverse effects on the operation of existing farming and rural activities located in the general rural and rural lifestyle zones. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R4 | S214.135 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the intent of the rules for network utilities but queries why there is no consideration required of the potential adverse effects that network utilities, their establishment, operation and upgrading can have on existing lawfully established activities in the rural environment. The Councils appear to have focused primarily on reverse sensitivity impacts related to network utilities, potentially to the detriment of other duly established activities.</p> <p>The Councils, by classifying many network utility activities as permitted activities, have not considered reverse sensitivity impacts on existing rural activities. This places an additional burden on landowners in the rural environment to work out how they can continue their operations around the restrictions network utilities bring with them.</p> | <p>Amend the Permitted activity status for rules which allow network activities to occur which will adversely impact on existing rural activities and operations.</p> <p>Insert new matter of discretion for Restricted Discretionary and Discretionary activities as follows: The potential adverse effects on the operation of existing farming and rural activities located in the general rural and rural lifestyle zones.</p> |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R5 | S214.136 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the intent of the rules for network utilities but queries why there is no consideration required of the potential adverse effects that network utilities, their establishment, operation and upgrading can have on existing lawfully established activities in the rural environment. The Councils appear to have focused primarily on reverse sensitivity impacts related to network utilities, potentially to the detriment of other duly established activities.</p> <p>The Councils, by classifying many network utility activities as permitted activities, have not considered reverse sensitivity impacts on existing rural activities. This places an additional burden on landowners in the rural environment to work out how they can continue their operations around the restrictions network utilities bring with them.</p> | <p>Amend the Permitted activity status for rules which allow network activities to occur which will adversely impact on existing rural activities and operations.</p> <p>Insert new matter of discretion for Restricted Discretionary and Discretionary activities as follows: The potential adverse effects on the operation of existing farming and rural activities located in the general rural and rural lifestyle zones.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R6 | S214.137 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the intent of the rules for network utilities but queries why there is no consideration required of the potential adverse effects that network utilities, their establishment, operation and upgrading can have on existing lawfully established activities in the rural environment. The Councils appear to have focused primarily on reverse sensitivity impacts related to network utilities, potentially to the detriment of other duly established activities.</p> <p>The Councils, by classifying many network utility activities as permitted activities, have not considered reverse sensitivity impacts on existing rural activities. This places an additional burden on landowners in the rural environment to work out how they can continue their operations around the restrictions network utilities bring with them.</p> | <p>Amend the Permitted activity status for rules which allow network activities to occur which will adversely impact on existing rural activities and operations.</p> <p>Insert new matter of discretion for Restricted Discretionary and Discretionary activities as follows: The potential adverse effects on the operation of existing farming and rural activities located in the general rural and rural lifestyle zones.</p> |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R7 | S214.138 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the intent of the rules for network utilities but queries why there is no consideration required of the potential adverse effects that network utilities, their establishment, operation and upgrading can have on existing lawfully established activities in the rural environment. The Councils appear to have focused primarily on reverse sensitivity impacts related to network utilities, potentially to the detriment of other duly established activities.</p> <p>The Councils, by classifying many network utility activities as permitted activities, have not considered reverse sensitivity impacts on existing rural activities. This places an additional burden on landowners in the rural environment to work out how they can continue their operations around the restrictions network utilities bring with them.</p> | <p>Amend the Permitted activity status for rules which allow network activities to occur which will adversely impact on existing rural activities and operations.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R8 | S214.139 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the intent of the rules for network utilities but queries why there is no consideration required of the potential adverse effects that network utilities, their establishment, operation and upgrading can have on existing lawfully established activities in the rural environment. The Councils appear to have focused primarily on reverse sensitivity impacts related to network utilities, potentially to the detriment of other duly established activities.</p> <p>The Councils, by classifying many network utility activities as permitted activities, have not considered reverse sensitivity impacts on existing rural activities. This places an additional burden on landowners in the rural environment to work out how they can continue their operations around the restrictions network utilities bring with them.</p> | Amend the Permitted activity status for rules which allow network activities to occur which will adversely impact on existing rural activities and operations. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R9 | S214.140 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the intent of the rules for network utilities but queries why there is no consideration required of the potential adverse effects that network utilities, their establishment, operation and upgrading can have on existing lawfully established activities in the rural environment. The Councils appear to have focused primarily on reverse sensitivity impacts related to network utilities, potentially to the detriment of other duly established activities.</p> <p>The Councils, by classifying many network utility activities as permitted activities, have not considered reverse sensitivity impacts on existing rural activities. This places an additional burden on landowners in the rural environment to work out how they can continue their operations around the restrictions network utilities bring with them.</p> | <p>Amend the Permitted activity status for rules which allow network activities to occur which will adversely impact on existing rural activities and operations.</p> <p>Insert new matter of discretion for Restricted Discretionary and Discretionary activities as follows: The potential adverse effects on the operation of existing farming and rural activities located in the general rural and rural lifestyle zones.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R10 | S214.141 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the intent of the rules for network utilities but queries why there is no consideration required of the potential adverse effects that network utilities, their establishment, operation and upgrading can have on existing lawfully established activities in the rural environment. The Councils appear to have focused primarily on reverse sensitivity impacts related to network utilities, potentially to the detriment of other duly established activities.</p> <p>The Councils, by classifying many network utility activities as permitted activities, have not considered reverse sensitivity impacts on existing rural activities. This places an additional burden on landowners in the rural environment to work out how they can continue their operations around the restrictions network utilities bring with them.</p> | <p>Amend the Permitted activity status for rules which allow network activities to occur which will adversely impact on existing rural activities and operations.</p> <p>Insert new matter of discretion for Restricted Discretionary and Discretionary activities as follows: The potential adverse effects on the operation of existing farming and rural activities located in the general rural and rural lifestyle zones.</p> |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R11 | S214.142 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the intent of the rules for network utilities but queries why there is no consideration required of the potential adverse effects that network utilities, their establishment, operation and upgrading can have on existing lawfully established activities in the rural environment. The Councils appear to have focused primarily on reverse sensitivity impacts related to network utilities, potentially to the detriment of other duly established activities.</p> <p>The Councils, by classifying many network utility activities as permitted activities, have not considered reverse sensitivity impacts on existing rural activities. This places an additional burden on landowners in the rural environment to work out how they can continue their operations around the restrictions network utilities bring with them.</p> | <p>Amend the Permitted activity status for rules which allow network activities to occur which will adversely impact on existing rural activities and operations.</p> <p>Insert new matter of discretion for Restricted Discretionary and Discretionary activities as follows: The potential adverse effects on the operation of existing farming and rural activities located in the general rural and rural lifestyle zones.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R12 | S214.143 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the intent of the rules for network utilities but queries why there is no consideration required of the potential adverse effects that network utilities, their establishment, operation and upgrading can have on existing lawfully established activities in the rural environment. The Councils appear to have focused primarily on reverse sensitivity impacts related to network utilities, potentially to the detriment of other duly established activities.</p> <p>The Councils, by classifying many network utility activities as permitted activities, have not considered reverse sensitivity impacts on existing rural activities. This places an additional burden on landowners in the rural environment to work out how they can continue their operations around the restrictions network utilities bring with them.</p> | <p>Insert new matter of discretion for Restricted Discretionary and Discretionary activities as follows:</p> <p>The potential adverse effects on the operation of existing farming and rural activities located in the general rural and rural lifestyle zones.</p> |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R13 | S214.144 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the intent of the rules for network utilities but queries why there is no consideration required of the potential adverse effects that network utilities, their establishment, operation and upgrading can have on existing lawfully established activities in the rural environment. The Councils appear to have focused primarily on reverse sensitivity impacts related to network utilities, potentially to the detriment of other duly established activities.</p> <p>The Councils, by classifying many network utility activities as permitted activities, have not considered reverse sensitivity impacts on existing rural activities. This places an additional burden on landowners in the rural environment to work out how they can continue their operations around the restrictions network utilities bring with them.</p> | <p>Insert new matter of discretion for Restricted Discretionary and Discretionary activities as follows:</p> <p>The potential adverse effects on the operation of existing farming and rural activities located in the general rural and rural lifestyle zones.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R14 | S214.145 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the intent of the rules for network utilities but queries why there is no consideration required of the potential adverse effects that network utilities, their establishment, operation and upgrading can have on existing lawfully established activities in the rural environment. The Councils appear to have focused primarily on reverse sensitivity impacts related to network utilities, potentially to the detriment of other duly established activities.</p> <p>The Councils, by classifying many network utility activities as permitted activities, have not considered reverse sensitivity impacts on existing rural activities. This places an additional burden on landowners in the rural environment to work out how they can continue their operations around the restrictions network utilities bring with them.</p> | <p>Insert new matter of discretion for Restricted Discretionary and Discretionary activities as follows: The potential adverse effects on the operation of existing farming and rural activities located in the general rural and rural lifestyle zones.</p> |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R15 | S214.146 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the intent of the rules for network utilities but queries why there is no consideration required of the potential adverse effects that network utilities, their establishment, operation and upgrading can have on existing lawfully established activities in the rural environment. The Councils appear to have focused primarily on reverse sensitivity impacts related to network utilities, potentially to the detriment of other duly established activities.</p> <p>The Councils, by classifying many network utility activities as permitted activities, have not considered reverse sensitivity impacts on existing rural activities. This places an additional burden on landowners in the rural environment to work out how they can continue their operations around the restrictions network utilities bring with them.</p> | <p>Amend the Permitted activity status for rules which allow network activities to occur which will adversely impact on existing rural activities and operations.</p> <p>Insert new matter of discretion for Restricted Discretionary and Discretionary activities as follows: The potential adverse effects on the operation of existing farming and rural activities located in the general rural and rural lifestyle zones.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R16 | S214.147 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the intent of the rules for network utilities but queries why there is no consideration required of the potential adverse effects that network utilities, their establishment, operation and upgrading can have on existing lawfully established activities in the rural environment. The Councils appear to have focused primarily on reverse sensitivity impacts related to network utilities, potentially to the detriment of other duly established activities.</p> <p>The Councils, by classifying many network utility activities as permitted activities, have not considered reverse sensitivity impacts on existing rural activities. This places an additional burden on landowners in the rural environment to work out how they can continue their operations around the restrictions network utilities bring with them.</p> | <p>Insert new matter of discretion for Restricted Discretionary and Discretionary activities as follows:</p> <p>The potential adverse effects on the operation of existing farming and rural activities located in the general rural and rural lifestyle zones.</p> |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R17 | S214.148 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the intent of the rules for network utilities but queries why there is no consideration required of the potential adverse effects that network utilities, their establishment, operation and upgrading can have on existing lawfully established activities in the rural environment. The Councils appear to have focused primarily on reverse sensitivity impacts related to network utilities, potentially to the detriment of other duly established activities.</p> <p>The Councils, by classifying many network utility activities as permitted activities, have not considered reverse sensitivity impacts on existing rural activities. This places an additional burden on landowners in the rural environment to work out how they can continue their operations around the restrictions network utilities bring with them.</p> | <p>Insert new matter of discretion for Restricted Discretionary and Discretionary activities as follows:</p> <p>The potential adverse effects on the operation of existing farming and rural activities located in the general rural and rural lifestyle zones.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R18 | S214.149 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the intent of the rules for network utilities but queries why there is no consideration required of the potential adverse effects that network utilities, their establishment, operation and upgrading can have on existing lawfully established activities in the rural environment. The Councils appear to have focused primarily on reverse sensitivity impacts related to network utilities, potentially to the detriment of other duly established activities.</p> <p>The Councils, by classifying many network utility activities as permitted activities, have not considered reverse sensitivity impacts on existing rural activities. This places an additional burden on landowners in the rural environment to work out how they can continue their operations around the restrictions network utilities bring with them.</p> | <p>Insert new matter of discretion for Restricted Discretionary and Discretionary activities as follows: The potential adverse effects on the operation of existing farming and rural activities located in the general rural and rural lifestyle zones.</p> |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R19 | S214.150 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the intent of the rules for network utilities but queries why there is no consideration required of the potential adverse effects that network utilities, their establishment, operation and upgrading can have on existing lawfully established activities in the rural environment. The Councils appear to have focused primarily on reverse sensitivity impacts related to network utilities, potentially to the detriment of other duly established activities.</p> <p>The Councils, by classifying many network utility activities as permitted activities, have not considered reverse sensitivity impacts on existing rural activities. This places an additional burden on landowners in the rural environment to work out how they can continue their operations around the restrictions network utilities bring with them.</p> | <p>Amend the Permitted activity status for rules which allow network activities to occur which will adversely impact on existing rural activities and operations.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R20 | S214.151 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | <p>The submitter supports the intent of the rules for network utilities but queries why there is no consideration required of the potential adverse effects that network utilities, their establishment, operation and upgrading can have on existing lawfully established activities in the rural environment. The Councils appear to have focused primarily on reverse sensitivity impacts related to network utilities, potentially to the detriment of other duly established activities.</p> <p>The Councils, by classifying many network utility activities as permitted activities, have not considered reverse sensitivity impacts on existing rural activities. This places an additional burden on landowners in the rural environment to work out how they can continue their operations around the restrictions network utilities bring with them.</p> | Amend the Permitted activity status for rules which allow network activities to occur which will adversely impact on existing rural activities and operations. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | | S214.152 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>An important function of territorial authorities under section 31(1)(b)(i) of the RMA is the control of land use for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating adverse effects from natural hazards such as floods and earthquakes. It is important that the council exercise this function in a way that adequately balances allowing people and communities to use their property and undertake activities while also ensuring that lives and significant assets are not harmed or lost as a result of a natural hazard event. The submitter supports the risk-based approach to natural hazards that the council has taken.</p> | Retain the Natural Hazards chapter, incorporating the amendments sought by the submitter in subsequent submission points. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P3 | S214.153 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports in part NH-P3. They agree that hazard sensitive activities should not be located in high hazard areas and that hazard sensitive activities should be allowed in moderate hazard areas provided the requirements in NH-P3 are met.</p> <p>The submitter opposes defining potentially</p> | Retain NH-P3 where the definition of 'potentially sensitive activities' is amended to exclude buildings associated with primary production and rural industry activities. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|---|-----------------------------------|
| | | | | | hazard sensitive activities to include buildings associated with primary production activities and rural industry activities. The respective activities are non-habitable and do not pose a 'potential' level of risk to people and communities. As such, they should be permitted to locate within all natural hazard areas. | |
| LIGHT - Light | LIGHT-P4 | S214.154 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports LIGHT-P4. This policy sufficiently provides for the use of light to aid primary production activities that occur in the morning and late at night. Use of artificial light is also important for security purposes. | Retain LIGHT-P4 as notified. |
| LIGHT - Light | | S214.155 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | Supports Light chapter as notified. | Retain Light chapter as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-O2 | S214.156 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the FUZ- Future Urban Zone Objectives to enable existing rural uses while restricting urban development until areas are comprehensively planned and rezoned. | Retain FUZ-O2 as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-O3 | S214.157 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the FUZ- Future Urban Zone Objectives to enable existing rural uses while restricting urban development until areas are comprehensively planned and rezoned. | Retain FUZ-O3 as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-P2 | S214.158 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the overall policy framework of the Future Urban Zone Chapter. The Policies clearly enable ongoing rural production activities while restricting urban development that would counter the policies of General Rural Zone, as well as FUZ-P2 and FUZ-P3 managing and avoiding incompatible activities. | Retain FUZ-P2 as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-P3 | S214.159 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the overall policy framework of the Future Urban Zone Chapter. The Policies clearly enable ongoing rural production activities while restricting urban development that would counter the policies of General Rural Zone, as well as FUZ-P2 and FUZ-P3 managing and avoiding incompatible activities. | Retain FUZ-P3 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-P4 | S214.160 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the overall policy framework of the Future Urban Zone Chapter. The Policies clearly enable ongoing rural production activities while restricting urban development that would counter the policies of General Rural Zone, as well as FUZ-P2 and FUZ-P3 managing and avoiding incompatible activities. | Retain FUZ-P4 as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-P5 | S214.161 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the overall policy framework of the Future Urban Zone Chapter. The Policies clearly enable ongoing rural production activities while restricting urban development that would counter the policies of General Rural Zone, as well as FUZ-P2 and FUZ-P3 managing and avoiding incompatible activities. | Retain FUZ-P5 as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S172.001 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports the definition for 'Accessory building' as it best defines detached ancillary buildings that excludes any minor residential unit. Accessory buildings may be subject to specific fire protection requirements including firefighting water supply and access to reduce any potential fire risks. | Retain 'Accessory building' definition. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S172.002 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Support in part the definition for 'community facility' insofar that it includes land and buildings used by the community for safety purposes. However, as currently notified, the definition could be interpreted to include fire stations which the submitter finds inappropriate. While fire stations are important to serve communities, the facilities themselves are not community facilities in the same way that churches and community halls are. They are not for the use of the general public and have very specific location and functional requirements such as car parking requirements and vehicle crossing dimensions etc. For this reason, emergency service activities and facilities should be excluded from the definition of community facilities. Explicitly excluding emergency service | Amend 'Community facility' definition: means land and buildings used by members of the community for recreational, sporting, cultural, safety, health, welfare, or worship purposes. It includes provision for any ancillary activity that assists with the operation of the community facility. Note: 'Community facility' excludes land and buildings used for emergency service activities which is covered by the definition 'emergency service facility'. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | facilities from this definition is necessary to differentiate emergency service facilities for the purpose of providing a more appropriate rule framework to better support building and operational requirements related to new and existing fire stations. | |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S172.003 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports the definition for 'Emergency service facility'. It is vital that the PDP provides for emergency service facilities to better provide for the health, safety, and wellbeing of communities by enabling the establishment of fire stations. | Retain 'Emergency service facilities' definition. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S172.004 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports the definition of 'Functional need' as it defines and recognises activities that have a need to be in certain locations. Fire stations may have a functional need to be located in certain areas, including those with increased risk of natural hazards. Locating fire stations where they have a functional need can help reduce response times to fire events and protect the community more efficiently. | Retain 'Functional need' definition. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S172.005 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports the definition for 'habitable room' as it includes occupied rooms. Habitable rooms may be subject to specific fire protection requirements including firefighting water supply and access to reduce any potential fire risks. | Retain 'Habitable room' definition. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S172.006 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports the definition of 'Hazardous substance' being consistent with section 2 of the RMA and reference to other relevant legislation including the 'Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996'. | Retain 'Hazardous substance' definition. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S172.007 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports the definition of 'natural hazard' being consistent with section 2 of the RMA. | Retain 'Natural hazard' definition. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S172.008 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports the definition of 'Operational need' as it defined and recognises activities that have a need to operate in certain locations where the activity is specifically required. Fire stations that have a need to function in certain areas may include areas with | Retain 'Operational need' definition. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | increased risk of natural hazards. Allowing fire stations to operate where there is an operational need can help reduce response times to fire events and protect the community more efficiently. | |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S172.009 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Support the definition for 'residential activity' as it includes the use of land and buildings that are primarily purposed for living accommodation. Residential buildings shall be subject to specific fire protection requirements including firefighting water supply and access to protect people from fire risks. | Retain 'Residential activity' definition. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S172.010 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports the definition for 'residential unit' as it includes buildings used for residential activity. Residential units shall be subject to specific fire protection requirements including firefighting water supply and access to protect people from fire risks. | Retain 'Residential unit' definition. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S172.011 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Support the definition for 'structure' as it defined buildings that are fixed/located on land. Structures may be subject to specific fire protection requirements including firefighting water supply and access to reduce any potential fire risks. | Retain 'Structure' definition. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S172.012 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Seeks the inclusion of a new definition for 'Temporary emergency services training activity' in order to provide greater clarity to plan users and to support the relief sought elsewhere in this submission. In order to ensure an efficient and effective emergency response, firefighting training is an essential activity. Firefighting training may include live fire training and equipment training both on and off site. The Statement of Performance Expectations (SPE) 2023/24 confirms a commitment to the Government that all firefighters achieve a certain level of training. | Insert 'Temporary emergency services training activity' definition. Temporary emergency services training activity means a temporary activity undertaken for the training of any component of Fire and Emergency New Zealand for any emergency purpose. An emergency purpose are those purposes which enable Fire and Emergency New Zealand to achieve its main functions under section 11 and 12 of the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--|---|
| Interpretation | Definitions | S172.013 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports the definition of 'temporary activity' insofar that it provides for temporary events. Subject to acceptance of the new definition for 'temporary emergency services training activity' the submitter considers that 'temporary emergency services training activities' should be excluded from this definition to provide further clarity to the plan user. | Retain 'Temporary activity' definition. |
| Strategic Direction | CCR-O3 | S172.014 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports CCR-O3 insofar as it encourages development that does not increase the consequences of natural hazards. | Retain CCR-O3 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O2 | S172.015 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports UFD-O2 insofar as it encourages urban growth in areas with sufficient infrastructure capacity. As defined in the RMA, infrastructure includes a water supply distribution system which is a critical part of providing firefighting water supply. | Retain UFD-O2 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O4 | S172.016 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports UFD-O4 insofar as it promotes urban growth and development which is integrated with efficient provision, timing, and funding of infrastructure. | Retain UFD-O4 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | INF-O1 | S172.017 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports INF-O1 insofar as it recognises the benefits of infrastructure and the importance of protecting infrastructure from incompatible land use, subdivision, and development. | Retain INF-O1 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-O1 | S172.018 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports TR-O1 insofar as it promotes a well-connected, integrated, safe, and accessible transport network that enables emergency service vehicles to respond to emergency call outs effectively and efficiently. | Retain TR-O1 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-O3 | S172.019 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports TR-O3 insofar as it discourages compromising the safe, effective, and efficient operation of the transport network through incompatible land use, subdivision, and development. | Retain TR-O3 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P2 | S172.020 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports TR-P2 insofar as it promotes good design outcomes for the transport network including roads and vehicle crossings which meet the minimum design standards required by the PDP. | Retain TR-P2 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--|-------------------------------|
| TR - Transport | TR-P5 | S172.021 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports TR-P5 insofar as it requires development to meet minimum standards when connecting to road corridors and, where these are not met, adverse effects on the transport network must be avoided, remedied, or mitigated. | Retain TR-P5 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R1 | S172.022 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports TR-R1 insofar as the construction or alteration of accessways, vehicle crossings, and roads must comply with TR-S1 and TR-S5. | Retain TR-R1 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R2 | S172.023 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports TR-R2 insofar as the construction or alteration of accessways, vehicle crossings, and roads must comply with TR-S1 and TR-S5. | Retain TR-R2 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S1 | S172.024 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports TR-S1 insofar as the standard does not allow for roads with carriageway widths less than 6.5m or gradients greater than 12.5%. | Retain TR-S1 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S5 | S172.025 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports TR-S5 insofar as it requires site accessways to be designed in accordance with the Council's Engineering Development Standard. | Retain TR-S5 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S14 | S172.026 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports TR-S14 insofar as it requires accessways to be designed to provide firefighting access where a site is located in an area where no fully reticulated water supply system is available, or having an accessway length greater than 50m when connected to a road that has a fully reticulated water supply system including hydrants. Access is particularly important in unreticulated areas where fire appliances need to enter a site to access the onsite firefighting water supply and the emergency (i.e. structural fire). In areas that may be reticulated, if a dwelling is not located within 50m from a road with appropriate widths / gradients, there is a risk that the hose run distance between an accessible hydrant and site of a fire will be exceeded. | Retain TR-S14 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|-------------------------------|
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-O1 | S172.027 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports NH-O1 insofar as it promoted not increasing the risks and consequences from natural hazards on people, property, infrastructure, and the environment. | Retain NH-O1 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P2 | S172.028 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports NH-P2 insofar as it allows for hazard sensitive activities to locate in high hazard areas where the activity has an operational need or functional need to locate within the high hazard area. There are existing fire stations located in hazard areas and may have an operational and/or functional need to locate new stations in areas subject to hazard overlays. | Retain NH-P2 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P3 | S172.029 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports NH-P3 insofar as it allows for hazard sensitive activities to locate in these hazard areas providing it is demonstrated that the risks associated with the hazard are appropriately mitigated. | Retain NH-P3 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P4 | S172.030 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports NH-P4 insofar as it allows for hazard sensitive activities to locate in these hazard areas providing it is demonstrated that the risks associated with the hazard are appropriately mitigated. | Retain NH-P4 as notified. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P5 | S172.031 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports enabling the construction or maintenance of firebreaks in habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation. This will promote the health, safety, and wellbeing of life and property within the community. | Retain ECO-P5 as notified. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P7 | S172.032 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports ECO-P7 insofar as it provides for the modification of vegetation comprising significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna where it is necessary for the avoidance of imminent danger to human life or property, or it is necessary for the construction/maintenance of a firebreak. | Retain ECO-P7 as notified. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous | ECO-R1 | S172.033 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports ECO-R1 insofar as it permits the modification of indigenous vegetation where it is required in accordance with Section 43 and 64 of the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017. | Retain ECO-R1 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--|-------------------------------|
| Biodiversity | | | | | | |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-R2 | S172.034 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports ECO-R2 insofar as it permits the modification of indigenous vegetation where it is required in accordance with Section 43 and 64 of the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017. | Retain ECO-R2 as notified. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P3 | S172.035 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports NFL-P3 insofar as it recognises that some use and development may have an operation and/or functional need to located within an Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes area. There may be an operational and/or functional need to locate new fire stations in areas comprising an outstanding natural feature or landscape. | Retain NFL-P3 as notified. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P5 | S172.036 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports NFL-P5 insofar as it recognises that some use and development may have an operation and/or functional need to located within an Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes area. There may be an operational and/or functional need to locate new fire stations in areas comprising an outstanding natural feature or landscape. | Retain NFL-P5 as notified. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-R1 | S172.037 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Support NFL-R1 insofar as it permits the construction of new buildings or structures where compliance is achieved with the relevant zone standards. Where compliance is not achieved, consent as a restricted discretionary activity would be required with a matter of discretion relating to whether the activity has an operational and/or functional need to locate in the area. | Retain NFL-R1 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O2 | S172.038 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SUB-O2 insofar as it promotes servicing subdivision and development for the likely or anticipated use of the land. Furthermore, it promotes connecting subdivision within the urban boundary to a reticulated service with sufficient capacity, and for subdivision in Rural Zones to be capable of being serviced by on-site means. | Retain SUB-O2 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|-------------------------------|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O3 | S172.039 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SUB-O3 insofar as it promotes integrating subdivision and development with the existing and planned development of roads and infrastructure. | Retain SUB-O3 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P1 | S172.040 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SUB-P1 insofar as it promotes allowing subdivision where the design has legal and physical access to each allotment created. | Retain SUB-P1 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P2 | S172.041 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SUB-P2 insofar as it promotes subdivision to be located where appropriate infrastructure is available or provided in an integrated and comprehensive manner (such as allotments being of a sufficient size and shape to accommodate onsite water supply infrastructure including for firefighting purposes). Furthermore, SUB-P2 promotes ensuring roads and vehicle access to sites meet the minimum design standard to allow for safe and efficient traffic movements. | Retain SUB-P2 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P7 | S172.042 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SUB-P7 insofar as it seeks to avoid subdivision within the Future Urban Zone that may result in the efficient and effective provision of infrastructure being compromised. Supportive of the efficient coordination of infrastructure and delivery with urban growth. | Retain SUB-P7 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R1 | S172.043 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SUB-R1 insofar as compliance is required with SUB-S7 and SUB-S10, which appropriately manage the provision of firefighting water supply and emergency service access. Where compliance with the relevant subdivision standards is not achieved, the matters of discretion extend to the matters of any standard that is not met, and the infrastructure capacity to service the site or the ability to provide for on-site servicing. | Retain SUB-R1 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R2 | S172.044 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SUB-R2 insofar as compliance is required with SUB-S7 and SUB-S10, which appropriately manage the provision of firefighting water supply and emergency service access. Where compliance with the | Retain SUB-R2 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | relevant subdivision standards is not achieved, the matters of discretion extend to the matters of any standard that is not met, and the infrastructure capacity to service the site or the ability to provide for on-site servicing. | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S172.045 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SUB-R4 insofar as compliance is required with SUB-R7 and SUB-R10, which appropriately manage the provision of firefighting water supply and emergency service access. Additionally, the matters of control include: - the provision of appropriate infrastructure and services and their design and location, including firefighting water supply. - fire rating of party/common walls. | Retain SUB-R4 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R5 | S172.046 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SUB-R5 insofar as compliance is required with SUB-R7 and SUB-R10, which appropriately manage the provision of firefighting water supply and emergency service access. Additionally, the matters of control include: - the provision of appropriate infrastructure and services and their design and location, including firefighting water supply. - fire rating of party/common walls. | Retain SUB-R5 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S7 | S172.047 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SUB-S7 insofar as it requires all new allotments created to have legal and physical access to a road in accordance with the relevant standards in TR-Transport, which includes a standard relating to firefighting access. | Retain SUB-S7 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S10 | S172.048 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports the inclusion of a standard which requires all new allotments accommodating existing or proposed dwellings to comply with the water supply requirements in the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Supports the matter of discretion which allows for consideration of alternative means of providing an adequate water supply for firefighting purposes. | Amend SUB-S10 1. All new allotments accommodating existing or proposed dwellings must comply with the water supply requirements in the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | However, the submitter notes this only provides for residential dwellings. It is vital that all land use activities are provided with a suitable firefighting water supply, as there is a fire risk associated with all structures. The drafting of SUB-S10 would not ensure that commercial, industrial etc. allotments and buildings will be provided with a suitable firefighting water supply. Amend SUB-S10 and consider this will better provide for the protection of life and property across the Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa districts. SNZ PAS 4509:2008 provides a variety of options for providing a compliant firefighting water supply in accordance with the FW rating of the associated building/activity. | |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P3 | S172.049 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports CE-P3 insofar as the policies recognise that certain activities may need to locate within Very High and High Natural Character areas or coastal environment where there is an operational and/or functional need to locate within the area. | Retain CE-P3 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P4 | S172.050 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports CE-P4 insofar as the policies recognise that certain activities may need to locate within Very High and High Natural Character areas or coastal environment where there is an operational and/or functional need to locate within the area. | Retain CE-P4 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-S2 | S172.051 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports CE-S2 insofar as the modification of indigenous vegetation that is within 10m of an existing lawfully established residential unit is exempt from the standard. | Retain CE-S2 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | | S172.052 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Support that the rules of the Noise chapter do not apply to any warning device or siren used by emergency services for emergency purposes. | Retain exemptions for warning device or siren used by emergency services for emergency purposes in the NOISE chapter as notified. |
| TEMP - Temporary Activities | New provision request | S172.053 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | In order to ensure an efficient and effective emergency response, firefighting training is an essential activity. Firefighting training may include live fire training and equipment training both on and off site. | Insert new rule: TEMP-RX Temporary emergency services training activities All Zones 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where the following |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>Fire and Emergency's State of Performance Expectations (SPE) 2023/2024 confirms commitment to the Government that all firefighters achieve a certain level of training. In order to ensure an efficient and effective emergency response, firefighter training is an essential activity.</p> <p>Firefighter training may include live fire training and equipment training both on and off site. This will ensure that any adverse effects of temporary activities are managed in accordance with community expectation.</p> | <p>conditions are met: a. Limited to: i. a period of two days, excluding set-up or pack-down activities, which can occur up to one week prior to commencement and up to one week following completion of the temporary emergency services training activity. 2. Activity status where compliance not achieved: N/A</p> |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-O1 | S172.054 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports GRZ-O1 insofar as it promotes the integration of residential activities with existing or planned infrastructure. | Retain GRZ-O1 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-O4 | S172.055 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Requires the ability to construct and operate fire stations in locations which enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies. Seeks an amendment to GRZ-O4 to recognise non-residential activities that have an operational and/or functional need to locate within the zone. It is considered that this will support the health, safety, and well-being of residential communities. | <p>Amend GRZ-O4 Non-residential activities in the Residential Zone:</p> <p>Non-residential activities in the General Residential Zone are limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - social infrastructure and small-scale activities that support the function of local communities and are compatible with the character and amenity values of the Zone, or- activities that support the safety and wellbeing of the community and have an operational need or functional need to locate within the Zone. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P3 | S172.056 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports GRZ-P3 insofar as it recognises non-residential activities may have a need to locate in residential zones where they have an operational or functional need to do so. | Retain GRZ-P3 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P7 | S172.057 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports avoiding residential development where there is insufficient capacity in existing reticulated infrastructure or where residential | Retain GRZ-P7 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | development would occur prior to planned reticulated infrastructure installation. | |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R1 | S172.058 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports GRZ-R1 subject to the relief sought under GRZ-S9. | Retain GRZ-R1 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R3 | S172.059 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports GRZ-R3 subject to the relief sought under GRZ-S9. | Retain GRZ-R3 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R6 | S172.060 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports GRZ-R6 subject to the relief sought under GRZ-S9. | Retain GRZ-R6 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R7 | S172.061 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports GRZ-R7 subject to the relief sought under GRZ-S9. | Retain GRZ-R7 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R8 | S172.062 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports GRZ-R8 subject to the relief sought under GRZ-S9. | Retain GRZ-R8 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R9 | S172.063 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports GRZ-R9 subject to the relief sought under GRZ-S9. | Retain GRZ-R9 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R10 | S172.064 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports GRZ-R10 subject to the relief sought under GRZ-S9. | Retain GRZ-R10 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R11 | S172.065 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports GRZ-R11 insofar as these activities have a restricted discretionary status and the matters of discretion allow for consideration of servicing/infrastructure requirements. | Retain GRZ-R11 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R12 | S172.066 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports GRZ-R12 insofar as these activities have a restricted discretionary status and the matters of discretion allow for consideration of servicing/infrastructure requirements. | Retain GRZ-R12 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R13 | S172.067 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports GRZ-R13 insofar as these activities have a restricted discretionary status and the matters of discretion allow for consideration of servicing/infrastructure requirements. | Retain GRZ-R13 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R14 | S172.068 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports GRZ-R14 insofar as these activities have a restricted discretionary status and the matters of discretion allow for consideration of servicing/infrastructure requirements. | Retain GRZ-R14 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | New provision request | S172.069 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | <p>Seek the inclusion of a new rule for emergency service facilities being a permitted activity in the General Residential Zone. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as development progresses.</p> <p>The permitted activity standards within the General Residential chapter will appropriately manage the effects of fire stations within the zone.</p> | Insert a new rule which provides for emergency service facilities as a permitted activity within the General Residential zone. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-S9 | S172.070 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | <p>Supports GRZ-S9 insofar as it required all buildings and activities to be provided with a connection to Council's reticulated water supply systems, which shall be in accordance with Council Engineering Standards. Acknowledge that the provisions of the Council Engineering Standards sets out the requirements for reticulated hydrant systems. However, the Council Engineering Standards do not require reticulated systems to be designated in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Furthermore, the standard currently reads as though it only applies to drinking water supplies.</p> <p>The PDP includes provisions for firefighting water supplies in relation to the creation of new allotments under the subdivision chapter. There is a gap in the PDP provisions to</p> | Amend: GRZ-S9 Drinking Water supply ... 2. All buildings and activities must be provided with a firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | ensure that land use activities are appropriately serviced with a firefighting water supply. Request an amendment to GRZ-S9 to ensure all land use activities in residential zones are adequately serviced with a firefighting water supply. SNZ PAS 4509:2008 provides flexibility in regard to how an appropriate firefighting water supply can be provided. | |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-O1 | S172.071 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SETZ-O1 insofar as it allows for community activities to locate in the zone where they provide services to the local community. | Retain SETZ-O1 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-P1 | S172.072 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports SETZ-P1 insofar as it promoted the provision of on-site servicing if reticulated infrastructure is not available and recognises the need for larger lots to accommodate on-site servicing. Amend SETZ-P1 to recognise that emergency service facilities may need to locate in the zone to meet the needs of local coastal and/or rural communities and visitors. | Amend SETZ-P1: ... c. cultural activities, visitor accommodation, reserves, community, emergency service and education facilities to meet the needs of local coastal and/or rural communities and visitors. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R1 | S172.073 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SETZ-R1 subject to the relief sought under SETZ-S9. | Retain SETZ-R1 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R3 | S172.074 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SETZ-R3 subject to the relief sought under SETZ-S9. | Retain SETZ-R3 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R5 | S172.075 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SETZ-R5 subject to the relief sought under SETZ-S9. | Retain SETZ-R5 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R6 | S172.076 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SETZ-R6 subject to the relief sought under SETZ-S9. | Retain SETZ-R6 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R7 | S172.077 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SETZ-R7 subject to the relief sought under SETZ-S9. | Retain SETZ-R7 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R8 | S172.078 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SETZ-R8 subject to the relief sought under SETZ-S9. | Retain SETZ-R8 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R9 | S172.079 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SETZ-R9 subject to the relief sought under SETZ-S9. | Retain SETZ-R9 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R10 | S172.080 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SETZ-R10 subject to the relief sought under SETZ-S9. | Retain SETZ-R10 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R11 | S172.081 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SETZ-R11 subject to the relief sought under SETZ-S9. | Retain SETZ-R11 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R12 | S172.082 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SETZ-R12 subject to the relief sought under SETZ-S9. | Retain SETZ-R12 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R13 | S172.083 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SETZ-R13 insofar as the activity has a restricted discretionary status and the matters of discretion allow for consideration of servicing requirements, particularly where three waters services can be provided on-site in compliance with Council's engineering standards. | Retain SETZ-R13 as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | New provision request | S172.084 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Seek the inclusion of a new rule for emergency service facilities being a permitted activity in the Settlement Zone. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situation where development occurs, and populations change. Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as development progresses. The permitted activity standards within the Settlement chapter will appropriately manage the effects of fire stations within the zone. | Insert a new rule which provides for emergency service facilities as a permitted activity within the Settlement Zone. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S9 | S172.085 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports SETZ-S9 insofar as it requires all buildings and activities to be provided with a connection to Council's reticulated water supply systems, which shall be in accordance | Amend SETZ-S9 Drinking Water supply: 1. Where reticulated services are available, all building and activities must |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>with Council Engineering Standards. Acknowledge that the provisions of the Council Engineering Standards sets out the requirements for reticulated hydrant systems. However, the Council Engineering Standards do not require reticulated systems to be designed in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Furthermore, the standard currently reads as though it only applies to drinking water supplies.</p> <p>The PDP includes provisions for firefighting water supplies in relation to the creation of new allotments under the subdivision chapter. There is a gap in the PDP provision in regarding to ensuring that land use activities are appropriately serviced with a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>Amend SETZ-S9 to ensure all land use activities in all zones are adequately serviced with a firefighting water supply. SNZ PAS 4509:2008 provides flexibility in regard to how an appropriate firefighting water supply can be provided.</p> | <p>be provided with a connection to Council's reticulated water supply systems, which shall be in accordance with Council Engineering Standards and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</p> <p>... Matters of Discretion:</p> <p>... 3. The suitability of any alternative means of providing an adequate supply of water for firefighting purposes in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</p> |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O1 | S172.086 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports GRUZ-O1 insofar as it allows for other activities to locate in the zone where they have a functional need or operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone. | Retain GRUZ-O1 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P1 | S172.087 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports GRUZ-P1 insofar as it provides for other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located in the General Rural Zone. | Retain GRUZ-P1 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R1 | S172.088 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports GRUZ-R1 insofar as it requires compliance with GRUZ-S7. | Retain GRUZ-R1 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R3 | S172.089 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports GRUZ-R3 insofar as it requires compliance with GRUZ-S7. | Retain GRUZ-R3 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R7 | S172.090 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports GRUZ-R7 insofar as it requires compliance with GRUZ-S7. | Retain GRUZ-R7 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R8 | S172.091 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports GRUZ-R8 insofar as it requires compliance with GRUZ-S7. | Retain GRUZ-R8 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R13 | S172.092 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports GRUZ-R13 insofar as it requires compliance with GRUZ-S7. | Retain GRUZ-R13 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R4 | S172.093 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | It is vital that any buildings to be used for accommodation purposes are appropriately serviced with a suitable water supply for firefighting purposes. Without a suitable firefighting water supply or installation of a sprinkler system, an acceptable risk is posed to residents of the buildings. Amend GRUZ-R4 to require compliance with GRUZ-S7. | Amend GRUZ-R4 ... a. Compliance is achieved with:... iv. GRUZ-S7; and... |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | New provision request | S172.094 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Seek the inclusion of a new rule for emergency service facilities being a permitted activity in the General Rural Zone. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as development progresses. The permitted activity standards within the General Rural chapter will appropriately manage the effects of fire stations within the zone. | Insert a new rule in the GRUZ - General Rural Zone chapter that provides for emergency service facilities as a permitted activity within the General Rural Zone. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S7 | S172.095 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports GRUZ-S7 insofar as it requires all new buildings to comply with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008, and includes a matters of discretion relating to the suitability of any alternative servicing options. | Retain GRUZ-S7 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-O3 | S172.096 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Fire stations may have a functional need to be located in certain areas, including the Rural Lifestyle Zone. Locating fire stations where they have a functional and/or operational need can help reduce response times to fire events and protect the community more efficiently. Amend RLZ-O3 to provide for activities that may have an operational or functional need to locate within the zone. | Amend: RLZ-O3 Enable compatible activities Residential activities, light primary production activities, and ancillary activities that are compatible with the character and amenity values of the Rural Lifestyle Zone are provided for, and emergency service facilities where there is an operational and/or functional need to locate within the zone. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-P1 | S172.097 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend RLZ-P1 to recognise that emergency service facilities may need to locate in the zone to meet the needs of rural communities. | Amend: RLZ-P1 Compatible activities Enable residential activities, primary production, emergency service facilities , and ancillary activities that are compatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the Rural Lifestyle Zone. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-R1 | S172.098 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Amend RLZ-R1 to require compliance with RLZ-S5. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Rural Lifestyle Zone. | Amend RLZ-R1: ... a. Compliance is achieved with:... x. RLZ-S5, and... |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-R3 | S172.099 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Amend RLZ-R3 to require compliance with RLZ-S5. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Rural Lifestyle Zone. | Amend RLZ-R3: ... a. Compliance is achieved with:... x. RLZ-S5, and... |
| RLZ - Rural | RLZ-R4 | S172.100 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports RLZ-R4 subject to the relief sought in relation to RLZ-S5. | Retain RLZ-R4 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Lifestyle Zone | | | | | | |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-R9 | S172.101 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports RLZ-R9 subject to the relief sought in relation to RLZ-S5. | Retain RLZ-R9 as notified. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-R10 | S172.102 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports RLZ-R10 subject to the relief sought in relation to RLZ-S5. | Retain RLZ-R10 as notified. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | New provision request | S172.103 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Seek the inclusion of a new rule for emergency service facilities being a permitted activity in the Rural Lifestyle Zone. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as development progresses. The permitted activity standards within the Rural Lifestyle chapter will appropriately manage the effects of fire stations within the zone. | Insert a new rule in RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone chapter that provides for emergency service facilities as a permitted activity within the zone. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-S5 | S172.104 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports RLZ-S5 insofar as it requires an on-site firefighting water supply to be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 where a connection to Council's reticulated system is not available. The Council Engineering Standards do not require reticulated systems to be designed in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008. The PDP includes provisions for firefighting water supplies in relation to the creation of | Amend: RLZ-S5 On-site services ... 4. Where a connection to Council's reticulated system is not available, an onsite A firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, must be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Matters |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>new allotments under the subdivision chapter. There is a gap in the PDP provision in regard to ensuring that and use activities are appropriately serviced with a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>Amend RLZ-S5 to ensure all land use activities in all zones are adequately serviced with a firefighting water supply. SNZ PAS 4509:2008 provides flexibility in regard to how an appropriate firefighting water supply can be provided.</p> <p>There are not matters of discretion when compliance is not achieved with RLZ-S5. The submitters seeks the inclusion of a matters of discretion relating to the suitability of any alternative servicing options.</p> | <p>of discretion:</p> <p>1. The suitability of any alternative servicing options or infrastructure options.</p> |
| NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone | NCZ-O1 | S172.105 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports NCZ-O1 insofar as it provides for community activities that serve the needs of the immediate residential neighbourhood. | Retain NCZ-O1 as notified. |
| NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone | NCZ-P1 | S172.106 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports NCZ-P1 insofar as it provides for compatible use and development where the activity services the need of the surrounding neighbourhood. As fire stations may have a functional and/or operational need to locate within the zone to serve the surrounding community, include 'emergency service activities' to the list of potentially compatible activities under NCZ-P1. | <p>Amend NCZ-P1:</p> <p>... Compatible activities may include the following (where they can meet the above criteria):</p> <p>... 1. Emergency service facilities.</p> |
| NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone | NCZ-R1 | S172.107 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports NCZ-R1 subject to the relief sought in relation to NCZ-S7. | Retain NCZ-R1 as notified. |
| NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone | NCZ-R3 | S172.108 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports NCZ-R3 subject to the relief sought in relation to NCZ-S7. | Retain NCZ-R3 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone | NCZ-R4 | S172.109 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports NCZ-R4 subject to the relief sought in relation to NCZ-S7. | Retain NCZ-R4 as notified. |
| NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone | NCZ-R5 | S172.110 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Amend NCZ-R5 to require compliance with NCZ-S7. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Neighbourhood Centre Zone. | Amend NCZ-R5: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... xi. NCZ-S7, and ... |
| NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone | NCZ-R6 | S172.111 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Amend NCZ-R6 to require compliance with NCZ-S7. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Neighbourhood Centre Zone. | Amend NCZ-R6: ... a. Compliance is achieved with:... xi. NCZ-S7, and ... |
| NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone | NCZ-R7 | S172.112 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Amend NCZ-R7 to require compliance with NCZ-S7. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Neighbourhood Centre Zone. | Amend NCZ-R7: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... xi. NCZ-S7, and ... |
| NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone | New provision request | S172.113 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Seek the inclusion of a new rule for emergency service facilities being a permitted activity in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as development progresses. | Insert a new rule which provides for emergency service facilities as a permitted activity within the Neighbourhood Centre Zone. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | The permitted activity standards within the Neighbourhood Centre chapter will appropriately manage the effects of fire stations within the zone. | |
| NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone | NCZ-S7 | S172.114 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | <p>Supports NCZ-S9 insofar as it required all buildings and activities to be provided with a connection to Council's reticulated water supply systems, which shall be in accordance with Council Engineering Standards. The provisions of the Council Engineering Standards sets out the requirements for reticulated hydrant systems.</p> <p>The Council Engineering Standards do not require reticulated systems to be designed in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Furthermore, the standard currently reads as through it only applies to drinking water supplies.</p> <p>The PDP includes provisions for firefighting water supplies in relation to the creation of new allotments under the subdivision chapter. There is a gap in the PDP provision in regard to ensuring that land use activities are appropriately serviced with a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>Amend NCZ-S7 to ensure all land use activities in all zones are adequately serviced with a firefighting water supply. SNZ PAS 4509:2008 provides flexibility in regard to how an appropriate firefighting water supply can be provided.</p> | <p>Amend:</p> <p>NCZ-S7 Drinking wWater supply</p> <p>1. All buildings and activities must be provided with a connection to Council's reticulated water and supply systems, which shall be in accordance with Council's Engineering Development Standard and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</p> |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-O1 | S172.115 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports MUZ-O1 insofar as it provides for community activities within the zone. | Retain MUZ-O1 as notified. |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-P1 | S172.116 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports MUZ-P1 insofar as it provides for compatible use and development where the activity services the need of the surrounding area. Fire stations may have a functional and/or operational need to locate within the zone to serve the surrounding community. Seek to include 'emergency service activities' | <p>Amend MUZ-P1:</p> <p>... Compatible activities may include the following (where they can meet the above criteria):</p> <p>... x. Emergency service facilities</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | to the list of potentially compatible activities under MUZ-P1. | |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-R1 | S172.117 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Support MUZ-R1 subject to the relief sought in relation to MUZ-S8. | Retain MUZ-R1 as notified. |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-R3 | S172.118 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports MUZ-R3 subject to the relief sought in relation to MUZ-S8. | Retain MUZ-R3 as notified. |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-R4 | S172.119 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports MUZ-R4 subject to the relief sought in relation to MUZ-S8. | Retain MUZ-R4 as notified. |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-R5 | S172.120 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Amend MUZ-R5 to require compliance with MUZ-S8. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Mixed Use Zone. | Amend MUZ-R5: ...a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. MUZ-S8, and... |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-R6 | S172.121 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Amend MUZ-R6 to require compliance with MUZ-S8. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Mixed Use Zone. | Amend MUZ-R6: ...a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. MUZ-S8, and... |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-R7 | S172.122 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Amend MUZ-R7 to require compliance with MUZ-S8. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Mixed Use Zone. | Amend MUZ-R7: ...a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. MUZ-S8, and... |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-R11 | S172.123 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports the restricted discretionary status of emergency service facilities and consider the matters of discretion under MUZ-R11 appropriate. | Retain as notified. |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-S8 | S172.124 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports MUZ-S8 insofar as it requires all buildings and activities to be provided with a connection to Council's reticulated water supply systems, which shall be in accordance with Council Engineering Standards. The submitter acknowledges that the provisions of the Council Engineering Standards sets out the requirements for reticulated hydrant systems. | Amend: MUZ-S8 Drinking w Water supply 1. All buildings and activities must be provided with a connection to Council's reticulated water supply systems, which shall be in accordance with Council's Engineering Development Standard and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>Note that the Council Engineering Standards do not require reticulated systems to be designed in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Furthermore, the standard currently reads as though it only applied to drinking water supplies.</p> <p>Note that the PDP includes provisions for firefighting water supplies in relation to the creation of new allotments under the subdivision chapter. Consider that there is a gap in the PDP provision in regards to ensuring that land use activities are appropriately serviced with a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>Request an amendment to MUZ-S8 to ensure all land use activities in all zones are adequately serviced with a firefighting water supply. Note that SNZ PAS 4509:2008 provides flexibility in regard to how an appropriate firefighting water supply can be provided.</p> | the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-O1 | S172.125 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports TCZ-O1 insofar as it provides for community activities within the zone. | Retain TCZ-O1 as notified. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-P1 | S172.126 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports TCZ-P1 insofar as it provides for compatible use and development where the activity services the need of the surrounding area. As fire stations may have a functional and/or operational need to locate within the zone to serve the surrounding community, seek to include 'emergency service activities' to the list of potentially compatible activities under TCZ-P1. | Amend TCZ-P1: ... Compatible activities may include the following (where they can meet the above criteria): ... x. Emergency service facilities |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-R1 | S172.127 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports TCZ-R1 subject to the relief sought in relation to TCZ-S8. | Retain TCZ-R1 as notified. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-R3 | S172.128 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports TCZ-R3 subject to the relief sought in relation to TCZ-S8. | Retain TCZ-R3 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-R4 | S172.129 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Amend TCZ-R4 to require compliance with TCZ-S8. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Town Centre Zone. | Amend TCZ-R4: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. TCZ-S8, and... |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-R5 | S172.130 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Amend TCZ-R5 to require compliance with TCZ-S8. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Town Centre Zone. | Amend TCZ-R5: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. TCZ-S8, and... |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-R6 | S172.131 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Amend TCZ-R6 to require compliance with TCZ-S8. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Town Centre Zone. | Amend TCZ-R6: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. TCZ-S8, and... |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-R7 | S172.132 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Amend TCZ-R7 to require compliance with TCZ-S8. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Town Centre Zone. | Amend TCZ-R7: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. TCZ-S8, and... |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-R8 | S172.133 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Amend TCZ-R8 to require compliance with TCZ-S8. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Town Centre Zone. | Amend TCZ-R8: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. TCZ-S8, and... |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-R9 | S172.134 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Amend TCZ-R9 to require compliance with TCZ-S8. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Town Centre Zone. | Amend TCZ-R9: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. TCZ-S8, and... |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-R10 | S172.135 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Amend TCZ-R10 to require compliance with TCZ-S8. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Town Centre Zone. | Amend TCZ-R10: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. TCZ-S8, and... |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-R11 | S172.136 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Amend TCZ-R11 to require compliance with TCZ-S8. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Town Centre Zone. | Amend TCZ-R11: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. TCZ-S8, and... |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-R12 | S172.137 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Amend TCZ-R12 to require compliance with TCZ-S8. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Town Centre Zone. | Amend TCZ-R12: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. TCZ-S8, and... |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | New provision request | S172.138 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Seek the inclusion of a new rule for emergency service facilities being a permitted activity in the Town Centre Zone. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as development progresses. Consider the permitted activity standards within the Town Centre chapter will appropriately manage the effects of fire stations within the zone. | Insert a new rule which provides for emergency service facilities as a permitted activity within the Town Centre Zone. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-S8 | S172.139 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports TCZ-S8 insofar as it requires all buildings and activities to be provided with a connection to Council's reticulated water supply systems, which shall be in accordance with Council Engineering Standards. Acknowledge that the provisions of the Council Engineering Standards sets out the requirements for reticulated hydrant systems. Note that the Council Engineering Standards do not require reticulated systems to be | Amend: TCZ-S8 Drinking w Water supply 1. All buildings and activities must be provided with a connection to Council's reticulated water supply systems, which shall be in accordance with Council's Engineering Development Standard and the New Zealand Fire Service |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>designed in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Furthermore, the standard currently reads as though it only applied to drinking water supplies.</p> <p>Note that the PDP includes provisions for firefighting water supplies in relation to the creation of new allotments under the subdivision chapter. There is a gap in the PDP provision in regards to ensuring that land use activities are appropriately serviced with a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>Amend TCZ-S8 to ensure all land use activities in all zones are adequately serviced with a firefighting water supply. Note that SNZ PAS 4509:2008 provides flexibility in regard to how an appropriate firefighting water supply can be provided.</p> | Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-P3 | S172.140 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend GIZ-P3 to provide for activities which may have an operational and/or functional need to locate in the zone. As the policy is currently written, non-industrial activities are discouraged from locating in the General Industrial Zone unless it is ancillary to an industrial activity or provides goods or services essential to industrial activities. | Amend: GIZ-P3 Incompatible use and development Avoid non-industrial activities in the General Industrial Zone unless the activities: ... x. have an operational need and/or functional need to locate in the General Industrial Zone; or... |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-R1 | S172.141 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports GIZ-R1 subject to the relief sought in relation to GIZ-S8. | Retain GIZ-R1 as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-R3 | S172.142 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports GIZ-R3 subject to the relief sought in relation to GIZ-S8. | Retain GIZ-R3 as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-R4 | S172.143 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend GIZ-R4 to require compliance with GIZ-S8. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. Proposed amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the General Industrial Zone. | Amend GIZ-R4: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. GIX-S8, and ... |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-R5 | S172.144 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend GIZ-R5 to require compliance with GIZ-S8. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. Proposed amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the General Industrial Zone. | Amend GIZ-R5: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. GIX-S8, and... |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-R6 | S172.145 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend GIZ-R6 to require compliance with GIZ-S8. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. Proposed amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the General Industrial Zone. | Amend GIZ-R6: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. GIX-S8, and... |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-R7 | S172.146 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend GIZ-R7 to require compliance with GIZ-S8. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. Proposed amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the General Industrial Zone. | Amend GIZ-R7: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. GIX-S8, and... |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-R9 | S172.147 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend GIZ-R9 to require compliance with GIZ-S8. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. Proposed amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the General Industrial Zone. | Amend GIZ-R9: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. GIX-S8, and... |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-R10 | S172.148 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports the restricted discretionary status of emergency service facilities and considers the matters of discretion under GIZ-R10 appropriate. | Retain GIZ-R10 as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-S8 | S172.149 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports GIZ-S8 insofar as it required all buildings and activities to be provided with a connection to Council's reticulated water supply systems, which shall be in accordance with Council Engineering Standards. Acknowledge that the provisions of the Council Engineering Standards sets out the requirements for reticulated hydrant systems. Note that the Council Engineering Standards do not require reticulated systems to be | Amend: GIZ-S8 Drinking w Water supply 1. All buildings and activities must be provided with a connection to Council's reticulated water supply systems, which shall be in accordance with Council's Engineering Development Standard and the New Zealand Fire Service |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>designed in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Furthermore, the standard currently reads as though it only applies to drinking water supplies.</p> <p>Note that the PDP includes provisions for firefighting water supplies in relation to the creation of new allotments under the subdivision chapter. There is a gap in the PDP provision in regards to ensuring that land use activities are appropriately serviced with a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>Amend GIZ-S8 to ensure all land use activities in all zones are adequately serviced with a firefighting water supply. Note that SNZ PAS 4509:2008 provides flexibility in regard to how an appropriate firefighting water supply can be provided.</p> | Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-P3 | S172.150 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports NOSZ-P3 insofar as the policy provides for use and development that is incompatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the Natural Open Space Zone unless there is a functional or operational need to establish on the site. | Retain NOSZ-P3 as notified. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-R1 | S172.151 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Support NOSZ-R1 subject to the relief sought in relation to NOSZ-S5. | Retain NOSZ-R1 as notified. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-R3 | S172.152 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Support NOSZ-R3 subject to the relief sought in relation to NOSZ-S5. | Retain NOSZ-R3 as notified. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-R10 | S172.153 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend NOSZ-R10 to require compliance with NOSZ-S5. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. The proposed amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Natural Open Space Zone. | Amend NOSZ-R10: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. NOSZ-S5, and... |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--|---|
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-S5 | S172.154 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports NOSZ-S5 insofar as it requires all new buildings to comply with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008, and includes a matters of discretion relating to the suitability of any alternative servicing options. | Retain NOSZ-S5 as notified. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | New provision request | S172.155 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Seek the inclusion of a new rule for emergency service facilities being a permitted activity in the Natural Open Space zone. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as development progresses. Consider the permitted activity standards within the Natural Open Space chapter will appropriately manage the effects of fire stations within the zone. | Insert a new rule which provides for emergency service facilities as a permitted activity within the Natural Open Space zone. |
| OSZ - Open Space Zone | OSZ-P3 | S172.156 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports OSZ-P3 insofar as the policy provides for use and development that is incompatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the Open Space Zone unless there is a functional or operational need to establish on the site. | Retain OSZ-P3 as notified. |
| OSZ - Open Space Zone | OSZ-R1 | S172.157 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports OSZ-R1 insofar as they require compliance with OSZ-S5. | Retain OSZ-R1 as notified. |
| OSZ - Open Space Zone | OSZ-R3 | S172.158 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports OSZ-R3 insofar as they require compliance with OSZ-S5. | Retain OSZ-R3 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| OSZ - Open Space Zone | OSZ-R13 | S172.159 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend OSZ-R13 to require compliance with OSZ-S5. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Open Space Zone. | Amend OSZ-R13: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. OSZ-S5, and... |
| OSZ - Open Space Zone | OSZ-S5 | S172.160 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports OSZ-S5 insofar as it requires all new buildings to comply with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008, and includes a matters of discretion relating to the suitability of any alternative servicing options. | Retain OSZ-S5 as notified. |
| OSZ - Open Space Zone | New provision request | S172.161 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Seek the inclusion of a new rule for emergency service facilities being a permitted activity in the Open Space Zone. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as development progresses. Consider that the permitted activity standards within the Open Space chapter will appropriately manage the effects of fire stations within the zone. | Insert a new rule which provides for emergency service facilities as a permitted activity within the Open Space Zone. |
| SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ-O1 | S172.162 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SARZ-O1 insofar as it provides for community activities within the zone. | Retain SARZ-O1 as notified. |
| SARZ - Sport and Active | SARZ-P3 | S172.163 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SARZ-P3 insofar as the policy provides for use and development that is incompatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the Sports and Active | Retain SARZ-P3 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Recreation Zone | | | | | Recreation Zone unless there is a functional or operational need to establish on the site. | |
| SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ-R1 | S172.164 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SARZ-R1 insofar as they require compliance with SARZ-S5. | Retain SARZ-R1 as notified. |
| SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ-R3 | S172.165 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SARZ-R3 insofar as they require compliance with SARZ-S5. | Retain SARZ-R3 as notified. |
| SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ-R12 | S172.166 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend SARZ-R12 to require compliance with SARZ-S5. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Sports and Recreation zone. | Amend SARZ-R12: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. SARZ-S5, and... |
| SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ-S5 | S172.167 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports SARZ-S5 insofar as it requires all new buildings to comply with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008, and includes a matters of discretion relating to the suitability of any alternative servicing options. | Retain SARZ-S5 as notified. |
| SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone | New provision request | S172.168 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Seek the inclusion of a new rule for emergency service facilities being a permitted activity in the Sports and Recreation zone. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as development progresses. | Insert a new rule which provides for emergency service facilities as a permitted activity within the Sports and Recreation Zone. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | Consider the permitted activity standards within the Sports and Recreation chapter will appropriately manage the effects of fire stations within the zone. | |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-O1 | S172.169 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports FUZ-O1 insofar as it promotes the efficient provision of infrastructure within the Future Urban Zone, including avoiding use and development prior to the appropriate three waters infrastructure being available. | Retain FUZ-O1 as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-O3 | S172.170 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports FUZ-O3 insofar as it promotes the efficient provision of infrastructure within the Future Urban Zone, including avoiding use and development prior to the appropriate three waters infrastructure being available. | Retain FUZ-O3 as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-P3 | S172.171 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports FUZ-P3 insofar as it promotes the efficient provision of infrastructure within the Future Urban Zone, including avoiding use and development prior to the appropriate three waters infrastructure being available. | Retain FUZ-P3 as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-R1 | S172.172 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports FUZ-R1 subject to the relief sought in relation to FUZ-S5. | Retain FUZ-R1 as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-R3 | S172.173 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports FUZ-R3 subject to the relief sought in relation to FUZ-S5. | Retain FUZ-R3 as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-R4 | S172.174 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports FUZ-R4 subject to the relief sought in relation to FUZ-S5. | Retain FUZ-R4 as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-R5 | S172.175 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend FUZ-R5 to require compliance with FUZ-S5. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. Considers this amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Future Urban Zone. | Amend FUZ-R5: ... a. Compliance is achieved with:... x. FUZ-S5, and ... |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-R6 | S172.176 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend FUZ-R6 to require compliance with FUZ-S5. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. | Amend FUZ-R6: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. FUZ-S5, and ... |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | Considers this amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Future Urban Zone. | |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-R7 | S172.177 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend FUZ-R7 to require compliance with FUZ-S5. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. Considers this amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Future Urban Zone. | Amend FUZ-R7: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. FUZ-S5, and ... |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-R8 | S172.178 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend FUZ-R8 to require compliance with FUZ-S5. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. Considers this amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Future Urban Zone. | Amend FUZ-R8: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. FUZ-S5, and ... |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-R11 | S172.179 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend FUZ-R11 to require compliance with FUZ-S5. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. Considers this amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Future Urban Zone. | Amend FUZ-R11: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. FUZ-S5, and ... |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-S5 | S172.180 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Supports FUZ-S5 insofar as it requires all buildings and activities to be provided with a connection to Council's reticulated water supply systems, which shall be in accordance with Council Engineering Standards. Acknowledge that the provisions of the Council Engineering Standards sets out the requirements for reticulated hydrant systems. Council Engineering Standards do not require reticulated systems to be designed in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Furthermore, the standard currently reads as though it only applies to drinking water supplies. Note that the PDP includes provisions for firefighting water supplies in relation to the creation of new allotments under the subdivision chapter. Consider that there is a | Amend: FUZ-S5 Drinking water Water supply 1. Where reticulated services are available, all buildings and activities must be provided with a connection to Council's reticulated water supply systems, which shall be in accordance with Council Engineering Standards and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. ... Matters of discretion: ... 3. The suitability of any alternative means of providing an adequate supply of water for firefighting purposes in |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | gap in the PDP provision in regards to ensuring that land use activities are appropriately serviced with a firefighting water supply. Amend FUZ-S5 to ensure all land use activities in all zones are adequately serviced with a firefighting water supply. Note that SNZ PAS 4509:2008 provides flexibility in regard to how an appropriate firefighting water supply can be provided. | accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008... |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R1 | S172.181 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports MPZ-R1 subject to the relief sought in relation to MPZ-S5. | Retain MPZ-R1 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R3 | S172.182 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports MPZ-R3 subject to the relief sought in relation to MPZ-S5. | Retain MPZ-R3 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R4 | S172.183 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend MPZ-R4 to require compliance with MPZ-S6. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Māori Purpose Zone. | Amend MPZ-R4: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. MPZ-S6, and... |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R5 | S172.184 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend MPZ-R5 to require compliance with MPZ-S6. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Māori Purpose Zone. | Amend MPZ-R5: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. MPZ-S6, and... |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R8 | S172.185 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend MPZ-R8 to require compliance with MPZ-S6. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Māori Purpose Zone. | Amend MPZ-R8: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. MPZ-S6, and... |
| MPZ - Māori | MPZ-R9 | S172.186 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend MPZ-R9 to require compliance with MPZ-s6. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with | Amend MPZ-R9: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. MPZ-S6, and... |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Purpose Zone | | | | | an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Māori Purpose Zone. | |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R10 | S172.187 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend MPZ-R10 to require compliance with MPZ-s6. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Māori Purpose Zone. | Amend MPZ-R10: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. MPZ-S6, and... |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R14 | S172.188 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend MPZ-R14 to require compliance with MPZ-s6. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Māori Purpose Zone. | Amend MPZ-R14: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. MPZ-S6, and... |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R16 | S172.189 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend MPZ-R16 to require compliance with MPZ-S6. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. This amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the Māori Purpose Zone. | Amend MPZ-R16: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. MPZ-S6, and... |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-S6 | S172.190 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Supports MPZ-S6 insofar as it requires all new buildings to comply with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 and includes a matter of discretion relating to the suitability of any alternative servicing options. | Retain MPZ-S6 as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-R8 | S172.191 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part | Amend GIZ-R8 to require compliance with GIZ-S8. It is vital that all buildings and activities across all zones are provided with an appropriate firefighting water supply. Proposed amendment will better provide for the safety of communities within the General Industrial Zone. | Amend GIZ-R8: ... a. Compliance is achieved with: ... x. GIX-S8, and... |
| SCHED3 - Schedule | Notable Trees | S157.001 | francis MInehan | Amend | Considers that the 81 Main Street Greytown Copper Beech (Woolworths NZ Ltd) should be proposed for notable tree status. Considers it | Amend SCHED3 - Notable Trees to include: xxx Copper Beech (fagus |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| of Notable Trees | | | | | worth approaching the company/owner to seek agreement for its listing, noting Woolworths's acceptance of the tree's significance/status/right to preservation during the recent Commissioner hearing. | sylvatica) 81 Main Street, Greytown Woolworths NZ Ltd |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | | S157.002 | francis MInehan | Neutral | Notes confusion as to whether St John's is a Methodist or an Anglican Church (64 Fox St, Featherston) | Amend SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings and Items to clarify whether HS067 - St Johns Church (64 Fox St, Featherston) is a Methodist or Anglican Church. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | | S157.003 | francis MInehan | Support in part | Considers that notable trees should be given full recognition equivalent to heritage sites. Submitter considers the council to not rely on the RMA to provide an indirection recognition of the heritage value/status of notable trees. | Amend TREE - Notable Trees Chapter to enhance recognition of notable trees equivalent to heritage sites. |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S157.004 | francis MInehan | Amend | Considers the building should not be described as 'Greytown Library'. The Greytown Library is in the Greytown Town Centre. HS106 was for a time the Greytown Library but it is better described as the former Masonic Lodge which it was and which it looks like today. | Amend SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings and Items: HS106 Greytown Library Masonic Lodge 115-117 Main Street, Greytown (Parts Lot 1 DP 11855) |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S157.005 | francis MInehan | Amend | Notes the cottage at 118 Mole Street, Greytown was constructed in 1895. Considers it may be early to date the original Edwardian Villa. Considers it is splendid, ornate, and in a class of its own and is strongly associated with Hutton Kidd (orchardist/ researcher - gala apple fame). | Amend SCHED1 Heritage Buildings and Items to include as follows: HS(XXX) Cottage, Piwakawaka Gardens 118 Mole Street, Greytown |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S157.006 | francis MInehan | Amend | Notes that the gas flute/ chimney is a remnant/ sole survivor of the gas age in Greytown and a rare piece of 'industrial' heritage. | Amend SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings and Items to include as follows: HS(XXX) Gas Flue / Chimney 139 Kuratawhiti Street, Greytown |
| SCHED3 - Schedule | Notable Trees | S80.001 | Frank & Lisa Cornelissen | Oppose | The listing is for a hedgerow of 19. The submission states the trees are no longer a | Delete Tsm04mlt from SCHED3 - Notable Trees. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|--------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| of Notable Trees | | | | | hedge and have been cut through the middle, reducing the value of the trees. | |
| SCHED3 - Schedule of Notable Trees | Notable Trees | S80.002 | Frank & Lisa Cornelissen | Amend | The submission states the address should be 10 Vintners Lane not 1-3 Vintners Lane. | Amend the address for Tsm04a to Tsm05n (16 trees) on SCHED3 - Notable Trees. |
| SCHED3 - Schedule of Notable Trees | Notable Trees | S80.003 | Frank & Lisa Cornelissen | Amend | The submission states this tree was cut down by South Wairarapa District Council several years ago. | Delete Tsm05a from SCHED3 - Notable Trees |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S80.004 | Frank & Lisa Cornelissen | Amend | The submission states both of these properties are privately owned and are no part of Considine Park therefore it may be an error in mapping. | Amend Open Space Zone applying to properties at 41 and 45 Kitchener Street, Martinborough if this is in error. |
| ENG - Energy | | S282.001 | Frank van Steensel | Oppose | Supports the submission made by the South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group (SWWAG). | Amend provisions as requested in the submission by SWWAG (Submission number 207). |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S138.001 | Fran Wilde | Support in part | Submitter seeks the TCZ be extend beyond Kuratāwhiti and Jellicoe Street. Opposed to the ribbon development of the commercial area and seeks to intensify the development around a core of the village. Submitter states that there is wasted land behind the current retail strip that could be further developed. The ability for pedestrians to walk around the village is preferred and would be diminished by the proposed long strip development. | Amend proposed Town Centre Zone in Greytown to extend beyond Kuratāwhiti and Jellicoe Street. |
| Planning Maps | Historical and Cultural Values | S267.001 | Fred Waiker | Oppose | The properties next to the settlement zones have been occupied and had a succession of ownership over the same time period as the residential properties in Whatarangi, Ngawi and Lake Ferry, as such they should also be excluded from the proposed changes. The integrity of the process must be questioned when there is no data to enforce the changing of the boundaries. The proposed actions for the areas of significance "identification, protection and restriction" are broad and provide no assurances of what will or will not be allowed on the private land. | Amend the planning maps to delete the Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori extent from the full coastline. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Interpretation | Definitions | S122.001 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Supports the recognition of quarrying activities as Primary Production activities, considers the definition recognises quarrying can only occur where aggregate resource is located and that it is most often located in rural areas. | Retain the definition of Primary Production as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S122.002 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support in part | Supports the definition of quarrying activity as it encompasses the range of activities associated with quarrying. Noting the definition is from the National Planning Standards, the definition presents challenges when applied to rules for quarrying activities, e.g. cleanfilling in the context of quarry rehabilitation (cleanfilling as defined by National Planning Standards relates to virgin material, limits the ability of quarry operators to rehabilitate quarries due to cost and lack of availability of this material), and waste minimisation (definition does not provide for resource recovery unless it is recycling aggregate - other products e.g. concrete from demolition are seldom processed prior to coming to a cleanfill site, which limits the benefits that recovering material at quarries could provide with regard to waste minimisation and waste levies). See further submission points for specific relief. | Retain the definition of Quarrying Activity as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S122.003 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Supports the definition as a reasonable description of sensitive activity as it applies to primary production and quarrying activities, both in terms of new and existing quarrying activities and managing reverse sensitivity effects. | Retain the definition of Sensitive Activity as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S122.004 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers the definition would capture any tree located in the road reserve regardless of its location or whether it was planted for landscape or amenity purposes or not. This would potentially capture wilding trees or trees planted for hedging. | Amend the definition of Street Tree to clarify that the definition only applies to trees that have been purposefully planted for landscaping or amenity purposes (for example, "Any tree that has been purposefully planted for landscaping or amenity purposes where the trunk is |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | located within the legal road reserve"). |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S122.005 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers it is not clear whether or not cleanfills are included under the definition of 'waste management facility'. The submitter seeks an amendment to explicitly exclude cleanfills from the definition to avoid confusion. | Amend the definition of Waste Management Facility to exclude cleanfills: ... It excludes: ... d. cleanfills. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O1 | S122.006 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose in part | Supports the recognition of the contribution the rural environment has to wellbeing, but wishes to see key activities that occur in the rural environment specifically recognised. | Amend RE-O1 to explicitly reference primary production and ancillary activities as contributing to the region's economic and social wellbeing (e.g. The Wairarapa's rural environment, primary production, and ancillary activities contributes positively to the region's economic and social wellbeing.) |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O2 | S122.007 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers that with the definition of 'quarrying activities', RE-O2, as notified could exclude quarrying through reference to protecting productive capacity which is a term that focuses on soil rather than the wider value of land. Notes the NPS-HPL provides a consenting pathway for quarrying activities and therefore is considered 'appropriate' under the circumstances outlined in the NPS-HPL. This needs to be recognised in RE-O2 as support for GRUZ-P9. | Amend RE-O2 so as not to exclude quarrying activities as follows or in a way that achieves similar relief (e.g. The General Rural Zone remains available for primary production activities and productive capacity is protected against inappropriate activities.) |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O3 | S122.008 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers that RE-O3 replicates the objective of the NPS-HPL without providing any district-specific direction or recognising the NPS-HPL provides pathways for use of highly productive land for uses other than land based on primary production such as mineral extraction. Seeks amendments to RE-O3 to reflect these pathways through reference to 'inappropriate use and development' as set out in Clause 3.9 of the NPS-HPL. | Amend RE-O3 to recognise that the NPS-HPL provides pathways for the use of Highly Productive Land where these are deemed 'appropriate' in the context of Clause 3.9 of the NPS-HPL (e.g. Highly productive land is protected from inappropriate use or development for use in land-based primary production, both now and for future generations). |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Strategic Direction | RE-O4 | S122.009 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support in part | Supports the overall objective, provided that what constitutes or contributes to rural character is clearly expressed within the Plan (references GRUZ-O2 in other submission points). | Retain RE-O4 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O5 | S122.010 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Notes reverse sensitivity effects from rural residential and lifestyle development can be significant for activities such as quarrying, and therefore considers it is important this is highlighted at a strategic level in the Plan. | Retain RE-O5 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O2 | S122.011 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose in part | States that reverse sensitivity effects resulting from urban development can be significant for activities such as quarrying, and is therefore important this is highlighted at a strategic level in the Plan. | Amend UFD-O2 to include direct reference to reverse sensitivity: ... 3. is compatible with the character and amenity of urban areas; and4. avoids reverse sensitivity effects. |
| Strategic Direction | INF-O1 | S122.012 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose in part | Notes that access to physical materials can have a significant impact on the cost of infrastructure. Considers it is therefore important that a ready local supply of key physical materials such as aggregate is available to provide effective, efficient, and resilient infrastructure. Considers the importance of these materials in achieving infrastructure objectives including carbon reduction goals needs to be highlighted. | Amend INF-O1 to recognise the role that the materials supply chain provides in achieving infrastructure outcomes: The benefits of infrastructure are recognised, while ensuring its adverse effects are well managed, and infrastructure is protected from incompatible land use, subdivision and development, including reverse sensitivity effects, and infrastructure is supported through a ready, local supply of the physical construction materials. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P4 | S122.013 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Considers the policy TR-P4 takes a pragmatic approach to on-site facilities by allowing facilities to "ensure they are appropriate for the demands of the activities and development carried out on the site" as opposed to a rigid set of standards which often don't consider activities such as quarrying. | Retain TR-P4 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P7 | S122.014 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Roads are designed for transportation. If the character or amenity values of an area which | Amend TR-P7 to remove reference to amenity values and the character of the road: |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | to be preserved in some way, land use zoning, integration of transport networks and land use, modifications to the transport network itself (traffic management), road capacity, and appropriate access arrangements (i.e., to an appropriate road in the hierarchy) provide better tools. The requirements for an Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) do not include an assessment of amenity or character, and this is not a matter of discretion for TR-R5. | ... b. effects on the amenity values and character of the road; ... |
| TR - Transport | TR-R1 | S122.015 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | This submission relates to TR-R1(1), which references minimum parking numbers. The submitter states that minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use. | Amend TR-R1 to include an exemption for quarrying activities from minimum on-site facility standards such as parking and loading in the relevant rule standards. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S16 | S122.016 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use and transport generation / interaction. | Amend TR-S16 and Table TR-9 to exempt quarrying activities from minimum number of parking bays |
| CL - Contaminated Land | CL-O1 | S122.017 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose in part | Considers the phrase 'its intended use' would include human health considerations if this was a component of the intended use of a contaminated site and it is therefore unnecessary to specifically require land to be safe for human health. | Amend CL-O1 to refer to the intended use of the land: Contaminated land is identified and managed so that it is safe for human health and its intended use. |
| CL - Contaminated Land | CL-P2 | S122.018 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose in part | Considers the phrase 'its intended use' would include human health considerations if this was a component of the intended use of a contaminated site and it is therefore unnecessary to specifically require land to be safe for human health. | Amend CL-P2: Manage the subdivision, change of use, or disturbance of contaminated land to ensure it is safe for human health by... |
| NH - Natural Hazards | New provision request | S122.019 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Considers that having systems and facilities in place to enable recovery is a key part of building resilience to natural hazards and climate change risk given that avoidance is | Insert a new policy that recognises the role of activities that allow communities to recover from the adverse effects of natural hazards and climate change in providing for social, economic, and cultural resilience: NH- |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|----------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | not always practicable. This includes access to material for rebuild and recovery. | PXProvide for activities that enhance social, economic and cultural resilience in response to the adverse effects of natural hazards and climate change including activities that enhance the community's ability to recover. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-P3 | S122.020 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Supports the ability to undertake trimming of notable trees and activities in their root protection areas where the work will have minimal effect on the tree. | Retain TREE-P3 as notified |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-P2 | S122.021 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Supports the ability to undertake trimming of notable trees and activities in their root protection areas in specific circumstances including for the installation of underground network utilities. | Retain TREE-P2 as notified |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-R2 | S122.022 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Supports that the framework under TREE-P2 is predicated on reasonable limits within TREE-R2. | Retain TREE-R2 as notified |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P6 | S122.023 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Supports the policy as it recognises that effects may not always be reasonably avoided, reminded, or mitigated, or offset, and provides for compensation in this case. Considers it important that the application of the effects management hierarchy recognises that there are practicable limitations to when and how the various levels in the hierarchy can be applied. | Retain ECO-P6 as notified |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P8 | S122.024 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers ECO-P8 b) and c) could be interpreted as both providing direction regarding effects as notified, which is potentially confusing. The relief sought seeks to clarify where actions are being taken to avoid or minimise the loss, damage, or disruption to ecological processes, functions, and integrity of the vegetation and habitat, that this will be a factor when considering the extent of modification. | Amend ECO-P8 to minimise the potential for conflict between b) and c): ... b. the extent of modification, including while factoring in measures to avoid or minimise the loss, damage, or disruption to ecological processes, functions and integrity of the vegetation and habitat... |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P8 | S122.025 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support in part | Supports a reasonable amount of indigenous vegetation clearance as a permitted activity. | Retain ECO-R2 as notified, provided the relief sought in relation to ECO-P8 is adopted. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-S1 | S122.026 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Supports reasonable limits on vegetation clearance, the limits placed on vegetation size (particularly trunk diameter) as a measure of maturity (ECO-P7) will severely limit the application of Rule ECO-P2. | Amend ECO-S1 to allow vegetation clearance when vegetation meets either one of the size tests under ECO-S1(3): ... 3. Any other indigenous vegetation species where: a. the vegetation height is either less than 4m, and or the trunk diameter is less than 30cm as measured 1.4m above ground... |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P3 | S122.027 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose in part | Supports allowing earthworks to main infrastructure, but seeks to broaden the policy to allow earthworks associated with activities that have an operational or functional need to occur within 25m of significant waterbodies, which provides support for the restricted discretionary status of NATC-R1(2). | Amend NATC-P3: Allow earthworks within 25m of Significant Waterbodies where they are for the purpose of maintenance works on infrastructure, such as maintaining drains, man-made dams, access tracks or roads, for approaches to bridges and culverts or for water supply infrastructure, including irrigation, or activities that have an operational or functional need to be located within 25m of Significant waterbodies. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P4 | S122.028 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers the phrase 'minimise adverse effects' is problematic as it can be interpreted as 'reduce to the smallest possible amount or degree', which does not take into account the feasibility of such an action. | Amend NATC-P4: ...b. significant adverse effects on the values of Significant Waterbodies are avoided and all other adverse effects are avoided, minimised, or remedied or mitigated. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|----------------------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | | |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P6 | S122.029 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Supports allowing the modification of vegetation in proximity to significant waterbodies in select circumstances, in this case associated with primary production. | Retain NATC-P6 as notified. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-R1 | S122.030 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Supports providing for earthworks within 25m of significant waterbodies where effects can be appropriately managed. | Retain NATC-R1 as notified. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-R2 | S122.031 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers that a reasonable amount of indigenous vegetation modification should be allowed so as to increase efficiency of the rule. | Amend NATC-R2 to allow some indigenous vegetation clearance as a permitted activity... b. The modification of vegetation associated with an existing primary production activity and there is no for any modification of indigenous vegetation compliance with ECO-S1 is achieved. (This relief assumes that the relief sought by the submitter in relation to ECO-S1 is adopted) |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P3 | S122.032 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Supports NFL-P3 as it recognises that some activities need to be located in areas of outstanding natural features or areas. | Retain NFL-P3 as notified. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P5 | S122.033 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Supports allowing subdivision, use, and development within an Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes where it is associated with activities that have a functional or operational need to be located in such an area. | Retain NFL-P5 as notified. |
| PA - Public Access | PA-O1 | S122.034 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers it important that public access to and along water bodies can be restricted where adverse health and safety effects could arise, which is consistent with PA-P3 as notified. | Amend PA-O1 to acknowledge that access may need to be restricted where adverse health and safety effects could arise: ... b. minimises incompatibility of providing public access with adjoining activities; andc. does not create adverse health and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | | safety effects. |
| PA - Public Access | PA-P3 | S122.035 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Considers it is important that public access to and along water bodies can be restricted where adverse health and safety effects could arise. | Retain PA-P3 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | Introduction | S122.036 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | The introduction to the subdivision chapter hints at potential reverse sensitivity effects through the phrase '... any impacts on adjacent sites'. However, given the significant issue reverse sensitivity effects can be for activities such as quarrying, this issue should be addressed much more directly. | Amend SUB-Introduction to explicitly reference reverse sensitivity effects: ... Subdivision can also affect the natural and physical environment and introduce long-term development patterns that cannot be easily changed and create reverse sensitivity effects... |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O1 | S122.037 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers reverse sensitivity effects can be a significant issue for activities such as quarrying. The submitter seeks that reverse sensitivity effects are expressly addressed in the objective. | Amend SUB-O1 to requiring the avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects. ... f. respond to the risks of natural hazards and is resilient to climate change; andg. avoids reverse sensitivity effects. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P1 | S122.038 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Seeks that reverse sensitivity effects are expressly addressed in the policy. | Amend SUB-P1 to require avoidance of all reverse sensitivity effects: Allow subdivision, and development that results in the efficient and productive use of land, provides for the needs of the community, avoids reverse sensitivity effects , and supports the policies of the District Plan for the applicable zones, where the design:... |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P5 | S122.039 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers the phrasing of SUB-P5 creates confusion by seeking to control an activity (subdivision) by using positive language relating to other activities (e.g. enabling primary production). | Redraft SUB-P5 so it clearly describes how subdivision will occur so it does not compromise the purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone, and achieves SUB-O1. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|--|--|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P6 | S122.040 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose in part | Supports clear direction with regard to avoiding the fragmentation of land, and the potential for subdivision, use and development of land to foreclose its use for primary production activities. Notes reverse sensitivity effects can be a significant issue for activities such as quarrying and therefore seeks that reverse sensitivity effects are expressly addressed in the policy. | Amend SUB-P6 to include a requirement to avoid all reverse sensitivity effects: ... a. limiting small lot subdivision within the General Rural Zone to only areas where the soil resource is fragmented, is not located on highly productive land, and it does not compromise the use of land for primary production activities (including through reverse sensitivity effects) ; and... |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-O2 | S122.041 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Reverse sensitivity effects are significant for activities such as quarrying. A specific objective that existing activities are not compromised is therefore an important inclusion in the Plan. | Retain NOISE-O2 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P2 | S122.042 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers that given the remainder of the policy that requires the consideration of potential adverse effects, it is unnecessary and overly restrictive to only enable the consideration of positive effects where there is a functional need for the activity to occur in a particular location. | Amend NOISE-P2: ... i. potential positive effects associated with the activity which is generating the noise that has a functional need to occur in that location. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P3 | S122.043 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Supports recognition that at times, compliance with construction noise standards may be challenging due to site specific factors such as topography. Given construction noise effects are often temporary, non-compliance with noise standards may not necessarily lead to a significant effect. | Retain NOISE-P3 as notified |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P8 | S122.044 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Supports the recognition that the character of the rural environment is influenced by noise, but considers that all primary production activities should be included given the qualifier that the noise has limited duration and frequency. | Amend NOISE-P8: The use of noisy equipment that has a limited duration and frequency (in particular, audible bird scaring devices and frost protection devices, and harvesters) that supports agricultural primary production in the rural environment is enabled by exempting these activities from noise limits, subject to reasonable use. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------|--|--|
| NOISE - Noise | Introduction | S122.045 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | This submission relates to NOISE Rules (exemptions). The submitter believes that all primary production activities should be included within the noise rule exemptions given the qualifier that the noise has limited duration and frequency. | Amend the exemptions under the NOISE - Rules heading: The following activities are not subject to the rules and standards in this chapter: ... d. Agriculture, horticulture, pastoral farming Primary Production , and conservation, activities undertaken... |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-S1 | S122.046 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | The same maximum noise limits apply to the Māori Purpose Zone as to the residential zones which suggests that the sensitivities of the two zones are the same. The submitter argues that while this may be the case for some activities envisaged in the Māori Purpose Zone, but may not be for others. These noise limits for this zone should reflect the range of activities that might occur within the zone, the relative sensitivity of these activities to noise, and any temporal influences on these sensitivities. | Amend NOISE-S1 so the maximum noise limits for the Māori Purpose Zone include a range of limits customised to the particular sensitivities of the land uses anticipated. |
| NOISE - Noise | New provision request | S122.047 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Requests a new rule is included within the Plan to control sensitive activities where these are to be located in proximity to quarries so as to avoid reverse sensitivity effects. | Insert a new NOISE rule: NOISE-RX Sensitive activities in proximity to quarrying activities Activity status: Permitted 1. The establishment of a new, or alteration, or expansion of an existing sensitive activity Where: 1. The sensitive activity shall be setback from the boundary of any legally established quarrying activity: a. 200m to any allowable excavation area; and b.500m to any allowable processing area; and c.500m to any activity that involves blasting. The establishment of residential units, or minor residential units on the same site as the quarry are exempt from this rule requirement. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | | Existing residential units or minor residential units within the specified setback that are rebuilt on their existing site but no closer to the quarry are exempt from this requirement. Activity status when compliance not achieved: Discretionary. |
| TEMP - Temporary Activities | TEMP-P1 | S122.048 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Supports the Plan recognising and enabling temporary activities, including those associated with construction | Retain TEMP-P1 as notified |
| TEMP - Temporary Activities | TEMP-R1 | S122.049 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Supports the plan recognising and enabling temporary activities, including those associated with construction. | Retain TEMP-R1 as notified |
| TEMP - Temporary Activities | TEMP-R3 | S122.050 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers the temporary outdoor storage of materials is not dissimilar to the temporary storage of construction related materials. Seeks alignment between these two rules to minimise the chance of issues of interpretation regarding whether materials are ancillary to construction or demolition or not. | Amend TEMP-R3 to make it clear that the rule applies to the outdoor storage of materials and to align the timeframes with TEMP-R1: TEMP-R3 Temporary outdoor storage of goods or materials 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The activity does not exceed 6 12 months in duration in a 24-month period... |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O1 | S122.051 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Supports the explicit recognition of the role of primary production in the General Rural Zone. | Retain GRUZ-O1 as notified |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O2 | S122.052 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Supports the recognition of the influence primary production (which includes quarrying activities) and ancillary activities has on rural character. | Retain GRUZ-O2 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O3 | S122.053 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Supports the explicit recognition of the support for primary production and resource dependent activities in the General Rural Zone. | Retain GRUZ-O3 as notified |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|---|---|
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O4 | S122.054 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Supports the explicit recognition of the support for primary production and resource dependent activities in the General Rural Zone, and activities that are not incompatible with primary production activities. | Retain GRUZ-O4 as notified |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O5 | S122.055 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Supports an explicit objective regarding reverse sensitivity | Retain GRUZ-O5 as notified |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P1 | S122.056 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Supports explicit recognition regarding the activities that are anticipated to occur in the General Rural Zone. | Retain GRUZ-P1 as notified |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P2 | S122.057 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose in part | Considers the phrasing of GRUZ-P3 creates confusion by seeking to control an activity (subdivision, use and development) by using positive language relating to other activities (e.g. enabling primary production). | Amend GRUZ-P2 to remove reference to productive potential: ... b. will result in fragmentation of land and the productive potential of land ; or... |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P3 | S122.058 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers the wording of GRUZ-P3 creates confusion by seeking to control an activity (subdivision, use and development) by using positive language relating to other activities (e.g. enabling primary production). | Amend GRUZ-P3 so it describes how subdivision, use and development will occur so it does not compromise the purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone and achieves GRUZ-O2. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P4 | S122.059 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose in part | Supports the intention of the policy to avoid inappropriate activities within the General Rural Zone. However, the submitter would prefer to see defined terms used where possible to avoid interpretive issues for plan users. | Amend GRUZ-P4 to use the term primary production where possible: ... b. recognizing the cumulative effects associated with small lot subdivision on the productive use and potential within for the General Rural Zone to be utilised for primary production activities. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P5 | S122.060 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose in part | Generally supports GRUZ-P5 but is concerned that GRUZ-P5(b)(iv) does not adequately consider the reading hierarchy, the purpose of roads within this hierarchy, and the exemptions within the noise rules for vehicles on the roads. Considers that GRUZ-P5(b)(i) suggests that quarrying activities do not contribute to the character of the General Rural Zone in line with GRUZ-O2. | Amend GRUZ-P5 to recognise that vehicles on roads are exempt from noise rules and that roads anticipate a level of traffic consistent with where they sit within the road hierarchy for the district, and: ... b. providing for other quarrying activities where it can be demonstrated that: i. the siting and scale of buildings, structures, |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | GRUZ-P5(b)(vi) directs quarries to internalise effects as far as practicable which addresses the potential effects on amenity values, while recognising that quarrying activities are an activity that necessarily occurs in the rural environment, it is anticipated to occur, and contributes to the overall character of the rural environment. | machinery, stored material, quarried areas, cut faces, and visual screening maintains the character and amenity values of the General Rural Zone; ... iv. there are measures to mitigate any adverse effects on character and amenity values of the General Rural Zone from the movement of vehicles;... |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P6 | S122.061 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Supports a policy addressing reverse sensitivity effects in rural zones, but notes Policy GRUZ-P6(b) and (c) relate to the direct effects of rural activities on sensitive activities, not reverse sensitivity effects. The policy should be amended to remove these direct effect elements. | Amend Policy GRUZ-P6 to focus on reverse sensitivity effects only: ... c. ensuring adequate separation distances between existing sensitive activities and new intensive primary production activities, quarrying activities, and rural industry; and d. avoiding quarry, landfill, cleanfill area, and mining activities in proximity to urban areas where the amenity values of urban environments would be diminished. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P9 | S122.062 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose in part | Notes a recent resource consent application example has found that reference to 'aggregate extraction' in the NPS-HPL has created unintended consequences and therefore requests that this interpretation issue is addressed directly in GRUZ-P9. | Amend GRUZ-P9 to make it clear that any reference within the NPS-HPL to aggregate extraction encompasses the activities defined by the term quarrying activity: Avoid subdivision, use, and development of highly productive land, except as provided for in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. When applying Clause 3.9(2)(i)(iv) of the National Policy |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | Statement for Highly Productive Land, any reference to 'aggregate extraction' is to be interpreted as being reference to Quarrying Activity. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R12 | S122.063 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose in part | Supports the multi-tiered approach to the classification of quarrying activities proposed through GRUZ-R12(2) and (3), but considers GRUZ-R12 (2) (5) does not adequately consider the roading hierarchy, the purpose of roads within this hierarchy, and the exemptions within the noise rules for vehicles on the roads. The submitter also notes that the definition of quarrying activity includes rehabilitation rather than remediation as per GRUZ-R12(8) and the matters of discretion should be consistent with this defined terminology. | GRUZ-R12 Quarrying activities ... 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary ... Matters of discretion: ... 5. Adverse effects on character and amenity values of the Zone from the movement of vehicles... ... 3. Activity Status: Discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with GRUZ-R12(2); orb. The activity includes the recovery and recycling of construction and demolition materials. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | New provision request | S122.064 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Notes the definition of quarrying activity does not include the deposition of non-virgin but inert fill. Supports the inclusion of a new rules that provides for the deposition of inert fill as part of quarry rehabilitation as a discretionary activity. | Insert a new GRUZ rule for depositing inert fill: GRUZ-RX Deposition of inert fill Activity status: Discretionary Where: a. The fill is inert and is deposited as part of quarry rehabilitation. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R16 | S122.065 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Notes rural industries are critical to supporting primary production activities such as quarrying. Supports a permitted activity rule for Rural Industry activities where these are of a scale that is compatible with the character of the General Rural Zone, rather than a default discretionary activity. | Amend GRUZ-R16 to allow for some rural industry as a Permitted activity: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where:a. a maximum of five staff shall work on the site at any one time;b. the manufacture, processing or production of goods involve initial or further processing of commodities derived from primary production;c. the maximum GFA occupied for the rural industry shall be |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | 250m ² ;d. the maximum GFA occupied for the rural industry within a SASM shall be 150m ² ;e. the maximum land area occupied for the rural industry shall be 500m ² ;f. any retail sales area shall be set back a minimum of 10m from the site boundary;g. the retail sale of goods on the site is restricted to those manufactured, produced, or processed on the site;h. the maximum NFA or land area occupied for retail sales shall be 50m ² ; and i. any buildings, yard storage, or parking areas associated with the activity shall not be located within 60m of any residential unit, or other sensitive activity located on a site other than where the rural industry is occurring. 1-2. Activity Status: Discretionary Where: a. compliance is not achieved with Rule GRUZ-R16(1) |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | | S122.066 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Not Stated | Considers the plan needs to be explicit in how it addresses quarrying, along with other permitted Primary Production activities in the General Rural Zone. | Amend the General Rural Zone to recognise that quarrying influences rural character and amenity, generates traffic, and occurs only where the suitable aggregate resources exist, and this should be anticipated and provided for as it is a Primary Productive activity. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S122.067 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support in part | The plan recognises the potential for reverse sensitivity effects to affect primary production activities but does so in a disparate way. Considers this may lead to a situation where plan users only interacting with part of the plan may miss some of this critical policy direction. | Amend the Plan to provide for a consistent approach to address reverse sensitivity effects. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------|------------|--|---|
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | | S122.068 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Not Stated | Quarrying can only occur where the suitable aggregate resource is located. The resource is therefore susceptible to the impact of competing land uses, subdivision, and incompatible activities. | Amend the Plan to recognise and consider the risk of adverse effects on primary production activities from competing land uses, subdivision, and incompatible activities that do not have a functional or operational need to locate in a rural area. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S18 | S122.069 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use and transport generation / interaction. | Amend TR-S18 and Table TR-11 to exempt quarrying activities from minimum parking bay dimensions |
| TR - Transport | TR-S19 | S122.070 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use and transport generation / interaction. | Amend TR-S19 to exempt quarrying activities from blind aisle standards |
| TR - Transport | TR-S20 | S122.071 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use and transport generation / interaction. | Amend TR-S20 to exempt quarrying activities from parking bay gradients |
| TR - Transport | TR-S21 | S122.072 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use and transport generation / interaction. | Amend TR-S21 to exempt quarrying activities from parking bay construction and formation |
| TR - Transport | TR-S22 | S122.073 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use and transport generation / interaction. | Amend TR-S22 to exempt quarrying activities from reverse manoeuvring standard |
| TR - Transport | TR-S23 | S122.074 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature | Amend TR-S23 and Table TR-12 to exempt quarrying activities from minimum number cycle parking spaces |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|---|------------------|---------------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | of the land use and transport generation / interaction. | |
| TR - Transport | TR-S24 | S122.075 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use and transport generation / interaction. | Amend TR-S24 to exempt quarrying activities from cycle parking design standards |
| TR - Transport | TR-S25 | S122.076 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use and transport generation / interaction. | Amend TR-S25 and Table TR-13 to exempt quarrying activities from trip-end facilities standards |
| TR - Transport | TR-S26 | S122.077 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use and transport generation / interaction. | Amend TR-S26 and Table TR-14 to exempt quarrying activities from loading space dimensions |
| TR - Transport | TR-S27 | S122.078 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use and transport generation / interaction. | Amend TR-S27 and Table TR-15 to exempt quarrying activities from loading and standing space access standards |
| TR - Transport | TR-S28 | S122.079 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Oppose | Considers minimum parking and loading standards (as examples of on-site facilities) are not practical (or often necessary) for activities such as quarrying given the nature of the land use and transport generation / interaction. | Amend TR-S28 to exempt quarrying activities from loading space construction and formation standards |
| Designations | SWDC - South Wairarapa District Council | S241.001 | Garrick Robert and Pamela Orene Wells | Oppose | Raises concerns about the use of Pains Farm for wastewater disposal purposes including lack of notification, not the purpose for which the land was originally gifted, negative effects on property values, effects on health of neighbours, and lack of health and safety plan. | Amend the Designations chapter to delete SWDC-S-26: Martinborough wastewater land based disposal - Pains Farm. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S205.001 | Garry Daniell | Oppose | Submitter notes the following: - Land to the north of 125 Te Ore Ore Road is proposed to be zoned Rural Lifestyle. | Amend the zoning at 125 Te Ore Ore Road from General Rural to Rural Lifestyle. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>- Considering both the Objectives and Policies of the General Rural Zone and Rural Lifestyle Zone it is considered the Rural Lifestyle Zone is the most appropriate for the site.</p> <p>-The Rural Lifestyle Zone would provide for residential development at a low density that would create a natural buffer between the urban residential areas to the west and the Ruamahanga River and General Rural Zone to the East.</p> | |
| Planning Maps | Hazards and Risks | S205.002 | Garry Daniell | Oppose | <p>Submitter commissioned a geotechnical assessment of the site in 2017 to investigate the location of the Masterton Fault on the site. This investigation of the site did not find any evidence of the faultline on the site and the submitter has shared this information with Council. The submitter therefore requests amendments to the Fault Hazard overlays on the site (either removal or reduction) to appropriately reflect these findings and any related amendments to Fault Hazard related provisions.</p> | Delete or amend to reduce the Fault Hazard overlay extent across 125 Te Ore Ore Road. |
| Planning Maps | General District-Wide Matters | S205.003 | Garry Daniell | Oppose | <p>Site contains both LUC Class 6 and 3 soil, which is considered Highly Productive Land currently under the NPS-HPL. The NPS-HPL may be amended to exclude LUC Class 3 land. Should this change be implemented during the processing of the PDP, the submitter requests any consequential changes resulting from such an amendment to the NPS-HPL.</p> | Amend the district plan provisions to be consistent with the NPS-HPL. |
| ENG - Energy | Introduction | S253.001 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Oppose in part | <p>Submitter states that paragraph 2, page 2 of the introduction is not clear, nor accurate, so should be changed or removed. Solar irradiance is available all-over New Zealand at a level suitable for energy generation and is not a constraint that is specific to the Wairarapa as a location. Proximity to a substation or overhead line is not a constraint. This is a convenience and cost saving for the proposing company. Flat land is not a constraint. Solar generation can and is being</p> | <p>Amend ENG-Energy Introduction as follows: "...There are potential tensions between the existing values of these areas and their potential for wind energy generation. Solar energy generation poses similar tensions. High quality solar farms need to account for the following in their design which constrains where they can be located: a. The solar irradiance of an area. b. Proximity to an existing substation or</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | achieved on undulating land or hillsides in other countries. A less than 5% gradient is a cost cutting convenience for the proposing company. | existing overhead line. c. Flat land with a less than 5 degree slope. By their nature, there is tensions between other competing land uses, in particular..." |
| ENG - Energy | Introduction | S253.002 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Oppose in part | To understand the point in which the level of adverse effects become too much, it is considered a clear maximum point or level should be referred to. | Amend ENG-Energy chapter Introduction [paragraph 3, page 2], to include 'measurable levels' to support the statement "some level of adverse effects may need to be accepted..."(inferred). |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S253.003 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Oppose in part | Infrastructure required for solar power generation has a short life span, high content of rare earth minerals and a large carbon footprint in their production. Noted there is no definition of 'sustainable' in the Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan document. | Insert a definition of "sustainable" (inferred). |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-O3 | S253.004 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Oppose in part | The submitter expresses that solar and wind infrastructure needs to be renewed frequently compared to other forms of energy generation and solar being the least efficient form of energy generation. | Amend ENG-O3 to use a better description of 'renewable' to reflect that solar and wind infrastructure needs to be renewed frequently. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P2 | S253.005 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Oppose in part | Add - that small scale is to be for owner use and not just fed into national grid. That is local resilience. | Amend Policy ENG-P2 as follows: "Enable small-scale electricity generation, and small-scale electricity generation for owners use and not fed into the national grid , where it is of a form and scale that avoids, remedies, or mitigates its adverse effects." (inferred) |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P3 | S253.006 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Oppose in part | Add -that community scale is to be for direct community use and not just fed into national grid. That is local resilience. | Insert in ENG-P3 that " community scale is to be for direct community use and not |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | just fed into national grid". |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P4 | S253.007 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Oppose in part | Submitter does not detail specific reasons for f, h and i, but notes for j that contaminated soil can still grow food, but it will have absorbed forever accumulative chemicals the body can not remove. | Amend ENG-P4 as follows: "... f. potential adverse effects from the activity, including traffic generation, visual, light, safety, and noise, heat, accumulative noise, wireless connectivity interference, increased fire risk, increased wind; ...h. cumulative effects from multiple renewable electricity generation activities; [add measurement for how close power plants can be in relation to each other] ... i. potential for adverse effects on nearby residents , natural features and landscapes, waterbodies, indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage, and sites of significance to Māori; j. potential effects on the productive capacity healthy productivity of the land, including the ability to protect the productive capacity of highly productive land; ... " |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P5 | S253.008 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Support in part | Submitter has not provided reason. | Amend Policy ENG-P5 as follows: "Manage subdivision and land use activities to avoid adverse effects on the efficient operation of established renewable electricity generation facilities and manage placement of energy generation facilities to avoid adverse effects on |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | established residential activities and land use. " (Inferred) |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R1 | S253.009 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Support in part | Submitter has not provided reasons. | Amend ENG-R1 to include "new upgrade" and "additional infrastructure" as a Discretionary activity. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R2 | S253.010 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Support in part | Submitter has not provided specific reasons. | Amend ENG-R2 as follows: "ENG- R2 Operation, maintenance, repair, expansion and removal of existing renewable electricity generation activities b. All above ground structures and underground infrastructure that are no longer required for renewable electricity generation purposes are removed within two years of being replaced or becoming redundant" Include "expansion of any existing renewable electricity generation activities" as a Discretionary Activity. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R3 | S253.011 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Support in part | No parameters set. | Amend to include a maximum size of "small scale". |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R4 | S253.012 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Support in part | No parameter set. | Amend to include maximum size of "community scale". |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R6 | S253.013 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Support in part | No parameters set. | Amend to include a maximum size of "large scale". |
| NOISE - Noise | Introduction | S253.014 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Support in part | Noise level regulations need to accommodate the low-level electrical buzz from solar facilities. There are also mechanical machinery turning panels. The constant nature of the noise during all daylight hours and its impact on sensitive activities. | Amend NOISE-Noise Introduction as follows: "... e. NZS 6808:2010 Acoustics Wind Farm Noise-; andf. NZS [xxxx:xxxx] acoustics Solar Energy Generation Noise. [Refer to |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | attachment in Original Submission] " |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S253.015 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Support in part | Submitter does not provide specific reasons for the first two amendments. For the removal of "battery energy storage system" the submitter notes the definition should not automatically consider "battery energy storage systems" a part of a large-scale electricity generation activity. A large-scale electricity generation facility can function and exist without a battery storage system, therefore, should not be included in the definition. It is further noted, battery energy storage system should have separate and specific consent regulations. | Amend Definition as follows for 'Large-scale renewable solar and wind electricity generation activity'. "Means electricity generation activities utilising renewable free energy sources for the purpose..." "...It includes all ancillary components and activities such as substations, battery energy storage systems , climate/environmental monitoring equipment" |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S253.016 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Amend | Solar array structures are "buildings" in line with the building definition and this should be made clear in the ENG chapter. | Amend the ENG-Energy chapter to include that solar array structures are definably "buildings" according to the buildings definition. |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S253.017 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Amend | Arrays and other associated structures within the facility are obviously infrastructure (in line with infrastructure definition) and intensively cover the land. Reference should therefore be made to them being "infrastructure". | Amend ENG-Energy chapter to include the term "infrastructure" when referring to large-scale electricity generation. |
| ENG - Energy | Introduction | S253.018 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Support in part | Solar power generation plants manufacture energy. The general description in the ENG-Energy section should therefore include words like buildings, infrastructure, manufacture and especially industrial activity. Words like 'green', 'solar farm', 'sustainable', 'renewable' have been overused and undefined by a very large industry. These words hide the industrial nature and impacts or power generation. | Amend ENG-Energy to include reference to energy generation plants being industrial activities (inferred). |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S253.019 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Amend | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale | Amend ENG-Energy to include that all utility scale power generation consent applications are to be publicly notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S253.020 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Amend | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | Amend ENG-Energy to include a standard regulating the location of utility scale solar power generation to non-residential areas, non-prime farmland or marginal land. |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S253.021 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Amend | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | Amend ENG-Energy to include a new note that resource consent is to remain with the original parties (consent holder) and is not to be used as an instrument of trading to entities not party to the original applications. New owners would require a new resource consent / renewal of consent. |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S253.022 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Amend | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | Amend ENG-Energy to include a new standard setting out consultation requirements, mandating consultation with relative stakeholders; lwi, conservation, aviation, water protection and historical authorities, telecommunications owners and operators. |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S253.023 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Amend | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | Amend ENG-Energy to include a new standard, requiring independent engineering assessments to be undertaken for wind loading and wet ground conditions. |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S253.024 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Amend | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | Amend ENG-Energy to include a new standard, that ensures all applications include impact reports; visual, glare, noise, fire and safety |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S253.025 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Amend | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | Amend ENG-Energy to include a new standard requiring community impact evaluations; economic, tourism, agricultural, employment...with consent applications. |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S253.026 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Amend | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale | Amend ENG-Energy to oblige applicants to shoulder testing and assessment expenses. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-S2 | S253.027 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Oppose in part | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | Amend ENG-S2 to include the requirement for water quality monitoring; all water wells and bore within 5.5km of a solar panel prior to construction, during use, and up to 5 years after decommissioning (inferred). |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-S1 | S253.028 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Oppose in part | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | Amend ENG-S1 to include a standard, that there shall be a three yearly review of decommissioning plans; including restoration, toxic waste disposal, fault of landowner's failure to decommission, financial assurance, cash held in country, not to include salvage values, disaster and halt of production conditions (inferred). |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S253.029 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Amend | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | Amend ENG-Energy to include a new standard that includes: " Applicant to establish safety protocols, provide annual equipment and training for emergency services, coordination plan with responders and hospitals, and cover cost for facility call outs. Applicant and landowner to procure adequate liability insurance; to cover injury, death, property damage. " |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S253.030 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Amend | Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added. | Amend ENG-Energy to include the following provision for 'Construction and Maintenance': " 1. Post-approval construction to commence within 12 months, if not plan approval null and void. 2. Stringent development standards for chemical content with specific product details provided. 3. " |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | <p>Wildlife preservation corridor per 20Ha of Solar field no less than 10 meters in width</p> <p>4. Solar field size restrictions; Max 80.9Ha, not within 3.5km of another utility scale solar facility.</p> <p>5. Maximum 1% footprint of total farmland acreage per council to be used for renewable energy</p> <p>6. Fencing is not to be topped with razor wire nor to include opaque barriers.</p> <p>7. Sound and vibration levels limited and tested.</p> <p>8. Underground wiring to be inside conduit</p> <p>9. Modifications require new permits as if a new project</p> <p>10. Biannual statement of activity to be provided to ensure facility is actively producing electricity for the power grid. Panels below useful life threshold activate the decommissioning plan."</p> |
| <p>ENG - Energy</p> | <p>ENG-S4</p> | <p>S253.031</p> | <p>Gaylene Leslie O'Connor</p> | <p>Support in part</p> | <p>Clear rules are needed in the plan to help Council process applications for large scale electricity production, so more regulatory measures should be added.</p> | <p>Amend ENG-S4 to also include the following specific requirements with regard to setbacks and height:"</p> <p>1. No panel within 50m from non-participating property line or road</p> <p>2. No panel within 150m from a residential building.</p> <p>3. No panel within 3.6km from school property line</p> <p>4. No panel within 3.6km from a town boundary.</p> <p>5. No panel within 3.2km of an artesian well or bore</p> <p>6. Solar field not placed within a storm water system, floodplain or above an aquifer.</p> <p>7. No panel exceed 4.5m at highest rotation-</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | Notice given to any landing strip owner; setbacks to be agreed by landing strip owner" |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S253.032 | Gaylene Leslie O'Connor | Amend | Submitter notes this, including the other related submission points related to increasing regulations, are now being introduced to Local Council plans in countries that have had 20 years or more experience living with utility scale renewable energy systems, their impacts and associated companies. Submitter urges Councils to read the Spencer County, Indiana, July 2023.16 ordinance, which contains details of how these measures are implemented. | Amend ENG-Energy to provide specific protection for residents (either a rule or standard) for 'Protection for Residents' as follows:" 1. Complaints about energy generating facility interference of telecommunication, television broadcast, microwave transmissions or glare issues to be rectified within 24hrs at company cost.2. Solar companies must value guarantee all owner-occupied residential dwellings within 1.6 km of a solar panel for a period of 35 years." |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S81.001 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support in part | Considers that this definition should be extended to include the extraction of minerals taken for other on-farm uses, such as use ancillary to farming, horticulture and development of renewable generation activities where the mineral extracted is only used within the property of extraction. | Amend the Farm Quarry: "Means the extraction of minerals taken for use ancillary to farming and horticulture or for renewable electricity generation activities where the minerals are, and only used within the property of extraction. It includes the extraction of material for farm and forestry tracks, accessways, and hardstand areas on the property of origin. It does not include the exportation or removal of extracted material (including any aggregate) from the property or origin or retail or other sales of such material." |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Interpretation | Definitions | S81.002 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support | Supports the biodiversity offset definition as proposed. | Retain the biodiversity offset definition as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S81.003 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support | Supports the Environmental compensation definition as proposed. | Retain the Environmental compensation definition as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S81.004 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support in part | Supports definition for infrastructure as it has the same meaning as in section 2 of the RMA. Supports the use of the RMA definition of infrastructure as the basis for the definition. However, they note that the infrastructure used in facilities for the generation and transmission of electricity now includes the use of battery storage systems. Considers that the definition of infrastructure should be extended to include battery storage systems, recognising the role that such systems are likely to play in future electricity systems. It also notes that that the numbering of the clauses in the Proposed District Plan definition is incorrect and should be amended. | Amend the definition of Infrastructure: "Has the same meaning as in section 2 of the RMA, with an added reference to battery energy storage systems , as set out below... the facilities for the generation of energy, battery energy storage systems , lines used or intended to be used to convey electricity, and support structures for lines used or intended to be used to convey electricity, excluding facilities, lines, and supported structures if a person..." |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S81.005 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support | Supports the proposed definition and the inclusion of ancillary activities into the definition. | Retain the definition for Large-scale renewable electricity generation activity as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S81.006 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support in part | Supports the use of the definition from the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. However, it notes that the numbering of the clause in the Proposed Plan definition is incorrect. | Amend the Natural inland wetland definition to fix numbering. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S81.007 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support | Supports the use of the definition from the National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation. | Retain the Renewable electricity definition as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S81.008 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support | Supports the use of the definition from the National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation. | Retain the Renewable electricity generation activities definition as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S81.009 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support in part | Considers that the clause "as it applied to network utilities is not necessary and can be deleted in the definition as the term "upgrade" is used in both the Energy and Network Utilities chapters. Alternatively the definition | Amend the definition of "Upgrade": " As it applies to network utilities, m Means the improvement or increase in carrying capacity, operational efficiency, security, |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | can be amended to "as it applied to energy activities or network utilities". | or safety of existing infrastructure, but excludes maintenance and repair", or "As it applied to energy activities or network utilities , means the improvement or increase in carrying capacity, operational efficiency, security, or safety of existing infrastructure, but excludes maintenance and repair." |
| Strategic Direction | New provision request | S81.010 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Amend | Supports Objective 1 CCR-O1 (Climate change mitigation) that the Wairarapa develops and functions in a way that assists in the transition to a low-carbon future. However, given that development of renewable electricity generation will form a significant part of New Zealand's climate change response. Considers that a strategic direction to recognise the benefits of renewable electricity generation and providing for their development, operation, maintenance, and upgrade. | Insert a new Climate Change and Resilience objective as follows: CCR-O5 Renewable electricity: Recognise the benefits of renewable electricity generation activities and the electricity transmission network, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and provide for their development, operation, maintenance, and upgrade within the Wairarapa to assist with the decarbonisation of the economy. |
| Strategic Direction | New provision request | S81.011 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Amend | Considers that the development of renewable electricity generation (solar and wind) within the Wairarapa is most likely to occur within the rural environment. Considers that an objective recognising that renewable electricity generation is likely to form part of the rural environment in the future and recognises that the Rural Environment is where such activities are most likely to occur. | Insert a new Rural Environment objective as follows: RE-O6 Renewable Electricity Generation: The General Rural Zone is available for renewable electricity generation activities and contributes positively to New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments. |
| Strategic Direction | New provision request | S81.012 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Amend | States that infrastructure activities may occur in all areas of the Wairarapa and are necessary to both ensure that economic and social wellbeing is provided for across the district. Considers that a strategic direction | Insert a new Infrastructure objective as follows: INF-O2 Infrastructure Location: Infrastructure activities must be recognised and provided for within all |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | explicitly recognising that infrastructure can be expected to occur in any environment identified in the Proposed Plan is necessary to alert all plan users to the likelihood of such activities occurring in all areas. | environments in the District, while ensuring adverse effects are well managed. |
| ENG - Energy | Introduction | S81.013 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support in part | Considers that as New Zealand moves towards a more sustainable energy future, battery energy storage systems are likely to occur more frequently throughout the District, often in association with (but not always) renewable electricity generation systems. The introduction should recognise that battery/ energy storage systems may also be likely to occur more frequently throughout the District. | Amend the Energy introduction: "...Facilities for the storage and transmission of the generated electricity to the grid may also be necessary... Increased demand also increases the need for more battery energy storage and distribution systems, which may bring about adverse effects on the environment. The effects from energy generation, storage , and distribution facilities..." |
| ENG - Energy | Introduction | S81.014 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support | Considers that this introduction provides clarity and certainty of the provisions that apply to the activities for all users of the Plan. | Retain the Energy introduction as notified (except as noted in the above submission point) |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-O1 | S81.015 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support in part | Considers that references to "renewable electricity generation" in the Proposed District Plan should be amended to "renewable electricity generation activities" to clarify that the provisions relate to all the activities required to deliver renewable electricity generation. | Amend Objective ENG-O1 as follows: "ENG-O1 Benefits of renewable electricity generation activities : The significant local, regional, and national benefits of renewable electricity generation activities are recognised and provided for." |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-O3 | S81.016 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support in part | Considers that proposed objective does not reflect the intent of the objective that requires the generation of renewable electricity to be increased, in order to facilitate the development of new renewable electricity generation assets (including small, community, and large scale) to move the region towards a low emission economy. | Amend Objective ENG-O3: "To move the Wairarapa towards a low emission economy through the efficient use of energy efficiency and increase the generation of electricity from renewable sources in the Wairarapa." |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P1 | S81.017 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support in part | Considers ENG-P1 should be amended to refer to renewable electricity generation "activities". | Amend Policy ENG-P1: "Enable activities associated with investigating the site suitability for renewable electricity generation activities. " |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P2 | S81.018 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support in part | Considers ENG-P2 should be amended to refer to renewable electricity generation "activities". | Amend Policy ENG-P2: Enable small-scale renewable electricity generation activities where it is of a form and scale that avoids, remedies, or mitigates its adverse effects. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P3 | S81.019 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support in part | Considers ENG-P3 should be amended to refer to renewable electricity generation "activities". | Amend Policy ENG-P3: Encourage community-scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone where effects are appropriately managed, by having regard to: a. benefits of community scale renewable electricity generation activities , including resilience benefits... |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P4 | S81.020 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support in part | Considers ENG-P4 should be amended to refer to renewable electricity generation "activities". | Amend Policy ENG-P4: Provide for large-scale renewable electricity generation activities where effects are appropriately managed, by having regard to: a. benefits of large-scale renewable electricity generation activities... |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P5 | S81.021 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support in part | Considers ENG-P5 should be amended to refer to renewable electricity generation "activities" rather than facilities to be consistent. | Amend Policy ENG-P5: Manage subdivision and land use activities to avoid reverse effects on the efficient operation of established renewable electricity generation facilitiesactivities. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P6 | S81.022 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support in part | Considers ENG-P6 should be amended to refer to renewable electricity generation "activities". | Amend Policy ENG-P6: Enable the operation, maintenance, repair and removal of existing renewable electricity generation activities |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | and provide for the upgrade of renewable electricity generation activities where the effects are appropriately managed. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S81.023 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Oppose in part | "Maintenance" and "repair" are only defined in relation to heritage buildings and items, but these terms are italicised in the ENG chapter. Submission point refers to ENG-P6, ENG-R1, ENG-R2, ENG-R3, ENG-R4; and ENG-R5. | Amend the definition of Maintenance: Means, in relation to an identified heritage building or item, the regular and ongoing protective care of the building or item to prevent deterioration and retain its heritage values. This definition does not apply to the ENG-Energy chapter. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R6 | S81.024 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Oppose in part | Genesis considers that in order to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy 2011, Wellington Regional Policy Statement Objective 9(c), Policy 7, and Policy 39 and proposed objectives ENG-O1 and ENG-O3, and Policies ENG-P4 and ENG-P6, these activities should be a discretionary activity in all zones in order to recognise the benefits of renewable generation activities. Large scale solar systems and activities may not only occur within the General Rural Zone and could, be established on commercial buildings solely for supply to the grid. | Amend Rule ENG-R6: General Rural All Zones: 1. Activity status: Discretionary. All other Zones: 2. Activity status: Non-complying |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S81.025 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Oppose in part | Genesis considers that provision of battery storage systems are not a "non-renewable" electricity generation activity and are not provided for under the other rules in the chapter. Electricity generation companies (such as Genesis) are not network utilities. Given that battery energy storage systems are likely to be proposed by entities other than network utilities, Genesis considers that those parts of Rule NU-R6 relating to energy storage systems should be repeated as a new Rule ENG-R9 to provide for battery energy storage systems as permitted or restricted discretionary activities. | Include a new Rule ENG-R9 as follows: ENG-R9 Battery energy storage systemsAll zones 1. Activity Status Permitted Where:a. The maximum building and structure height is:i. 2.5m orii. complies with NU-S2.b. The maximum area of the battery energy storage system is:i. 20m2 in Residential Zones; or ii. 30m2 in all other Zones.c. When located within or on a site adjacent to the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------|---|
| | | | | | | <p>General Residential Zone, the battery energy storage system is set back from site boundaries to comply with the height in relation to boundary standard for the General Residential Zone; and d. compliance is achieved with:i. NU-S4; andii. NU-S5.All zones 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionaryWhere:a. Compliance is not achieved with ENG-R9(1).Matters of discretion:1. The functional need and operational need of, and benefits from, the battery energy storage system, including the potential impact on the supply and security of renewable electricity.2. The bulk, height, location, and design of the battery energy storage system, including any associated buildings or structures.3. The amenity values of the respective zone and the extent to which any adverse visual amenity effects can be avoided, remedied, or mitigated, including:i. any innovative design that integrates the battery energy storage system within the site, existing built form and/or landscape in a way that assists to maintain the character and amenity of the surrounding area; and ii. whether the use of landscaping and/ or recessive colours and finishes can assist to mitigate any adverse effects. 4. Whether the works may result in public health and/or safety risks.5. The effects</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | of non-compliance with any relevant rule or standard.6. The location of the battery energy storage system, including the need for connections to existing networks and services.7. Effects on the areas of outstanding natural features and landscapes, waterbodies, indigenous vegetation, historic heritage, and sites and areas of significance to Māori. 8. The local, regional and national benefits of energy storage systems as part of the electricity supply system. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P2 | S81.027 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Oppose in part | Considers that the terms "visually encroached upon by inappropriate activities" and "in proximity to" have vague and uncertain meanings and would be difficult to implement given that different opinions could be held by different parties considering the same proposal. Considers that these phrases should be deleted from the policy or amended to make them more certain. Also considers that the requirement for activities "to maintain the values of a site can be interpreted in different way and should be clarified to mean that an activity should not be established or undertaken in a manner that degrades the values of a site of significance. | Amend Policy SASM-P2: ... a. ensuring sites and areas of significance to Māori are not modified, destroyed, and/or , removed, and/or visually encroached upon by inappropriate activities; b. requiring that activities on, or in proximity immediately adjacent to sites and areas of significance to Māori to be undertaken in a way that maintains the site or area's cultural, spiritual, and historical values, interests, or associations of importance to tangata whenua; ... |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P3 | S81.028 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Oppose in part | Considers that the term "in proximity to" has a vague and uncertain meaning and should be deleted from the policy to ensure consistency with the policy heading (which is within sites and areas of significance to Māori) and the relevant Rule SASM-R3. | Amend Policy SASM-P3: ...b. Other earthworks within on, or in proximity to sites and areas of significance to Māori only where it can be demonstrated that the identified values will be protected, |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | having regard to... |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P4 | S81.029 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Oppose in part | Considers that the term "in proximity to" has a vague and uncertain meaning and should be deleted from the policy to ensure consistency with the policy heading (which is within sites and areas of significance to Māori) and the relevant Rules SASM-R2 to SASM-R7. | Amend Policy SASM-P4: Allow the following activities to occur within on, or in proximity to sites and areas of significance to Māori, while ensuring their design, scale, and intensity will not compromise cultural, spiritual, and historical values, interests, or associations of importance to tangata whenua... |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P5 | S81.030 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Oppose in part | Consider that the term "in proximity to" has a vague and uncertain meaning and should be deleted from the policy. | Amend Policy SASM-P5: Only allow any other use and development on, or in proximity immediately adjacent to sites and areas of significance to Māori... |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P4 | S81.031 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support | Supports the approach where the operational or functional need is able to be appropriately considered while seeking to protect these significant areas as much as possible. | Retain Policy ECO-P4 as notified. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P5 | S81.032 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Oppose in part | As renewable electricity generation activities are located where the renewable energy resource is located, considers that the ability to undertake maintenance for renewable electricity generation activities should also be provided for by this policy. | Amend Policy ECO-P5: Enable the following activities relating to within habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna in the Wairarapa where they contribute to the protection, maintenance, and enhancement of the areas: ... b. maintenance of the safety and efficiency of network utilities and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | renewable electricity generation activities ; c. maintenance of existing access tracks for network utilities and renewable electricity generation activities... |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P6 | S81.033 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Oppose in part | Considers that the proposed hierarchy is inconsistent with the RMA where the ability to compensate for the effects is enshrined in section 104(1)(ab) of the RMA. In the New Zealand context, environmental compensation measures are known to have achieved significant positive outcomes. Accordingly, considers the proposed hierarchy in Policy ECO-P6 should be removed to avoid the policy unintentionally hindering the achievement of tangible positive outcomes for biodiversity. | Amend Policy ECO-P6: ... More than minor residual adverse effects on significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, outside the Coastal Environment, that cannot be avoided, remedied, or mitigated in accordance with clauses 1-3 above shall be offset, or if biodiversity offsetting cannot be reasonably achieved, shall be addressed through biodiversity offset or environmental compensation. |
| LIGHT - Light | LIGHT-P4 | S81.034 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support in part | Policy LIGHT-P4 (Role of artificial lighting), is to provide for "appropriate levels of artificial lighting to enable the safe and efficient undertaking of outdoor activities, including night time working, recreation, and entertainment". Large-scale renewable electricity generation activities such as wind farms require navigational warning lighting to be installed under Part 77 of the Civil Aviation Rules "objects and activities affecting navigable airspace", on structures that could constitute a hazard in navigable airspace. Considers that wind farm activities are, and are likely to continue to be a feature in the Wairarapa. Therefore, considers that Policy LIGHT-P4 should be amended to recognise the navigational safety requirement. | Amend Policy LIGHT-P4: Provide for appropriate levels of artificial lighting to enable the safe and efficient undertaking of outdoor activities, including night time working, recreation, renewable electricity generation activities and entertainment. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | Introduction | S81.035 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support in part | Considers that renewable electricity generation activities should be explicitly recognised as a likely feature of the General | Amend the General Rural Zone - Introduction: ... The General Rural Zone consists of areas used predominantly for primary production |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | Rural Zone, given: a. renewable electricity generation activities already occur within the Wairarapa; and b. the likelihood that further large-scale renewable electricity generation activities would be located within the General Rural Zone; and c. The need for development of renewable electricity generation activities in future as envisaged by the Strategic Direction in the Proposed District Plan. | activities, including intensive primary production. The Zone may also be used for a range of activities that support primary production activities, including associated rural industry, renewable electricity generation activities and other activities that require a rural location... |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O2 | S81.036 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support in part | Considers that given the likelihood that large-scale renewable electricity generation activities would be located within the General Rural Zone and the need for such activities in future, renewable electricity generation activities should be explicitly recognised as a likely feature of the General Rural Zone and that Objective GRUZ-O2 should be amended to include such activities alongside the other activities identified. | Amend Objective GRUZ-O2: ... e. the presence of renewable electricity generation activities , rural infrastructure, including rural roads, state highways and , the national grid; and f. the on-site disposal of wastewater, and a general lack of urban infrastructure, such as street lighting, solid fences, and footpaths. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O4 | S81.037 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Oppose | Concerned that while this objective provides for renewable electricity generation activities, such activities would be considered secondary to "primary production" activities. Considers that the phrase "where they are not incompatible with primary production activities" should be deleted from the policy. | Amend Objective GRUZ-O4: Primary production activities are enabled , and other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone are enabled where they are not incompatible with primary production activities. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O5 | S81.038 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support in part | Considers existing renewable electricity generation activities should also be appropriately protected from potential reverse sensitivity effects. | Amend Objective GRUZ-O5: Sensitive activities are designed and located to avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects and incompatibility with primary production, existing renewable electricity generation activities , other land uses activities and key transport corridors in |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | the General Rural Zone. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P1 | S81.039 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Oppose in part | Concerned that renewable electricity generation activities will be considered secondary to "primary production" activities. Considers that the phrase "that there are not incompatible with primary production" should not apply to renewable electricity generation activities and that "provide for" should be changed to "enable" with respect to these activities to recognise and provide for renewable electricity generation activities that presently exist and occur within the General Rural Zone. | Amend Policy GRUZ-P1: ... b. Enable renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone... |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P3 | S81.040 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support in part | Considers that given the likelihood that large-scale renewable electricity generation activities will be located within the General Rural Zone and the need for such activities in future, renewable electricity generation activities should be explicitly enabled under this policy to recognise their likely presence within the General Rural Zone and the importance of such activities. | Amend Policy GRUZ-P3: ... d. enabling renewable electricity generation activities... |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P6 | S81.041 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support in part | The protection of existing renewable electricity generation activities from reverse sensitivity effects should be explicitly provided for in Policy GRUZ-P6. | Amend Policy GRUZ-P6: ... a. avoiding the establishment of any new sensitive activity near existing intensive primary production, primary production activities, waste management facilities, quarrying activities, renewable electricity generation activities and rural industry in circumstances where the new sensitive activity may compromise the operation of the existing activities... |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P9 | S81.042 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support in part | Clause 3.9 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land provides for certain activities to occur where highly productive land is protected from inappropriate use and development. Clause 3.10 provides for exemptions for highly | Amend Policy GRUZ-P9: Avoid subdivision, use and development of highly productive land, except as provided for or otherwise exempted in the National Policy |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | productive land uses. Considers it likely that highly productive land will be suitable for development of renewable electricity generation activities within the Wairarapa. To clarify that the matters provided for in the NPS as well as the exemptions recognised in clause 3.10, considers that policy GRUZ-P9 should be amended to include reference to exemptions under clause 3.10. | Statement for Highly Productive Land. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O1 | S81.049 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Support in part | Considers that given the likelihood that large-scale renewable electricity generation activities would be located within the General Rural Zone and the need for such activities in future, renewable electricity generation activities should be explicitly recognised as a likely feature of the General Rural Zone. | Amend Objective GRUZ-O1: The General Rural Zone is used primarily for primary production, activities that support primary production, renewable electricity generation activities and other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S81.050 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Amend | "Maintenance" and "repair" are defined in relation to heritage buildings and items only, but these terms are italicised in the ENG chapter. Submission point refers to ENG-P6, ENG-R1, ENG-R2, ENG-R3, ENG-R4; and ENG-R5. | Amend the definition of Repair: Means, in relation to an identified heritage building or item, to improve the long-term condition of a heritage item, by using identical or closely similar materials to fix any damaged or decayed heritage fabric. This definition does not apply to the ENG - Energy Chapter. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R2 | S81.051 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Oppose | Rule NU-R2 identifies activities as being permitted where they comply with particular standards and non-complying where they do not comply with the standards. Considers Discretionary activity status better gives effect to objectives and policies (particularly in terms of recognising and providing for such activities), recognises that these activities can occur throughout the District, and enables benefits to be recognised while enabling consideration of effects. | Amend Rule NU-R2 to delete the Non-complying activity status and replace with a Discretionary activity status. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|----------|--|--|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R7 | S81.052 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Oppose | Rule NU-R7 identifies activities as being permitted where they comply with particular standards and non-complying where they do not comply with the standards. Considers Discretionary activity status better gives effect to objectives and policies (particularly in terms of recognising and providing for such activities), recognises that these activities can occur throughout the District, and enables benefits to be recognised while enabling consideration of effects. | Amend Rule NU-R7 to delete Non-complying activity status and replace with Discretionary activity status. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R8 | S81.053 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Oppose | Rule NU-R8 identifies activities as being permitted where they comply with particular standards and non-complying where they do not comply with the standards. Considers Discretionary activity status better gives effect to objectives and policies (particularly in terms of recognising and providing for such activities), recognises that these activities can occur throughout the District, and enables benefits to be recognised while enabling consideration of effects. | Amend Rule NU-R8 to delete Non-complying activity status and replace with Discretionary activity status. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R3 | S81.054 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Oppose | Rule NU-R3 identifies activities as being permitted or restricted discretionary where they comply with particular standards and non-complying where they do not comply with the standards. Considers Discretionary activity status better gives effect to objectives and policies (particularly in terms of recognising and providing for such activities), recognises that these activities can occur throughout the District, and enables benefits to be recognised while enabling consideration of effects. | Amend Rule NU-R3 to remove the Non-complying activity status and replace with Discretionary. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R4 | S81.055 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Oppose | Rule NU-R4 identifies activities as being permitted or restricted discretionary where they comply with particular standards and non-complying where they do not comply with the standards. Considers Discretionary activity status better gives effect to objectives and policies (particularly in terms of recognising and providing for such activities), | Amend Rule NU-R4 to delete Non-complying activity status and replace with Discretionary. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | recognises that these activities can occur throughout the District, and enables benefits to be recognised while enabling consideration of effects. | |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R5 | S81.056 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Oppose | Rule NU-R5 identifies activities as being permitted or restricted discretionary where they comply with particular standards and non-complying where they do not comply with the standards. Considers Discretionary activity status better gives effect to objectives and policies (particularly in terms of recognising and providing for such activities), recognises that these activities can occur throughout the District, and enables benefits to be recognised while enabling consideration of effects. | Amend Rule NU-R5 to delete Non-complying activity status and replace with Discretionary. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R9 | S81.057 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Oppose | Rule NU-R9 identifies activities as being permitted or restricted discretionary where they comply with particular standards and non-complying where they do not comply with the standards. Considers Discretionary activity status better gives effect to objectives and policies (particularly in terms of recognising and providing for such activities), recognises that these activities can occur throughout the District, and enables benefits to be recognised while enabling consideration of effects. | Amend Rule NU-R9 to delete Non-complying activity status and replace with Discretionary. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R10 | S81.058 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Oppose | Rule NU-R10 identifies activities as being permitted or restricted discretionary where they comply with particular standards and non-complying where they do not comply with the standards. Considers Discretionary activity status better gives effect to objectives and policies (particularly in terms of recognising and providing for such activities), recognises that these activities can occur throughout the District, and enables benefits to be recognised while enabling consideration of effects. | Amend Rule NU-R10 to delete Non-complying activity status and replace with Discretionary. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|---|---|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R11 | S81.059 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Oppose | Rule NU-R11 identifies activities as being permitted or restricted discretionary where they comply with particular standards and non-complying where they do not comply with the standards. Considers Discretionary activity status better gives effect to objectives and policies (particularly in terms of recognising and providing for such activities), recognises that these activities can occur throughout the District, and enables benefits to be recognised while enabling consideration of effects. | Amend Rule NU-R11 to delete Non-complying activity status and replace with Discretionary. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R15 | S81.060 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Oppose | Rule NU-R15 identifies activities as being permitted or restricted discretionary where they comply with particular standards and non-complying where they do not comply with the standards. Considers Discretionary activity status better gives effect to objectives and policies (particularly in terms of recognising and providing for such activities), recognises that these activities can occur throughout the District, and enables benefits to be recognised while enabling consideration of effects. | Amend Rule NU-R15 to delete Non-complying activity status and replace with Discretionary. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R16 | S81.061 | Genesis Energy Ltd | Oppose | Rule NU-R16 identifies activities as being restricted discretionary where they comply with particular standards and non-complying where they do not comply with the standards. Considers Discretionary activity status better gives effect to objectives and policies (particularly in terms of recognising and providing for such activities), recognises that these activities can occur throughout the District, and enables benefits to be recognised while enabling consideration of effects. | Amend Rule NU-R16 to delete Non-complying activity status and replace with Discretionary. |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S11.001 | Geoffrey Lush | Oppose in part | The property does not hold any historic value and many of the fixtures and features of the property are not original. Request to remove it from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings and Items. | Amend SCHED1 to delete the following item as follows: Hm0471 Tironui 35 Essex Street, Masterton (Lot 1 DP 18680) |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S8 | S117.001 | Geoffrey Roberts | Support in part | If the provided performance measures are met, buildings should still be permitted to be relocated and used as residential dwellings regardless of prior use. Examples being churches, halls and other public buildings. Submitter states there is no clear reason for this blanket prohibition and it arbitrarily restricts the ability to recycle and repurpose buildings that may otherwise be demolished. | Amend Standard GRUZ-S8 as follows: "GRUZ-S8 Relocatable Buildings ... 3. Previous Use. Any relocatable building intended for use as a residential unit or for visitor accommodation must have previously been designed, built and used as a residential unit or for visitor accommodation. ..." |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-O1 | S97.001 | Gollins Commercial Limited | Amend | The Wairarapa, specifically Masterton, lack retail areas and large available lots for retail complexes that require large stores and carparking areas. An extension of the Mixed Use Zone may allow for larger scale developments that could have numerous benefits for the local community. | Amend and extend the Mixed Use Zone to include an area of approximately nine hectares at the southern end of the present Waingawa Industrial Zone. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S94.001 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The submitter supports the approach that CDC has taken to structure planning this development area and taking an integrated approach to connecting to the existing town and delivering infrastructure. The submitter notes that this site is identified in the draft Future Development Strategy. Carterton Future Urban Zone is a large parcel (almost the size of the existing urban area) on LUC class 2 land. RPS Policy 59 contains direction to retain LUC classes 1 and 2, which a district plan review must give effect to. The operative RPS and RPS Change 1 both seek a compact regional form, and Policy 56 seeks consideration of whether greenfield development will, "result in a loss of productive capability of the rural area, including cumulative impacts that would | Amend Carterton FUZ extent to reduce size and focus on northern part with better connections and access to town centre. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | reduce the potential for food and other primary production". | |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S94.002 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Oppose | <p>Amend extent to reduce size considerably, or remove Future Urban Zone. The submitter supports that SWDC has undertaken a spatial planning approach to inform the Proposed District Plan zoning.</p> <p>The submitter raises concerns that proposed the Future Urban Zone is a significant portion of land and on LUC class 1 and 2 land. RPS Policy 59 contains direction to retain LUC classes 1 and 2, which a district plan review must give effect to. The operative RPS and RPS Change 1 both seek a compact regional form, and Policy 56 seeks consideration of whether greenfield development will, "result in a loss of productive capability of the rural area, including cumulative impacts that would reduce the potential for food and other primary production".</p> <p>The nearby Woodside Railway Station is connected to the existing town centre by bus (Route 204) and bike trail. Operative RPS Policy 56 seeks that greenfield development's 'location, design or density will minimise demand for non-renewable energy resources'. There is also considerable direction in RPS Change 1 on reducing transport emissions.</p> <p>The extent of this zone should therefore either be considerably reduced or removed entirely to give effect to the RPS.</p> | Amend FUZ extent to reduce size considerably, or delete. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S94.003 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Oppose | <p>The submitter supports that SWDC has undertaken a spatial planning approach to inform the Proposed District Plan zoning.</p> <p>However, the submitter raises concerns that proposed the Future Urban Zones are on</p> | Amend FUZ extent to reduce size considerably, or delete. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>LUC class 3 land. The operative RPS and RPS Change 1 both seek a compact regional form, and Policy 56 seeks consideration of whether greenfield development will, "result in a loss of productive capability of the rural area, including cumulative impacts that would reduce the potential for food and other primary production".</p> <p>The existing urban area of Martinborough has a Low Density Residential Precinct applied, which signals that intensification within the existing urban area is not supported. In this context, we do not consider the need to zone such extensive areas of LUC class 3 land to meet demand is justified, particularly when density is being constrained in the existing urban area.</p> <p>There is also considerable direction in RPS Change 1 on reducing transport emissions. The extent of this zone should therefore either be considerably reduced or removed entirely to give effect to the RPS.</p> | |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S94.004 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Oppose | <p>The western Future Urban Zone is on LUC class 2 land, while the area by Cashmere Oaks is LUC class 3 land. There are also a few pockets of land being zoned to residential, including a site by Old Orchard Road, which is LUC class 3 land.</p> <p>The submitter notes these areas have not been identified for future urban development (as discussed by the Future Urban Zones Section 32 report), and so are subject to the interim requirements in NPS-HPL clause 3.5(7), including the direction to avoid subdivision and zoning to urban zones.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the General Residential Zone chapter does not adequately promote intensification and infill, and that the</p> | Amend or delete the Future Urban Zone. This approach may not be necessary (or the only practicable option) to provide sufficient development capacity, given the potential for greater intensification in the existing urban area. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | Medium Density Residential Precinct could be applied more widely across Masterton. | |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S94.005 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the efforts to provide for intensification through the medium density residential precinct in Masterton. The submitter notes that a lot of this area overlaps with the flood hazard mapping, so in reality there may be a limit to how much the densities in this area will be permitted to increase by the natural hazards rule framework of the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>The submitter seeks that a risk-based approach to natural hazards is taken, and therefore seek that other suitable locations in Masterton are also identified for the medium density residential precinct. MDC is required to give effect to the objectives and policies of the NPS-UD, including to enable heights and densities in appropriate locations according to Policy 5 of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>RPS Change 1 seeks an emphasis on intensification and reductions in transport emissions, and this direction applies to the Wairarapa towns. Featherston, Carterton and other parts of Masterton have good access to the train network in close proximity to town centres, rapid population growth, and changing demographics seeking smaller homes, which make them appropriate for higher densities in suitable areas.</p> <p>The S32 report (page 67) states that the medium density residential precinct was not expanded to Carterton due to its additional complexity in the rule framework without much benefit. The submitter does not feel this is adequate justification for why greater intensification has not been enabled in suitable parts of Carterton.</p> | <p>Amend to identify areas in central Carterton and Featherston suitable for intensification, and extend the Medium Density Residential Precinct to cover these areas.</p> <p>See original submission (Attachment 2) with suggestions of potentially suitable locations for the medium density residential precinct in Masterton and Carterton. Support the Featherston masterplan which identifies suitable areas for medium density.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | The submitter acknowledges that the Featherston master planning process is underway, however maintain their view that the medium density precinct should also apply in Featherston. | |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S94.006 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Oppose | <p>The submitter notes that the Low Density Residential Precinct is justified in two different ways in the Section 32 report; to manage infrastructure servicing constraints, and to maintain the low density character values of Greytown, Martinborough and parts of Masterton. The submitter notes that character is distinct from heritage; and if the Councils consider that heritage protections or character precinct provisions are necessary, this should be done through alternative and less all encompassing means.</p> <p>Applying a low density residential precinct is not the most effective and efficient way to manage infrastructure servicing constraints; the rule frameworks in the subdivision and zones chapters should manage this. The proposed approach artificially constrains the potential for existing urban areas to be able to respond to demand for housing and business demand where infrastructure capacity can be provided in a coordinated, safe and efficient way.</p> | Amend to consider whether all of Greytown and Martinborough's existing towns qualify for a low density residential precinct, and considerably reduce the extents in Martinborough, Greytown and Masterton. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S94.007 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Oppose | Seeks that rural expansion is carefully managed to appropriately protect highly productive land, the viability and vibrancy of existing centres, and to contribute to urban areas that are well-functioning. Generally, the submitter does not support extensive new rural lifestyle development and would prefer greater emphasis on intensifying existing urban areas where existing infrastructure capacity is available and can be used efficiently. | Amend RLZ extent to exclude highly productive land, or delete entirely. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>Submitter does not support the extensive new rural lifestyle zoning proposed north-east of Masterton. It is unclear why this zoning is necessary, and it appears to be inconsistent with the Proposed District Plan's broader direction to limit the impacts of rural lifestyle zoning, including direction in RE-O5.</p> <p>Most of the proposed extent is LUC class 3 land and is therefore subject to the interim requirements in NPS-HPL clause 3.5(7), including the direction to avoid rural lifestyle zones. The only exemptions provided for rural lifestyle zoning under clause 3.7 of the NPS-HPL relates to permanent or long-term constraints of land. The submitter could not find any justification of the zoning of this land under NPS-HPL clause 3.10 in Section 32 reports.</p> <p>The rural lifestyle zone also extends within the Masterton groundwater community drinking protection area. On-site wastewater systems within this area require a regional resource consent.</p> | |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S94.008 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Oppose | <p>The submitter notes the Proposed District Plan has zoned significant areas of land north-east (near Mole Street) and west (near Market Road) of SH2 to General Residential. The land to the west is LUC class 1 land and some parts are still operating as an orchard. The land to the east is LUC class 2 land. Please refer to submission point on the Greytown Future Urban Zone for the relevant RPS direction on this matter.</p> | Amend to consider whether the new residential zoning of LUC class 1 and 2 land is appropriate, and whether greater intensification could be enabled within the existing urban area. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S94.009 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Oppose | <p>New residential zoning to west of Carterton. The submitter notes that this site is flood prone, with parts of the western side of the site being within high hazard areas. Retaining the rural zoning may deter residential development within these high hazard areas.</p> | Amend to consider whether this zoning is appropriate for residential land uses, and whether retaining the rural zoning would address the Mangatarere Stream flood hazard. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Planning Maps | Zones | S94.010 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Submitter does not support the extensive urban zoning of LUC class 1 land. | Amend to be consistent with submission points on the new Greytown development areas and Low Density Residential Precinct. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S94.011 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Amend | GWRC-Rough Hill Forest- Current zoning is General Rural, but the land is managed for conservation (including soil) and future recreation purposes. | Amend zoning to Natural Open Space. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S94.012 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Amend | GWRC-Stoney Creek Forest- Current zoning is General Rural, but the land is managed for conservation (including soil) and future recreation purposes. | Amend zoning to Natural Open Space. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S94.013 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Amend | GWRC-Tauanui Forest - Current zoning is General Rural, but the land is managed for conservation (including soil) and future recreation purposes. | Amend zoning to Natural Open Space. |
| Planning Maps | Hazards and Risks | S94.014 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The submitter supports the inclusion of flood hazard maps into the Combined District Plan noting a minor modelling error in the Waiohine flood hazard model used to inform the flood hazard mapping, as shown in Attachment 3 of the full submission. | Amend the flood hazard maps to delete the small area shown in Attachment 3. The submitter has provided an updated flood hazard map with original submission. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S94.015 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Suggest adding a definition for 'biodiversity mitigation' to the plan that aligns with the definition provided in the NRP (See NRP Schedule G1). This would support the submitters suggested amendments to ECO-P4 and ECO-P6. | Insert definition for Biodiversity mitigation: Mitigation is the abatement (lessening or repair) of the adverse effects of an activity, undertaken in direct response to, and at the same location as, that activity, designed and implemented in accordance with principles set out in Appendix X |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S94.016 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The submitter requests that this is aligned with the definitions and principles set out in the NPS-IB to ensure indigenous biodiversity values are sufficiently protected. | Definition of 'Biodiversity offset' Amend to have the same meaning as in the NPS-IB, including with regards to the following matters: The 'no net loss' principle should be amended to align with the NPS-IB principle of 'net gain'. 'Limits to offsetting' principle - have regard to aligning with the proposed RPS Change 1 |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | version which includes a new appendix (1A) identifying ecosystems and species which are not appropriate for offset or compensation measures. 'Proximity' should align with the NPS-IB principle of 'landscape context' which takes into account the context of the impact and offset sites and ecological interactions. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S94.017 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Definition of 'Environmental compensation' should be aligned with the definitions and principles set out in the NPS-IB to ensure indigenous biodiversity values are sufficiently protected. Of particular concern is that the definition does not consider limits to compensation or where compensation is not appropriate. This essentially could allow for any form of compensation to occur without restriction or consideration of irreplaceability/vulnerability of indigenous biodiversity or where effects or proposed compensation measures are not well-understood. | Amend to have the same meaning as in the NPS-IBs: Should refer to 'biodiversity compensation' rather than 'environmental compensation'. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S94.018 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Definition of 'Hazard Areas'. The submitter supports identifying hazard areas in the district plan, and to use a hierarchy to assign the areas into high hazard, moderate hazard, or low hazard areas. This definition should refer to Table NH-1 in the Natural Hazards chapter, as this table clarifies what is meant by high hazard areas, moderate hazard areas and low hazard areas. | Amend to include reference to Table NH-1 OR Insert definitions for high hazard areas, moderate hazard areas, and low hazard areas to the definitions section. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S94.019 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | It is important to identify activities which are sensitive to hazards. The list of activities within the definition is considered appropriate. | Retain as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S94.020 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Definition of 'Natural hazard' The definition provided in the Proposed Plan is appropriate as it refers to the definition in the RMA. | Retain as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S94.021 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | A definition of water sensitive urban design would be useful in interpreting the Three Waters provisions. Recommend the Natural Resources Plan definition of the term. | Insert a new definition as follows: Water sensitive urban design The integration of planning, engineering design and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | water management to mimic or restore natural hydrological processes in order to address the quantitative and qualitative impacts of land use and development on land, water and biodiversity, and the community's aesthetic and recreational enjoyment of waterways and the coast. Water sensitive urban design manages stormwater at its source as one of the tools to control runoff and water quality. The terms low impact design, low impact urban design and water sensitive design are often used synonymously with water sensitive urban design. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S94.022 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | A definition of hydraulic neutrality would be useful in interpreting the Three Waters provisions. | Insert a new definition as follows: Hydraulic neutrality Managing stormwater runoff from subdivision, use and development through either on-site disposal or storage, so that peak stormwater flows and volumes are released from the site at a rate that does not exceed the modelled peak flows and volumes from the site in an undeveloped state. |
| Strategic Direction | CCR-O1 | S94.023 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | It is appropriate to include strategic direction on the management of climate change and resilience, including providing for planning for adaptation and mitigation measures. | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Strategic Direction | CCR-O2 | S94.024 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | <p>RPS Change 1 seeks for subdivision, use and development to actively provide for climate resilience, including recognising the role of the natural environment in both climate change mitigation and adaptation. Strategic climate change direction in the Combined District Plan should therefore recognise the relationship between the natural environment and climate change.</p> <p>The submitter seeks that CCR-O2 is amended to provide for this direction; we have sought similar wording to the Wellington City Proposed District Plan (and retained in the relevant Section 42A report).</p> | Amend as follows: The Wairarapa is resilient, adapts to the effects of climate change, supports natural functioning ecosystems and processes to help build resilience into the natural and built environments , and recognises the opportunities and risks associated with those effects. |
| Strategic Direction | CCR-O3 | S94.025 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Although this strategic direction objective discusses natural hazards more generally than just flood hazards, the wording of this objective is acceptable. In particular, GW supports the wording that the risk and consequence of natural hazards, including flood hazards "are not increased". | Retain as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | CCR-O4 | S94.026 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The submitter supports this objective. Water resilience is a critical issue for Wairarapa and this objective complements the regional plan provisions aiming to improve water resilience. | Retain as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | NE-O1 | S94.027 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Restoring the mauri of Wairarapa Moana is a key focus of the Ruamāhanga Whaitua Implementation Programme. | Retain as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | NE-O5 | S94.028 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | This objective does not fully cover the domains in clause 3.5 of the NPS-FM 2020 and so does not give full effect to that clause. Amendments are needed to properly reflect the domains named in clause 3.5. | Amend as follows: Land and water Freshwater, land, water bodies, ecosystems, and receiving environments are managed using an integrated approach, in collaboration with tangata whenua, the community, and other government entities |
| Strategic Direction | New provision request | S94.029 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Amend | These objectives do not reflect the hierarchy in clause 2.1 of the NPS-FM 2020. A new | Insert new objective NE-O7 as follows: Development, use, and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | objective is needed to give effect to the Part 2.1. | subdivision of land in the Wairarapa is managed in a way that prioritises: 1. first, the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems 2. second, the health needs of people 3. third, the ability of people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, now and in the future. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O2 | S94.030 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The submitter generally supports the intent of this objective in giving effect to the NPS-HPL, because the extent of the General Rural Zone will change over time, we consider the wording of this objective should be amended to refer to 'rural land' instead of the General Rural Zone. | Amend to: Rural land The General Rural Zone remains available for primary production activities and productive capacity is protected. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O3 | S94.031 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Wording aligns with the NPS-HPL. | Retain as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O5 | S94.032 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Given the clear direction on avoiding rezoning to rural lifestyle in Policy 6 of the NPS-HPL we consider that this provision should include explicit reference to highly productive land, which is not synonymous with the productive capacity of land. In addition, this objective should be amended for consistency with the NPS-FM. | Amend to: Opportunities for rural lifestyle subdivision and development are only provided in parts of the rural environment where they avoid rezoning and development of highly productive land , do not conflict with enabling primary production and protecting the productive capacity of land, and protect the health and wellbeing of freshwater ecosystems and receiving environments. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O1 | S94.033 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | This is a useful articulation of the Wairarapa's urban form which we support. Given the fact that Masterton must give effect to the NPS- | Amend to: Wairarapa's urban form is a series of well-functioning , connected urban areas located along the main transport |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>UD as an urban environment, we suggest including mention of Masterton's role as an urban environment.</p> <p>Reference to the urban areas being well-functioning should be added for consistency with NPS-UD terminology, as well as with RPS Change 1. The submitter considers that the characteristics of a well-functioning urban environment, as articulated by NPS-UD Policy 1, are relevant to all urban areas in the Wairarapa. As a combined district plan, NPS-UD direction is appropriate to apply in the context of urban form and development.</p> | <p>routes which each support a local community, with the Masterton urban environment functioning as the largest urban centre.</p> |
| <p>Strategic Direction</p> | <p>UFD-O2</p> | <p>S94.034</p> | <p>Greater Wellington Regional Council</p> | <p>Support in part</p> | <p>The submitter notes that Masterton must give effect to the NPS-UD as a tier 3 local authority and considers that the strategic direction objectives should refer to NPS-UD direction and terminology in objectives. The submitter also seeks alignment with RPS Objective 22 to achieve compact and well-designed regional form.</p> <p>As a combined district plan, NPS-UD direction is appropriate to apply in the context of urban form and development.</p> <p>A reference to the NPS-HPL objective would be useful in this objective, given its direction relevance to urban growth. We also question whether the locations and scales of the Proposed Future Urban Zones, as well as provisions in the General Residential Zone, adequately contribute to UFD-O2, particularly point 2.</p> <p>The submitter has requested stronger provisions to facilitate infill and greater densities around existing train stations and town centres.</p> | <p>Amend to: UFD-O2 Urban growth The Wairarapa's urban areas grow in a planned, efficient, compact, and structured way to meet future needs in a responsive manner that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. provides for a variety of housing types that respond to a range of community needs; 2. enables greater densities of development in areas with sufficient infrastructure capacity and located close to centres, services, open spaces and/or public transport; 3. is compatible with the character and amenity of the urban areas, recognising that amenity values change over time; and 4. improves housing affordability; and 5. protects the productive capacity of rural land; and 6. support reductions in transport-related greenhouse gas |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | emissions. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O3 | S94.035 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The submitter seeks amendments for greater consistency with the NPS-UD and RPS Change 1. The current title of this objective should be consistent with the wording of the objective, which is related to development capacity. | Amend policy: UFD-O3 Urban development capacity land supply There is sufficient development capacity to meet the Wairarapa's housing, commercial, industrial, educational, and recreational needs now and into the future, including housing affordability and choice. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O4 | S94.036 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The submitter seeks amendments for greater consistency with RPS Change 1 Policy 58. | Amend as follows:Urban growth and development is sequenced and integrated with the efficient provision, including the timing and funding, of infrastructure, schools, and open spaces. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O5 | S94.037 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The submitter generally supports this policy as it is consistent with the RPS direction on centres, but does suggest amendments to align with RPS Change 1 (e.g. Policy CC.1) direction and the NPS-UD. | Amend as follows:The Wairarapa contains vibrant and viable town centres that are the location for shopping, leisure, cultural, entertainment, and social interaction experiences, support safe use of active and sustainable transport modes , and provide for the community's employment and economic needs. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O6 | S94.038 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Consistent with RPS direction on supporting viable and vibrant centres. | Retain as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | New provision request | S94.039 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Amend | Insert new objective to reflect NPS-UD Policy 1(c) and RPS Change direction. Direction on integrating transport and urban development is currently missing from the strategic direction objectives, and this would | Insert new objective: UFD-O7 Connectivity Wairarapa residents have safe, multi-modal access between housing, employment, services, amenities, green |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | complement direction in the transport chapter as well as that in specific zones. | space, and local centres, preferably using active and sustainable transport modes. |
| Strategic Direction | INF-O1 | S94.040 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Amend | This reads as three different objectives, and it would be clearer split out. There should also be reference to the efficient use of existing infrastructure, as sought by operative RPS Objective 22 clause (k). | Amend to split into three different objectives: 1. The benefits of infrastructure are recognised and existing infrastructure is used efficiently. 2. The and adverse effects of infrastructure are well managed. 3. Infrastructure is protected from incompatible land use, subdivision and development, including reverse sensitivity effects. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S94.041 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Amend | <p>Clause 3.5(4) of the NPS-FM 2020 requires that "every territorial authority must include objectives, policies, and methods in its district plan to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments".</p> <p>While the Wairarapa Combined District Plan does have some excellent provisions in this area (standards in the zone chapters, for instance), the suite of provisions is not broad enough to give effect to this clause of the NPS-FM 2020. This could be addressed by inserting a new Three Waters chapter that contains direction for the promoting positive effects and avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects of urban development on water in relation to three waters infrastructure, by including objectives, policies and rules which help to achieve these outcomes and</p> | Insert a new Three Waters chapter into part 2. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>contribute towards Te Mana o te Wai.</p> <p>This approach has already been taken in this region by Wellington City Council and Porirua City Council in the most recent iterations of their district plans.</p> <p>Specific relief in terms of provisions are below.</p> | |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S94.042 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Amend | <p>As part of giving effect to Clause 3.5(4) of the NPS-FM 2020, an objective that focuses on protecting water bodies and freshwater ecosystems should be inserted.</p> | <p>Insert a new objective as follows: THW-01 Protecting water bodies and freshwater ecosystems Subdivision and development promotes positive effects, and avoids, remedies, or mitigates adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development and rural lifestyle development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments.</p> |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S94.043 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Amend | <p>SUB-O2 provides good direction on ensuring development is connected to three waters infrastructure, so it makes sense to move this objective to a new Three Waters chapter.</p> | <p>Amend by moving SUB-O2 from the subdivision chapter to the new Three Waters chapter as follows: THW-02 Infrastructure-enabled development Subdivision and developments are serviced to provide for the likely or anticipated use of the land while avoiding, remedying, or mitigating adverse effects on the environment by ensuring:</p> <p>(a) subdivisions within the urban boundary connect to reticulated water and wastewater services (and reticulated stormwater services where they are available or provide for on-site</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | | stormwater disposal) with sufficient capacity to accommodate proposed or anticipated development; and (b) subdivisions in Rural Zones are capable of being serviced via on-site water, wastewater, and stormwater measures when development occurs on the site. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S94.044 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Amend | Reducing stormwater runoff through achieving hydraulic neutrality is one means of reducing contamination of surface waterbodies to implement the NPS-FM, and so should be inserted as an objective. | Insert a new objective as follows: THW-O3 Hydraulic neutralityThere is no increase in offsite stormwater peak flows and volumes as a result of subdivision and development in Residential Zones, commercial and Mixed use Zones, and the Rural Lifestyle Zone. |
| Whole Plan | | S94.045 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Amend | One means of protecting water bodies and freshwater ecosystems from the adverse effects of development is through the use of water sensitive urban design, so a policy encouraging its use could be inserted to help implement THW-O1 as sought by this submission. | Insert a new policy as follows: THW-P1 Water sensitive urban designRequire new subdivision and development in Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed use Zones, Industrial Zones, and the Rural Lifestyle Zone to incorporate water sensitive design methods and to be designed, constructed, and maintained to: a. Improve the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems; b. Avoid or mitigate off-site effects from surface water runoff; and c. Be in accordance with available guidance and best practice solutions for the management |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | | of stormwater quality and quantity from the subdivision or development at the time. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S94.046 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Amend | One means of protecting water bodies and freshwater ecosystems from the adverse effects of development is through achieving hydraulic neutrality, so a policy encouraging its use could be inserted to help implement THW-O1 and THW-O3 as sought by this submission. | Insert a new policy as follows: THW-P2 Hydraulic neutrality Ensure that urban development is designed, constructed, and maintained to achieve hydraulic neutrality. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S94.047 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Amend | One means of protecting water bodies and freshwater ecosystems from the adverse effects of development is through appropriate locating and design of urban development, so a policy encouraging this could be inserted to help implement THW-O1 as sought by this submission. | Insert a new policy as follows: THW-P3 Protection of waterbodies Ensure that urban development is located and designed to protect and enhance freshwater and receiving environments, including rivers, lakes, wetlands, springs, riparian margins, and estuaries. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S94.048 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Amend | Certain heavy metals used in construction that are washed into freshwater bodies in stormwater is an area that territorial authorities can control, so policy direction on this should be inserted for consistency with RPS Change 1 (Policy FW.3) and NPS-FM clause 3.5(4). | Insert a new policy as follows: THW-P4 Building materials Avoid the use of exposed copper and zinc as an exterior building product unless: a. The copper or zinc product is treated or finished in a manner that prevents the release of copper or zinc into water; orb. The stormwater is treated on-site to remove any copper or zinc from the stormwater prior to discharging into the three waters stormwater network. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S94.049 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Amend | New policy direction to ensure appropriate three waters servicing across zones would be useful to support the three waters objectives sought in our submission. | Insert a new policy as follows: THW-P5 Three waters infrastructure servicing Require that all new |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------|--|--------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>subdivision and buildings are serviced by three waters infrastructure by: a. ensuring that subdivision and buildings inside or adjacent to the urban boundary are connected to reticulated water supply and wastewater services that have sufficient capacity to accommodate the development and are in position prior to the commencement of construction; and b. ensuring that subdivision and buildings outside the urban boundary are on allotments of a sufficient size and shape with appropriate soil conditions to accommodate on-site wastewater, stormwater, and water supply infrastructure, and that there is sufficient water supply capacity for firefighting purposes</p> |
| <p>Whole Plan</p> | <p>Whole Plan</p> | <p>S94.050</p> | <p>Greater Wellington Regional Council</p> | <p>Amend</p> | <p>This rule would implement THW-P1 as sought by our submission and support consistency with RPS Change 1.</p> | <p>Insert a new rule for all zones as follows:THW-R1 Use of water sensitive urban design in development 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The development is for no more than three residential units. 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. The development is for: i. four or more residential units, or ii. a retirement village, or iii. a non-residential building (excluding accessory buildings),</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | | <p>or iv. a subdivision that creates four or more allotments.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design, location, efficiency and effectiveness of water sensitive urban design methods; 2. Ownership, maintenance and operation arrangements for the water sensitive urban design methods from the site; 3. The level of hydraulic neutrality achieved by the water sensitive urban design methods; 4. Any site constraints that may prevent water sensitive urban design methods from be constructed on the site; 5. Any wider public water sensitive urban design treatment devices that the stormwater from the site may discharge into, thereby providing treatment prior to discharging into a water body; and 6. The matters set out in Policies THW-P1, THW-P2, and THW-P3. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S94.051 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Amend | This rule would implement THW-P2 as sought by our submission and support consistency with RPS Change 1. | <p>Insert a new rule for all zones as follows: THW-R2 Use of hydraulic neutrality in new development</p> <p>Activity status: Permitted Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The development is for no more than three residential units. 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. The development is for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. four or more |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | | <p>residential units, or ii. a retirement village, or iii. a non-residential building (excluding accessory buildings), or iv. a subdivision that creates four or more allotments. Matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The extent to which the development incorporates stormwater management techniques or controls to mitigate any increase in pre-development peak stormwater runoff; 2. Design, location, efficiency and effectiveness of measures to manage peak stormwater flows and volumes; 3. Ownership, maintenance and operation arrangements of any measures to reduce stormwater runoff from the site; 4. Any changes in off-site flood extents and depths from not achieving hydraulic neutrality; and 5. Any site constraints that may prevent hydraulic neutrality from be achieved on the site. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S94.052 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Amend | This rule would implement THW-P3 as sought by our submission and support consistency with RPS Change 1. | <p>Insert a new rule for all zones as follows:THW-R3 Proximity of new development to surface waterbodies</p> <p>Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The development is located more than 5m from any surface waterbody or more than 25 from any significant waterbody. <p>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Where:</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------|--|--------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>a. Compliance is not achieved with THW-R3(1). Matters of discretion are: 1. The distance of the setback from any surface waterbodies;2. The use of water sensitive urban design methods to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects on surface water bodies;3. The level of hydraulic neutrality achieved by the water sensitive urban design methods.</p> |
| <p>Whole Plan</p> | <p>Whole Plan</p> | <p>S94.053</p> | <p>Greater Wellington Regional Council</p> | <p>Amend</p> | <p>This rule would implement THW-P4 as sought by our submission and support consistency with RPS Change 1.</p> | <p>Insert a new rule for all zones as follows:THW-R4 Use of copper and zinc building materials1. Activity status: PermittedWhere: a. Any copper or zinc surfaces in external building materials (including roofing, guttering, spouting and cladding) are:i. sealed, painted, or finished in a manner that prevents the copper or zinc surfaces from being directly exposed to rainfall; orii. contained in stormwater that is treated on-site to remove any copper or zinc from the stormwater prior to discharging into the three waters stormwater network.2. Activity status: Restricted DiscretionaryWhere: a. The requirements of THW-R3.1 are not met.Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters set out in THW-P1 and THW-P4.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S94.054 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Amend | This rule would implement THW-P5 as sought by our submission. | <p>Insert a new rule as follows:THW-R5 New buildings (except accessory buildings), conversions of existing buildings and new allotments</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The building or allotment is connected to municipal three waters infrastructure for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Wastewater disposal; and ii. Drinking water supply; and iii. Stormwater management <p>2. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The building or allotment is served by on-site systems for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. wastewater disposal; and ii. drinking water supply; and iii. stormwater management. <p>3. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of THWR5.1 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: The matters set out in THW-P1, THW-P2, and THWP3.</p> <p>4. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Compliance with any of the requirements of THWR5.2 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: The matters set out in THW-P1, THW-P2, and THWP3. Note on relief sought: THW-R5.1 and R5.3 are intended to apply to Residential Zones, |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones, Open Space and Recreation Zones, and Special Purpose Zones, while THW-R5.2 and R5.4 are intended to apply to Rural Zones. |
| TR - Transport | TR-O1 | S94.055 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The submitter supports this direction and the emphasis on safe accessible opportunities for low and zero carbon transport modes. Questions the extent to which the rule framework and standards, including those in the residential and centre zones, will contribute to achieving TR-O1. | Retain as notified |
| TR - Transport | TR-P1 | S94.056 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | <p>The submitter generally supports this direction; but seeks an amendment for consistency with RPS Change 1 direction, which is stronger than promoting access to multi-modal transport options. RPS Change 1 also includes direction regarding the location of development and greater densities to minimise travel distances and efficiently use transport infrastructure, so we seek that this is added. TR-P1 should also explicitly refer to reductions in transport related greenhouse gas emissions to reflect the Emissions Reduction Plan (2022) and RPS Change 1.</p> <p>Beyond RPS Change 1, the submitter notes that operative Policy 57 seeks 'the provision of safe and attractive environments for walking and cycling' and 'connectivity with, or provision of access to, public services or activities, key centres of employment activity or retail activity, open spaces or recreational areas'. Objective 22 seeks an integrated, safe, and responsive transport network with efficient use of existing transport network infrastructure.</p> | Amend as follows: Support Provide for a multi-modal transport system that promotes supports reductions in transport related greenhouse gas emissions and alternative means of safe, efficient and effective transport through, including cycling, and walking and public transport facilities to enable people of all ages to move within the district and reduce the effects of vehicle-based transport systems by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. maximising safe and accessible opportunities for walking, cycling, and public transport use; b. requiring cycle parking as appropriate for the proposed use and end of trip cycle facilities where cycle parking is required to be provided; and c. seeking that development occurs in locations where safe and efficient use of transport infrastructure, including for |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | active and sustainable transport modes, is best provided for. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P2 | S94.057 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | This policy needs to be more direct about the need for the transport network to be improved to the use of public transport, walking, and cycling - consistent with Objective TR-O1 and consistent with national and regional policy direction in relation to travel choice, mode shift and emission reductions. | Insert new sub-clause: 'Promotes the use of public transport, walking and cycling through the provision of a safe, accessible and connected multimodal network' |
| TR - Transport | TR-P3 | S94.058 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The submitter is supportive of the application of the One Network Framework to identify and manage the classification of transport corridors within the Wairarapa - this will provide better national and regional consistency and will support more effective land use and transport integration by being clear about the role of a transport corridor within the wider transport network. | Retain as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P4 | S94.059 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The intent of this provision is supported but should be clearer about the need for on-site facilities to encourage and facilitate more trips to/from the site public transport, walking and cycling wherever possible. | Amend to separate out reference to pedestrian and cycle access and facilities into a second paragraph, with specific emphasis on requiring on site facilities to support the use of walking, cycling and public transport. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P7 | S94.060 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The requirement for high traffic generating activities to complete an Integrated Transport Assessment which includes an 'assessment of travel demand management mechanisms' is broadly consistent with the direction in RPS Change 1 Policy CC.2. TR-P7 should be amended (or similar relief) to include consideration and incorporation of efforts to maximise access to public and active transport options for consistency with Policy CC.2. The Councils may determine that 'high trip generating thresholds' will be used for the thresholds required by RPS Change 1 Policy CC.2. | Amend TR-P7 or equivalent relief to include requirement for a travel choice assessment, which includes consideration and incorporation of efforts to maximise access to public and active transport options, and support redistribution of demand from private cars to active and public transport modes. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| TR - Transport | TR-S16 | S94.061 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Oppose | <p>The submitter considers that the rule framework is complicated by separating carparking requirements by districts, which creates inconsistencies and undermines the intent of a combined district plan. Carterton and South Wairarapa would be the only two districts in the Wellington Region with minimum carparking requirements.</p> <p>Minimum car parking provision as part of new development can result in higher car ownership and incentivise more trips by private motor vehicle - contributing to growth in transport related greenhouse gas emissions. Removal of minimum car parking standards (except mobility parking) will allow flexibility for developers to consider how they best utilise site space, particularly where alternative forms of transport are available.</p> | Delete minimum carparking requirements for Carterton and South Wairarapa districts. Note with exception of mobility parking. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S23 | S94.062 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | <p>The requirement for a minimum number of cycle parking spaces supports regional goals for a multi-modal transport network, travel choice, mode shift and emission reduction.</p> <p>The matters for discretion include 'Cycle parking demand' - this is problematic as cycle demand for any new activity will be difficult to gauge and there may be latent/untapped demand based on current lack of good cycle parking facilities at similar sites/activities.</p> | Delete subclause: 2. Cycle parking demand. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S24 | S94.063 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | <p>The requirement for cycle parking to be designed to meet certain secure, safe, and accessible standards is important to ensure these meet minimum standards and support the uptake of more trips by bike. These standards could go further to reference best practice standards - see link provided - relating to cycle parking (e.g. visible, close to entrances, sheltered, well-lit etc.) to ensure the facilities provide a level of service that encourages more trips by bike.</p> | Amend as follows: Cycle parking facilities shall: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. be easily accessible for users; b. not impede pedestrian thoroughfares including areas used by people whose mobility or vision is restricted; and c. be clear of vehicle parking or maneuvering areas; and d. be designed with consideration to best practice |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | standards for cycle parking design and layout. Refer to: Cycling parking planning and design: Cycling Network Guidance technical note (Version 3, 9 December 2022) (nzta.govt.nz) |
| NH - Natural Hazards | Introduction | S94.064 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The submitter supports the inclusion of the flood hazard maps into the Combined District Plan. There is a minor error in the Waiohine flood hazard model used to inform the flood hazard mapping. The blue extent shown in Attachment 3 of the full submission is an error and should be removed. | Amend the flood hazard maps to delete the small area shown in Attachment 3. Submitter has provided an updated flood hazard map with original submission. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | Introduction | S94.066 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The introduction to this chapter discusses the risk-based approach to natural hazards. It is appropriate that the District Plan takes this risk-based approach. | Retain as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | Introduction | S94.067 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | It is important to define the hazard categories used in the District Plan, however these should also sit within the definitions section for ease of use. Alternatively, the definition of Hazard Areas could refer to Table NH-1, as suggested in feedback on this definition. | Insert Table NH-1 in the definitions chapter OR Amend the definition of Hazard Areas to refer to Table NH-1. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | Introduction | S94.068 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The inclusion of 'Flood hazard - river corridors' as a high hazard area is appropriate. | Retain as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | Introduction | S94.069 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The inclusion of 'Flood hazard - overland flow path' as a moderate hazard area is appropriate. | Retain as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | Introduction | S94.070 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The inclusion of 'Flood hazard - overland flow path' as a moderate hazard area is appropriate. | Retain as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | Introduction | S94.071 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Considers that Fault Avoidance Zones (FAZ's) (based on those mapped and identified by GNS science) should be included in Table NH-1 and that they be categorised on the basis of definition and recurrence intervals. This is more of risk-based approach in line with direction of the RPS natural hazards Policy 29. Agrees that Fault | Amend the name: Flood Alert Area to Flood Vulnerability Area Amend as follows: High hazard area Flood hazard - river corridors Fault hazard area - well defined and well defined extended FAZs with Recurrence Interval |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | Avoidance Areas (FAA's) should only be provided as information outside the plan. | (RI) classes I-IV (RI ≤10,000 years) Moderate hazard area Flood hazard - overland flow path Fault hazard area - uncertain constrained and distributed FAZs with (RI) class I-II (RI ≤3500 years) Low hazard area Flood hazard - ponding Possible liquefaction-prone area All other identified Fault Hazard Areas |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-O1 | S94.072 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Amend to recognise that hazard mitigation measures can act to reduce the risks from natural hazards. | Amend as follows: The risk and consequences from natural hazards on people, property, infrastructure, and the environment are reduced or not increased. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-O2 | S94.073 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The wording of this objective is generally consistent with the expectations of the submitter in respect to the use of natural features to reduce susceptibility to damage from natural hazards. Amend to recognise that a range of mitigation measures are available to reduce risk from natural hazards consistent with RPS Change 1. | Amend as follows: Natural features, nature-based solutions and hazard mitigation measures are used to reduce the susceptibility of people, communities, property, and infrastructure to damage from natural hazards. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P1 | S94.074 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The submitter supports a risk-based approach to manage subdivision, use, and development within the identified areas, specifically sensitivity to impacts and the hazard poses to lives and wellbeing. | Retain as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P2 | S94.075 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | This policy aims to avoid locating hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities within areas of high hazard unless | Retain as notified |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | there is an operational or functional need, which is acceptable. | |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P3 | S94.076 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | This policy aims to only allow hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities within areas of moderate hazard where the circumstances listed in the policy can be met, which is acceptable. | Retain as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P4 | S94.077 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | This policy aims to provide for hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities within areas of low hazard where mitigation is provided and the risk to other properties and activities is not increased, which is acceptable. | Retain as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P5 | S94.078 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Allowing for less hazard sensitive activities to occur within all hazard areas, where appropriate, is considered acceptable. The requirements listed in the policy are appropriate. | Retain as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P6 | S94.079 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Discouraging new buildings in the overland flow path and ponding areas is generally appropriate, where the requirements listed in the policy can be met. | Retain as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P8 | S94.080 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Infrastructure sometimes needs to be established in areas where a hazard is present. It is appropriate this is provided for, where there is an operational or functional need, is appropriately designed and significant adverse effects can be mitigated. | Retain as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P9 | S94.081 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | It is appropriate to provide for earthworks undertaken within flood hazard areas, where they do not impede flood pathways and the risk is not increased as a result of the activity. | Retain as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P10 | S94.082 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | <p>It is important to enable natural hazard mitigation works within hazard overlays when undertaken by relevant authorities, as these works significantly decrease the existing risk of these hazards to people's lives, wellbeing, property, and infrastructure.</p> <p>Amend to include direction to minimise impacts on the natural environment from hazard mitigation measures and consider the</p> | Amend and insert two new clauses: Enable natural hazard mitigation or stream and river management works provided: (a) works are undertaken by a statutory agency or their nominated contractors or agents within hazard areas where these will significantly decrease the existing risk to people's safety and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | use of a range of hazard mitigation measures including soft-engineering or nature-based solutions to give effect to direction in operative and proposed RPS Policy 52. | wellbeing, property, and infrastructure; (b) adverse effects on the natural environment are minimised, and; (c) the use of soft-engineering or nature-based solutions is considered where appropriate. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P11 | S94.083 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | It is appropriate to adopt a precautionary approach when planning for and adapting to the effects of natural hazards caused by climate change and sea level rise. | Retain as proposed |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P12 | S94.084 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Allowing for hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities to occur within flood alert areas, where appropriate, is considered acceptable. The requirements listed in the policy are appropriate. Please replace the name 'Flood Alert Area' with 'Flood Vulnerability Area'. This is to reduce any confusion that may arise around the possibility of emergency warning during an event. | Amend the name:Flood Alert Area to Flood Vulnerability Area |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P13 | S94.085 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Discouraging new buildings in flood alert areas is generally appropriate, where the requirements listed in the policy can be met. Please replace the name 'Flood Alert Area' with 'Flood Vulnerability Area'. This is to reduce any confusion that may arise around the possibility of emergency warning during an event. | Amend the name:Flood Alert Area to Flood Vulnerability Area |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R1 | S94.086 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | It is appropriate to provide for flood mitigation or stream or river management works within any of the flood hazard overlays as a permitted activity, where these works are undertaken by a statutory agency or their nominated agency. | Retain as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R2 | S94.087 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | It is appropriate to provide for less hazard sensitive activities within hazard areas as a permitted activity, where buildings are located outside of the identified overlays. The wording of this rule is generally consistent with the | Retain as notified |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | example contained within the draft Flood Hazard Planning Guidance document prepared by Greater Wellington. | |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R2 | S94.088 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | It is appropriate to require resource consent be obtained as a restricted discretionary activity where the requirements of the permitted activity rule NH-R2(1) are not met | Retain as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R2 | S94.089 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rule NH-R2(2) are considered appropriate as they refer back to the matters in Policy NH-P5. | Retain as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R3 | S94.090 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | For any potentially hazard sensitive activity and associated buildings within moderate hazard areas and low hazard areas, it is appropriate to require resource consent be obtained as a restricted discretionary activity where a building located in a flood hazard overlay has a finished floor level above the 1% AEP level. | Retain as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R2 | S94.091 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | It is appropriate to require that the finished floor level of any potentially hazard sensitive activity and associated buildings be above the 1% Flood AEP level where the building is located in a moderate or low hazard area. | Retain as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R3 | S94.092 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rule NH-R3(2) are considered appropriate as they refer back to the matters in Policy NH-P3 for activities in the moderate hazard area. | Retain as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R3 | S94.093 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rule NH-R3(2) are considered appropriate as they refer back to the matters in Policy NH-P4 for activities in the low hazard area. | Retain as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R3 | S94.094 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rule NH-R3(2) are considered appropriate as they refer back to the matters in Policy NH-P4 for activities in the low hazard area. | Retain as notified |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R4 | S94.095 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | It is appropriate to provide for additions to buildings within all hazard areas where the permitted activity conditions are met. Permitted conditions are proposed to ensure that additions to buildings within moderate hazard areas and high hazard areas are appropriately assessed | Amend as per requests against specific clauses listed below. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R4 | S94.096 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | It is appropriate to require, as a permitted activity condition, that additions to buildings do not increase the gross floor area of a hazard sensitive activity or potentially hazard sensitive activity by more than 20m ² . | Retain as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R4 | S94.097 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | It is appropriate to require, as a permitted activity condition, that the finished floor level of any addition to a building located within an identified ponding area of the flood hazard overlay, to be above the 1% Flood AEP level where the building is located in an inundation area. As an overland flowpath is identified as a moderate hazard area, it is not appropriate to provide for additions within these overlays as a permitted activity and instead, resource consent should be obtained. | Amend as follows: c. Any building additions located in the identified overland flowpath or ponding area of the flood hazard overlay have a finished floor level above the 1% AEP level. d. The additions are not located within a moderate hazard area / overland flow path area. e. The additions are not located within a high hazard area / river corridor. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R4 | S94.098 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | It is appropriate to require resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity where the additions to buildings within all hazard areas do not meet NH-R4(1). | Amend as follows: a. Compliance is not achieved with NH-R4(1)(a)-(d). |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R4 | S94.099 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Rule NH-R4(2)(1) The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rule NH-R4(2) are considered appropriate as they refer back to the matters in Policy NH-P3 for activities in the moderate hazard area. This is supported provided that the proposed additions to Rule NH-R4(1) are included. | Retain as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R4 | S94.100 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Rule NH-R4(2)(2) The proposed matters of discretion for | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | resource consents associated with Rule NH-R4(2) are considered appropriate as they refer back to the matters in Policy NH-P4 for activities in the low hazard area. | |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R4 | S94.101 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Oppose | <p>Rule NH-R4 (2) (3)</p> <p>The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rule NH-R4(2) are inappropriate for high hazard areas as they refer back to the matters in Policy NH-P2 for activities in the high hazard area. That policy seeks to "avoid locating hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities within high hazard areas unless the activity has an operational need or functional need to locate within the high hazard area". The restricted discretionary activity status is misleading as any additions to buildings for hazard sensitive activities or potentially hazard sensitive activities would not be able to meet the policy if there was no functional or operational need. For additions to buildings in the high hazard area which do not comply with the conditions under Rule NH-R4(1), the activity status should be amended to discretionary.</p> | <p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Delete: 3. For additions in the high hazard area, the matters in Policy NH-P2. Add new rule: 3. Activity status: Discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with NH-R4(1)(e).</p> |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R5 | S94.102 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | It is appropriate to provide for earthworks in flood hazard areas as a permitted activity where the permitted activity conditions are all met. | Retain as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R5 | S94.103 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | <p>NH-R5(1)(a)</p> <p>It is appropriate to provide for earthworks in flood hazard areas as a permitted activity where the earthworks are not located in a river corridor or overland flowpath.</p> | Retain as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R5 | S94.104 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | <p>NH-R5(1)(a)</p> <p>It is appropriate to require resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity where the earthworks in flood hazard areas do not meet NH-R5(1).</p> | Retain as notified |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R5 | S94.105 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | NH-R5(2)(1) The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rule NH-R5(2) are considered appropriate as they refer back to the matters in Policy NH-P9. | Retain as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R7 | S94.106 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The submitter supports the inclusion of this flood hazard information, please replace the name 'Flood Alert Area' with 'Flood Vulnerability Area'. This is to reduce any confusion that may arise around the possibility of emergency warning during an event | Amend the name:Flood Alert Area to Flood Vulnerability Area |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R7 | S94.107 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | NH-R7(1) Potentially hazard sensitive or hazard sensitive activities and buildings within flood alert area. It is appropriate to provide for new potentially hazard sensitive or hazard sensitive activities and associated buildings within flood vulnerability areas as a restricted discretionary activity. | Retain as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R7 | S94.108 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | NH-R7(1)(a) It is appropriate to require, as a restricted discretionary condition, a flood hazard assessment to determine the nature and scale of the flood hazard on the property. | Retain as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R7 | S94.109 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | It is appropriate to require, as a restricted discretionary condition, that the risk of flooding to people and property is not increased. It is important to clarify that this includes both the subject property and surrounding properties. | Amend as follows: b. The risk of flooding to people, and the property, and surrounding properties is not increased; |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R7 | S94.110 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | NH-R7(1)(c) It is appropriate to require, as a restricted discretionary condition, that the flood hazard is not worsened. | Retain as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R7 | S94.111 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rule NH-R7(1) are considered appropriate as they | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | include measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate flooding effects on the buildings and refer back to the matters in Policies NH-P12 and NH-P13 for buildings and activities in flood vulnerability areas. | |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R7 | S94.112 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | NH-R7(2) It is appropriate to require resource consent as a discretionary activity where new potentially hazard sensitive or hazard sensitive activities and associated buildings within flood alert areas do not meet NH-R7(1)(a), (b) or (c). | Retain as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R8 | S94.113 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | NH-R8(1)(a) It is appropriate to require resource consent for infrastructure within a low hazard area as a restricted discretionary activity. | Retain as notified |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R8 | S94.114 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | It is unclear whether infrastructure is considered to be a hazard sensitive, potentially hazard sensitive or less hazard sensitive activity. Based on the introductory text for the Natural Hazards chapter, infrastructure is not listed and therefore would be considered a less sensitive activity. However, the reference to Policy NH-P4 within the matters of discretion would indicate that it is not a less sensitive activity. The matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rule NH-R8(1) referring back to Policies NH-P8 and NH-P11 are appropriate. | Amend introductory text to clarify the hazard sensitivity of infrastructure and amend matters of discretion as necessary. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R2 | S94.115 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | NH-R8(2)(a) It is appropriate to require resource consent as a discretionary activity for infrastructure located within a moderate or high hazard area. | Retain as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R9 | S94.116 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | NH-R9(1) Hazard sensitive activities and associated buildings within moderate hazard and low | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | hazard areas. It is appropriate to require resource consent as a discretionary activity for any hazard sensitive activity and associated buildings within moderate hazard areas and low hazard areas. | |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R10 | S94.117 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | NH-R10(1) Hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities and associated buildings within high hazard areas. It is appropriate to require resource consent as a non-complying activity for any hazard sensitive activity or potentially hazard sensitive activity and associated buildings within high hazard areas. | Retain as notified. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P4 | S94.118 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The interaction between ECO-P4(c) and ECO-P6 is confusing as currently drafted. Both policies direct the application of the mitigation hierarchy/effects management hierarchy for activities within areas of significant indigenous vegetation or habitat. It is unclear what the relationship between the two policies is, and why there are two separate policies directing the same requirement. This is likely to lead to challenges with policy interpretation and implementation and may result in perverse environmental outcomes. The submitter suggests that ECO-P4(c) is amended so that it: 1. provides clear direction on what appropriate effects management actions would look like. The effects management hierarchy (also known as the 'mitigation hierarchy') is an internationally accepted approach to managing biodiversity and is considered to be one of the most important procedural instruments for protecting biodiversity from the impacts of development. Suggested amendments align with the | Amend as follows for reasons provided: 3. Requiring activities within or directly adjacent to these areas to avoid, remedy, or mitigate the adverse effects on the values of the area; and I. avoid more than minor adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity values, and II. where more than minor adverse effects cannot be avoided, minimise them, and III. where more than minor adverse effects cannot be avoided and/or minimise, they are remedied, and IV. where residual adverse effects remain the use of biodiversity offsets may be proposed or agreed by the applicant V. Where residual adverse effects cannot be redressed through the use of biodiversity offsetting the use of environmental compensation may be |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>wording in the NRP.</p> <p>2. uses avoid-minimise-remedy as the effects management sequence prior to offsetting, which is consistent with NRP Policy P41 on managing effects on significant biodiversity values, and clause 3.16 of the NPS-IB. The key concern with the hierarchy as drafted is that consent applicants are directed to remedy adverse effects before they mitigate them. This is not possible. To 'remedy' is to rehabilitate, restore or restate something after an impact has occurred. To 'mitigate' is to moderate, reduce or alleviate an effect. Consent applicants should not be empowered, for example, to re plant or otherwise restore damaged habitat (a remedy action) before considering how they might reduce the damage inflicted on that habitat (a mitigate action).</p> <p>3. includes a sentence to direct a precautionary approach to effects management, as per RPS Policy 47(h) and NRP Policy 41.</p> <p>4. provides more direction on interpretation of biodiversity mitigation, offsetting and compensation. The submitter thinks that applicants require clear direction when proposing mitigation, offsetting and compensation measures to avoid poor design and implementation. This direction could be provided in full in this policy, directly reference principles for offsetting and compensation in the NPS-IB, or be provided as appendices. The submitter suggests the use of appendices due to the level of detail needed. See Schedules G1/G2/G3 in operative NRP and/or Appendix 1A in RPS Change 1.</p> | <p>proposed or agreed by the applicant.</p> <p>A precautionary approach shall be used when assessing the potential for adverse effects on areas of significant indigenous vegetation or habitat.</p> <p>Additionally, amend as follows for reasons provided:Proposals for biodiversity mitigation, biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation will be assessed against the principles listed in Appendix X (biodiversity mitigation), Appendix Y (biodiversity offsetting) and Appendix Z (environmental compensation).</p> <p>Where more than minor adverse effects on Significant Natural Areas cannot be avoided, minimised, remedied, or redressed through the use of biodiversity offsets or environmental compensation, the activity is inappropriate.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Directly reference directly reference principles for offsetting and compensation in the NPS-IB.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P5 | S94.119 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | <p>The submitter suggests replacing the word 'enable' with 'only allow' to indicate the activity is only acceptable within certain constraints, i.e. where they "...contribute to the protection, maintenance, and enhancement of [areas of significant indigenous vegetation or habitat]".</p> <p>Removal of exotic vegetation within areas of significant indigenous vegetation or habitat is only beneficial if the exotic plant is a weed species. In other cases, the removal of exotic vegetation may remove habitat for native fauna or otherwise disturb the positive ecological processes or functions of the site. Well established exotic trees such as gums, wattles and pines often provide good roosting and feeding habitat for native species.</p> | <p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Enable Only allow the following activities relating to habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna in the Wairarapa where they contribute to...".</p> <p>a. removal of broken branches, deadwood, or diseased vegetation, or exotic species ..."</p> |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P6 | S94.120 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | <p>The submitter seeks that ECO-P6 is aligned with the definitions and principles set out in the NPS-IB to ensure indigenous biodiversity values are sufficiently protected.</p> <p>The submitter suggest that ECO-P4 provides the direction for applying effects management hierarchy, while ECO-P6 support implementation of ECO-P4 by directing matters for which applicants should have 'particular regard to'; this giving effect to operative RPS Policy 47.</p> | <p>Amend as follows to incorporate in order to give full effect to operative RPS Policy 47: Only allow for subdivision, use or development within areas of significant indigenous vegetation or habitat following management of effects as in ECO-P4. In considering whether an activity is appropriate, particular regard shall be given to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maintaining connections within, or corridors between, habitats of indigenous flora and fauna, and/or enhancing the connectivity between fragmented indigenous habitats; 2. Providing adequate buffering around areas of significant indigenous vegetation or habitat from other land uses; 3. Managing wetlands for the purpose of aquatic ecosystem health, recognising the wider benefits, such as |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | for indigenous biodiversity, water quality and holding water in the landscape; 4. Avoiding the cumulative adverse effects of the incremental loss of indigenous ecosystems and habitats; 5. Protecting the life supporting capacity of areas of significant indigenous vegetation or habitat including their natural ecological processes and functions. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P7 | S94.121 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Clause b. does not provide clarity around what indigenous vegetation is intended to be captured as 'mature indigenous vegetation'. | Insert a specified age parameter (i.e. vegetation no older than 10 years) in Clause b. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-S1 | S94.122 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | <p>Clause 3a enables vegetation clearance where the vegetation height is less than 4m and the trunk diameter is less than 30cm (as measured 1.4m above ground). The submitter considers that this does not adequately account for certain vegetation types (i.e. shrubs) to be excluded from the PA rule.</p> <p>Clause 3b. does limit the extent; however, there is potential, especially prior to comprehensive SNA identification, for smaller pockets of potentially very significant vegetation/habitat to be cleared as a permitted activity.</p> <p>Therefore the submitter seek clarification to support implementation of the NPS-IB and operative RPS Policies 23 and 24.</p> | <p>Insert a clause to ECO-S1 where: If a threatened species or naturally uncommon habitat is present, it is excluded; Or A report is required to be obtained from a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist confirming that the indigenous vegetation does not meet the criteria for a Significant Natural Area, and it is submitted to Council 14 days in advance of the clearance being undertaken.</p> |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-O1 | S94.123 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | This objective provides appropriate direction on preserving and enhancing natural character. | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|--|-------------------------------|
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P1 | S94.124 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | This policy provides appropriate direction on preserving the special qualities and natural character of surface waterbodies. | Retain as notified. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P2 | S94.125 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | This policy provides appropriate direction on restoring and enhancing natural character. | Retain as notified |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P3 | S94.126 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | This policy provides appropriate direction as to when earthworks are enabled in proximity to significant waterbodies. | Retain as notified. |
| NATC - Natural Character | ECO-P4 | S94.127 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | This policy provides appropriate direction as to when earthworks are restricted in proximity to significant waterbodies. | Retain as notified. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P5 | S94.128 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | This policy provides appropriate direction as to when buildings and structures are restricted in proximity to significant waterbodies. | Retain as notified. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P6 | S94.129 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | This policy provides appropriate direction as to when modification of vegetation is allowed in proximity to significant waterbodies. | Retain as notified. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-R1 | S94.130 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | NATC-R1(1) It is appropriate to provide for earthworks within 25m of a significant waterbody as a permitted activity, where these works are for the purpose of maintenance of drains, dams, tracks, roads, or maintenance of water supply infrastructure including irrigation, or the construction or maintenance of a bridge or culvert, or part management activities in Open Space and Recreation Zones. | Retain as notified |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-R1 | S94.131 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | NATC-R1(2) The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rule NATC-R1(2) are considered appropriate as they include effects on the risks from natural hazards, including erosion and flooding. | Retain as notified. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-R2 | S94.132 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | NATC-R2(1) It is appropriate to provide for modification of vegetation and associated earthworks within 25m of a significant waterbody as a permitted activity where these works involve identified | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | pest plant species or are associated with primary production. | |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-R1 | S94.133 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Flood protection at the Lower Ruamāhanga River and Floodway Stopbanks Designation have been included under the Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes overlay. Current GIS mapping shows the asset to be outside of the designation area. Seeks assurance that key maintenance, including activities such as excavator operations and herbicide spraying, would not be affected by this overlay. | Amend NFL-R1(1)(b) as follows: Earthworks, modification of indigenous vegetation, or buildings and structures are associated with conservation activities, or flood protection works where undertaken by the regional council; Or other relief providing for the operation of this flood protection asset. |
| PA - Public Access | PA-O1 | S94.134 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | As currently worded this objective does not cover the purposes of an esplanade reserve/strip as set out in s229 of the RMA. | Amend clause a. as follows: preserves their natural character, natural processes, water quality , indigenous biodiversity, landscape, historic heritage, and cultural values, or mitigates natural hazards; and |
| PA - Public Access | PA-P1 | S94.135 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | As currently worded this policy does not cover the purposes of an esplanade reserve/strip as set out in s229 of the RMA. | Amend clause a. as follows: the subdivision of land adjoins a surface waterbody or the Coastal Marine Area and access is necessary to protect natural character, natural processes, water quality , indigenous biodiversity, landscape, historic heritage, recreational, and cultural values, or mitigate natural hazards; and |
| SUB - Subdivision | Introduction | S94.136 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | There is no reference to protecting highly productive land in the introduction to the subdivision chapter despite clear direction from the NPS-HPL to avoid subdivision of highly productive land, and the importance of protecting highly productive land being noted elsewhere in this plan. | Amend to include reference to avoiding subdivision of highly productive land. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O1 | S94.137 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | <p>It is appropriate to plan for subdivision design and development that responds to the risks of natural hazards and is resilient to climate change.</p> <p>This objective could go further to address accessible streets and blocks to support more walking and cycling, and access/connection to public transport, consistent with RPS Change 1.</p> <p>This objective could also be strengthened to give effect to the NPS-HPL. As the submitter have pointed out elsewhere in their submission, there is an established pattern of land use and development occurring on LUC Class 1, 2, and 3 land in the Wairarapa which may prevent this land being mapped and notified as highly productive land. Given the strong national direction and regional and district incentives to protect highly productive land, the submitter considers that the proposed amendment to be both necessary and relevant in this objective.</p> | <p>Insert: Subdivision and developments create allotments and patterns of land use and development that: - Provide safe and convenient access for pedestrians and cyclists, including links to local amenities and public transport. - Avoid subdivision and development on highly productive land.</p> |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O3 | S94.138 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | <p>RPS direction on land use and transport integration (in both the operative RPS and Change 1) includes integration with active and public transport and is not limited to roads.</p> <p>This objective is an opportunity to give effect to the NPS-HPL and provide much stronger direction around the preferred location of future development - close to existing public transport and town centres/local amenities - consistent with the outcomes sought by Policy 57 in the operative RPS and in Change 1.</p> | <p>Amend as follows: Subdivision and development are provided for where they integrate with the existing and planned development of land, public and active transport networks and services, roads, and infrastructure, and avoid fragmentation or development that undermines the productive capacity of land and the effective and efficient provision of infrastructure, public transport, and roads.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P1 | S94.139 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The NPS-UD Objective 4 recognises that amenity values develop and change over time in response to diverse and changing needs. The submitter considers that clause (a) of this policy as drafted places too much emphasis on the reinforcement of existing character and qualities; which the submitter considers to be unclear terms. As part of giving effect to the NPS-UD, the Combined District Plan must acknowledge that urban areas will change over time. | Amend as follows: Allow subdivision and development that results in the efficient and productive use of land, provides for the needs of the community, and supports the policies of the District Plan for the applicable zones, where the design: a) reflects patterns of development that are consistent with, compatible, and reinforce the role, function, and existing or planned characteristics character and qualities of the zone as set out by the Objectives and Policies of the applicable zone; |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P2 | S94.140 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | This policy provides direction on connection to or provision of three waters infrastructure. The submitter support clause f. in particular as it provides for multi-modal transport as part of new subdivision. | Retain clauses a., b., c., and f. as notified |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P3 | S94.141 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The policy provides for the protection of waterbodies. | Retain as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P4 | S94.142 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | It is appropriate to manage significant risks from natural hazards by avoiding any subdivision in specified circumstances. It is considered appropriate to include the effects of climate change over a 100-year horizon within this policy. | Retain as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P5 | S94.143 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Aligns with relief sought on GRUZ-O2 and GRUZ-P3. | Amend clause (c) as follows: Enabling primary production, land-based primary production on highly productive land and ancillary activities; |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P6 | S94.144 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | This policy gives effect to the NPS-HPL. The submitter considers that the reference to the purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone provides strong | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | justification for the proposed amendment sought to GRUZ-O1. | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P6 | S94.145 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Support direct reference to NPS-HPL. | Retain as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | New provision request | S94.146 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Amend | A new policy is needed to help manage adverse effects of subdivision and development on freshwater and give effect to the NPS-FM 2020. | Insert new policy as follows: SUB-P9 Managing the effects of subdivision on freshwater Subdivision of land is managed in an integrated and sustainable way to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects, including cumulative effects, on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R1 | S94.147 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Matter of control/discretion provide direction for councils to consider provision of infrastructure to a subdivision and should be retained. The submitter considers that the matters included in this rule should be broader for consistency with RPS Change 1 (e.g. Policy FW.3 and 47). | Amend to include the following matter of control/discretion under all controlled activity and restricted discretionary activities in SUB-R1 to read as follows: Protection, maintenance, or enhancement of natural features and landforms, historic heritage, waterbodies, indigenous vegetation and biodiversity , sites of significance to Māori, or archaeological sites |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R1 | S94.148 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The proposed matters of control for resource consents associated with Rules SUB-R1(1) and SUB-R1(2) are considered appropriate as they include the matters set out in policies NH-P4 and SUB-P4, where proposal is located within a hazard area. | Retain as notified; this relates to SUB-R1(1) and (2). |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R1 | S94.149 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Oppose in part | The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rules SUB-R1(3) and SUB-R1(4) should include the matters set out in policies NH-P4 and SUB-P4 to ensure that, where located in hazard areas, these matters are addressed. | Amend SUB-R1(3) and (4) as follows: 4. Where located in a hazard area, the matters set out in policies NH-P4 and SUB-P4. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R2 | S94.150 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The proposed matters of control for resource consents associated with Rule SUB-R2(1), SUB-R2(2) and SUB-R2(3) are considered appropriate as they include the effects on the stability of land and buildings, the potential to create new or exacerbate existing natural hazards and refer back to SUB-P4. It is unclear why the sentiment of SUB-P4 has been added as a separate matter. For clarity, Policy SUB-P4 should also be added to the list of other directly referenced policies (Matters of control (1)). | Amend Matters of control under SUB-R2(1) as follows: 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, and SUB-P2 and SUB-P4. Amend Matters of control under SUB-R2(2) as follows: 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, SUB-P2, SUB-P4 , SUB-P5, SUB-P6 and SUB-P8. Amend Matters of Control under SUB-R2(3) as follows: 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, SUB-P2, SUB-P4 and SUB-P7. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R2 | S94.151 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rules SUB-R2(4), SUB-R2(5) and SUB-R2(6) are considered appropriate as they include reference back to the matters in Policy SUB-P4. | Retain SUB-R2(4), (5), and (6) as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R3 | S94.152 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The proposed matters of control for resource consents associated with Rule SUB-R3(1)) are considered appropriate as they include the effects on the stability of land and buildings, the potential to create new or exacerbate existing natural hazards and refer back to SUB-P4. It is unclear why the sentiment of SUB-P4 has been added as a separate matter. For clarity, Policy SUB-P4 should also be added to the list of other | Amend to Matters of control under SUB-R3(1) as follows: 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, and SUB-P2 and SUB-P4. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | directly referenced policies (Matters of control (1)). | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R3 | S94.153 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Oppose in part | The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rules SUB-R3(2) should include the effects on the stability of land and buildings, the potential to create new or exacerbate existing natural hazards. Reference the Policy SUB-P4 should also be included to the list of other directly referenced policies (Matters of control (1)). | Amend SUB-R3(2) as follows: 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, and SUB-P2 and SUB-P4. 7. Effects on the stability of land and buildings, and potential to create new or exacerbate existing natural hazards. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S94.154 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The proposed matters of control for resource consents associated with Rule SUB-R4(1) are considered appropriate as they include the effects on the stability of land and buildings, and potential to create new or exacerbate existing natural hazards. It is unclear why the sentiment of SUB-P4 has been added as a separate matter. For clarity, Policy SUB-P4 should also be added to the list of other directly referenced policies (Matters of control (1)). | Amend SUB-R4(1) as follows: 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, SUB-P2, SUB-P4 , SUB-P5 and SUB-P6. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S94.155 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rules SUB-R4(2) are considered appropriate as they include reference back to the matters in Policy SUB-P4. | Retain SUB-R4(2) as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R5 | S94.156 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The proposed matters of control for resource consents associated with Rule SUB-R5(1) are considered appropriate as they include the effects on the stability of land and buildings, and potential to create new or exacerbate existing natural hazards. It is unclear why the sentiment of SUB-P4 has been added as a separate matter. For clarity, Policy SUB-P4 should also be added to the list of other directly referenced policies (Matters of control (1)). | Amend Matters of control under SUB-R5(1) as follows: 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, SUB-P2, SUB-P4 , SUB-P5, SUB-P6 and SUB-P8. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R5 | S94.157 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Oppose in part | The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rules SUB-R5(2) should include reference the Policy SUB-P4 within the list of other directly | Amend SUB-R5(2) as follows: 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, SUB-P2, SUB-P4 , SUB-P5 and SUB-P6. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | referenced policies. This would be consistent with the approach to Rules SUB-R4(2) and SUB-R2(6). | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R5 | S94.158 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | It is unclear why this rule, which is for non-compliance with the condition related to direct access from State Highways (State Highway 53, State Highway 2, any Limited Access Road, Masterton Heavy Traffic Bypass, or the Wairarapa Railway) includes reference to SUB-P4, however other similar rules SUB-R2(7) and SUB-R4(3) do not include reference to Policy SUB-P4. It is considered that this is not a relevant matter for the purpose of this rule. | Amend SUB-R5(3) as follows: 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, SUB-P2, SUB-P3, SUB-P4 , SUB-P5, and SUB-P6. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R6 | S94.159 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | It is appropriate to require resource consent as a controlled activity for the subdivision of land within or partially within hazard areas when building platforms are located in a low hazard area. | Retain SUB-R6(1) as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R6 | S94.160 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The proposed matters of control for resource consents associated with Rule SUB-R6(1) are considered appropriate as they include the matters set out in NH-P4 as well as the effects on the stability of land and buildings, and potential to create new or exacerbate existing natural hazards. It is not clear why Policy SUB-P4 is referenced against Matter of control (3) as well as Matter of control (1). | Amend SUB-R6(1) as follows: 3. Effects on the stability of land and buildings, and potential to create new or exacerbate existing natural hazards and the matters in SUB-P4. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R6 | S94.161 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | It is appropriate to require resource consent as a discretionary activity for a building platform located in a moderate hazard area. | Retain SUB-R6(2) as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R6 | S94.162 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | It is appropriate to require resource consent as a non-complying activity for a building platform located in a high hazard area | Retain SUB-R6(3) as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R7 | S94.163 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The proposed matters of control for resource consents associated with Rule SUB-R7(1) are considered appropriate as they include the effects on the stability of land and buildings, and potential to create new or exacerbate existing natural hazards. It is unclear why the sentiment of SUB-P4 has been added as a separate matter. For clarity, Policy SUB-P4 | Amend as follows: 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, SUB-P2, SUB-P4 , SUB-P5 and SUB-P6. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | should also be added to the list of other directly referenced policies. | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R8 | S94.164 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Generally, the matters of discretion provide direction for councils to consider provision of infrastructure to a subdivision and protection of surface waterbodies. | Retain matter of control/discretion 1 in SUB-R8. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R9 | S94.165 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Generally, the matters of discretion provide direction for councils to consider provision of infrastructure to a subdivision and protection of surface waterbodies. | Retain matter of control/discretion 1 in SUB-R9. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R10 | S94.166 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Generally, the matters of discretion provide direction for councils to consider provision of infrastructure to a subdivision and protection of surface waterbodies. | Retain matter of control/discretion 1 in SUB-R10. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R11 | S94.167 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Generally, the matters of discretion provide direction for councils to consider provision of infrastructure to a subdivision and protection of surface waterbodies. | Retain matter of control/discretion 1 in SUB-R11. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R13 | S94.168 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Generally, the matters of discretion provide direction for councils to consider provision of infrastructure to a subdivision and protection of surface waterbodies. | Retain matter of control/discretion 1 in SUB-R13. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S3 | S94.169 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | This standard provides appropriate direction on the provision of drinking water infrastructure. | Retain as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S4 | S94.170 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | This standard provides appropriate direction on the provision of drinking water infrastructure. | Retain as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S5 | S94.171 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | This standard provides appropriate direction on the provision of stormwater infrastructure. | Retain as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S7 | S94.172 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The submitter notes that their previous request to add 'public transport' to sub clause 3 has been incorporated. | Retain as notified |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S8 | S94.173 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | While comprehensive, the matters of discretion do not account for the potential use of esplanade strips/reserves as a means of protecting water quality and thus do not reflect s229 of the RMA. | Insert a new matter of discretion as follows: 8. The extent to which the water quality of a surface waterbody will be adversely affected |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB - Table 1 | S94.174 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The proposed minimum lot size of 0.5ha in the rural lifestyle zone does not provide for the low density of on-site wastewater systems required to mitigate the potential impacts of development on freshwater quality, as sought by NPS-FM clause 3.5. The minimum lot size does not provide for appropriate separation distances between on-site wastewater systems and drinking water wells. A 50m buffer is required from new bores where water is used for potable water supply, or 20m from bores drilled pre-2019 under the Natural Resource Plan. | Amend to increase the minimum allotment size for the Rural Lifestyle Zone or address the freshwater concerns through other mechanisms. |
| FC - Financial Contributions | | S94.175 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The submitter supports the coordination of land use and infrastructure funding and delivery, however, seek that well-planned intensification is not disincentivised or unable to occur, particularly where occurring at a smaller scale. The costs of addressing existing infrastructure shortfalls should not land disproportionately on new infill urban development, and should be shared fairly. | Retain the direction regarding financial contributions for the development of new infrastructure. For existing infrastructure, amend to ensure that the objectives, policies, rules, and standards appropriately share the cost of upgrading existing infrastructure existing ratepayers and new infill development, so that infill development is not disincentivised. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-P3 | S94.176 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | This policy aims to prevent locating structures on or over the surface of water in rivers, lakes, and wetlands unless there is an operational or functional need, which is acceptable i.e., flood defence systems, as noted in the policy. | Retain as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O3 | S94.177 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | It is important that risks and consequences from coastal hazards including sea level rise are not increased. | Retain as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | Introduction | S94.178 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The submitter seeks that the chapter introduction is amended to refer to the NPS-UD, including its direction on housing variety, affordability, and intensification. MDC must give effect to the NPS-UD as a tier 3 local authority, and its objectives and policies are relevant to the General Residential Zone in Carterton and South Wairarapa too. | Amend chapter introduction to: Include reference to the NPS-UD and its relevant objectives and policies, including Policy 5 on intensification. Provide greater reference to the need for housing choice and affordability in the residential zone. Recognise the benefits of urban infill and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | The benefits of intensification are currently only discussed in relation to the Medium Density Residential Precinct and should be recognised and provided for more broadly. Urban intensification can include many typologies that are not multi-unit housing, for example shifting from one detached dwelling to two detached dwellings. | intensification, and compact urban form in the wider General Residential Zone, beyond just the Medium Density Residential Precinct, including the multiple typologies that intensification can include beyond multi-unit housing. Expand the extent of the Medium Density Residential Precinct. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-O1 | S94.179 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Submitter supports the recognition of housing variety. Seeks that the wording aligns with that in NPS-UD Policy 1 (a)(i). The submitter also seeks alignment with RPS Change 1 Policy CC.4 on climate resilience. | Amend as follows: The General Residential Zone primarily consists of residential activities that cater for a variety of housing needs, including type, price and location , that integrate with existing or planned reticulated infrastructure and support climate resilience . |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-O2 | S94.180 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | <p>The submitter seeks that this objective is amended for consistency with the NPS-UD, RPS Change 1, operative RPS direction on a compact urban form, and to recognise that amenity values change over time, and do not need to emphasise low density urban forms.</p> <p>Point 5 is a circular point (the character and amenity values cannot consist of compatibility with character and amenity values) so is also suggested it is removed.</p> <p>The submitter seeks alignment with RPS Change 1 direction on climate resilience and transport emissions, as well as linking to TR-O1 (c)-(e).</p> | <p>Amend as follows: The character and amenity values in the General Residential Zone, including the scale, form, and density of use and development will change over time in response to diverse needs, however primarily consists of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a built form comprising a range of residential unit types and sizes, characterised by predominantly 1- to 2-storey buildings and openness around and between buildings; 2. landscaping and trees, especially on street frontages, recognising their benefits for climate resilience; 3. a spacious living environment with high quality on-site residential and shared public amenity for residents and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | for adjoining sites and the street; and 4. an urban environment that is visually attractive, safe, easy to navigate, and convenient to access, including through walking, cycling and public transport.; and 5. development that is highly compatible with existing special character and amenity values. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-O4 | S94.181 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Oppose | <p>The submitter seeks amendments to this objective to reduce the extent to which it constrains the potential for future intensification in the Low-Density Residential Precinct.</p> <p>Do not support the extensive use of a Low Density Residential Precinct, without clear links to specific identified heritage values. Please also refer to submission point on the extent of the low density residential precinct.</p> | <p>Amend as follows: The Low Density Residential Precinct (LDRP):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. primarily consists of low density residential activities and development in keeping with the existing neighbourhoods' character of predominantly 1- to 2-storey buildings and high levels of on-site amenity, privacy, and generous private outdoor living areas for residents, adjoining sites, and the street; ... |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-O5 | S94.182 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports this objective and consider it is consistent with RPS Change 1 seeking well-designed urban form, including access to open space. Note the submission point seeking greater application of the medium density residential precinct.</p> <p>The submitter seeks alignment with RPS Change 1 direction on climate resilience and transport emissions, as well as linking to TR-O1 (c)-(e).</p> | <p>Amend as follows: ...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. residential activities and development are in keeping with the planned residential character of predominantly 2 and 3-storey buildings, in a variety of forms and with ample surrounded by open space with ample vegetation and landscaping, recognising their benefits for climate resilience; 3. residential activities and development provide quality on-site residential and shared public amenity for residents, |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | adjoining sites, and the street; ... 6. Safe and convenient access through walking, cycling and public transport. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P2 | S94.183 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Submitter strongly supports this policy and its emphasis on variety, innovation, open space, and emissions reduction. | Amend to also refer to climate resilience, for consistency with RPS Change 1. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P4 | S94.184 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the intent of this policy, however they seek recognition of climate resilience and transport emissions reduction for consistency with RPS Change 1 and to contribute to CCR-O1, CCR-O2, and TR-O1(c)-(e). The submitter also seeks amendments to reduce emphasis on existing low-density typologies, to recognise the benefits of enabling intensification in some areas.</p> <p>The references to on-site amenity in clauses 2 and 5 should be broadened to refer to shared public amenity, to reflect the vital role of shared green space in supporting community connections, wellbeing, and recreational opportunities, to align with clause 4.</p> <p>The submitter does not consider that multi-unit housing and retirement villages necessarily need to be constrained to larger sites.</p> <p>NPS-IB clause 3.22(4) requires that, 'Local authorities must promote the increase of indigenous vegetation cover in their regions and districts through objectives, policies, and methods...' It is therefore sought that the General Residential Zone provisions promote the use of indigenous vegetation to implement this direction, which is also consistent with the RPS.</p> | <p>Amend as follows: Provide for activities and structures that support the planned character for the General Residential Zone, and the climate change resilience of its residents, which provides for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. intensity of residential and infill development that is predominantly single detached or semi-detached residential units on single sites, with suburban lot sizes, and providing for high quality and spacious on-site and shared public amenity; 2. building height, bulk, and form that achieves the planned built character of predominantly 1- to 2-storey residential units within a generally spacious setting; 3. building height, bulk, and location maintains a reasonable level of sunlight access and privacy and to minimise visual dominance effects to the adjoining sites; 4. development that achieves attractive and safe streets and public open spaces where reliance on private vehicles is |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>reduced, including by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) providing for passive surveillance; ii) optimising front yard landscaping; and iii) minimising visual dominance of garage doors; and iv) providing for safe walking and cycling links to town centres, services and open space; and v) supporting access to public transport services; <p>5. a good standard of internal and shared public amenity within sites including useable and accessible outdoor living areas for residents; and</p> <p>6. multi-unit residential development and retirement villages on larger sites where it is demonstrated that they achieve contribute to the planned character for the zone, recognising that this will change over time; and 7. housing is designed to be resilient to the effects of climate change, including the impacts of future temperatures, intensity of rainfall and wind, including through tree canopy cover and landscaping, prioritising the use of indigenous vegetation.</p> |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P5 | S94.185 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Oppose in part | The submitter does not support the extensive and broad use of a Low Density Residential Precinct to constrain intensification, without clear links to specific identified heritage values. It's recommend that this policy is amended to refer to the maintenance of identified heritage values. | Amend as follows: Maintain identified heritage areas in the role, function, and predominant character of the Low-Density Residential Precinct, including in Greytown and Martinborough , by: |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|--|------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>1. maintaining a low density of single detached residential units on single sites, maintaining larger lot sizes, and providing for high quality and spacious on-site amenity;</p> <p>2. maintaining building height, bulk, and form that is in keeping with the identified heritage, character and amenity values of the established residential areas, which includes built character of predominantly 1- to 2-storey residential units within a generally spacious setting;</p> <p>... 7. housing is designed to be resilient to the effects of climate change, including the impacts of future temperatures, intensity of rainfall and wind, including through tree canopy cover and landscaping, prioritising the use of indigenous vegetation.</p> |
| <p>GRZ - General Residential Zone</p> | <p>GRZ-P6</p> | <p>S94.186</p> | <p>Greater Wellington Regional Council</p> | <p>Support in part</p> | <p>The submitter supports this policy and seeks amendments for consistency with RPS Change 1 direction on climate resilience, urban form, and transport emissions, and to contribute to CCR-O1, CCR-O2, and TR-O1(c)-(e).</p> <p>The submitter considers the reference to 'sufficient' setbacks is unclear and does not clearly relate to managing potential effects.</p> <p>NPS-IB clause 3.22(4) requires that, 'Local authorities must promote the increase of indigenous vegetation cover in their regions and districts through objectives, policies, and</p> | <p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>3. building height, bulk, and form that contributes to achieves the planned built character of predominantly 2- and 3-storey residential units in a variety of forms by:</p> <p>i) limiting the height, bulk, and form of development;</p> <p>ii) managing the design and appearance of multi-unit residential development; and</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>methods...' Therefore, the submitter seeks that the General Residential Zone provisions promote the use of indigenous vegetation to implement this direction, which is also consistent with the RPS.</p> | <p>iii) requiring sufficient setbacks to the extent necessary to manage potential adverse effects; and iv) landscaped areas, prioritising the use of indigenous vegetation and recognising their benefits for climate resilience; ... 5. development that achieves attractive and safe streets and public open spaces where reliance on private vehicles is reduced, including by: i) providing for passive surveillance; ii) optimising front yard landscaping; and iii) minimising visual dominance of garage doors; and iv) providing for safe walking and cycling links to town centres, services and open space; and v) supporting access to public transport services; 6. a good standard of internal amenity within sites including useable and accessible outdoor living areas for residents as well as access to shared public amenities; and 7. development designed to meet the day to day needs of residents by: i) providing privacy and outlook; and ii) providing access to daylight and sunlight and providing the amenities necessary for those residents; and iii) supporting multi-modal access to services, amenities and green space</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | ... 10. housing is designed to be resilient to the effects of climate change, including the impacts of future temperatures, intensity of rainfall and wind, including through tree canopy cover and landscaping |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P7 | S94.187 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The submitter supports this policy and it is consistent with operative and proposed RPS direction. They seek an amendment to recognise the benefits of using existing infrastructure efficiently prior to developing new infrastructure. | Amend as follows: Avoid residential development where there is insufficient capacity in existing reticulated infrastructure or where residential development would occur prior to planned reticulated infrastructure installation, and prioritise the efficient use and upgrading of existing infrastructure over the development of new infrastructure. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P8 | S94.188 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Submitter supports this policy. | Retain as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R1 | S94.189 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Refer to submitters previous submission points on objectives and policies for the General Residential chapter. | Amend rules and standards to recongise the benefits of well-designed intensification and any amendments consequential to the relief on objectives and policies. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R6 | S94.190 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Strongly support the provision for papakāinga. | Retain as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-S8 | S94.191 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The submitter supports this standard. | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S6 | S94.192 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The submitter strongly supports the provision for papakainga. | Retain as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O1 | S94.193 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Amend to better give effect to the NPS-HPL, specifically Clauses 3.11 and 3.12. By clearly referring to highly productive land, this amendment also creates a stronger link to SUB-P6 which includes specific direction to avoid inappropriate subdivision of highly productive land. | Amend to include land-based primary production on highly productive land. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O2 | S94.194 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | This objective goes some way toward giving effect to NPS-HPL Clause 3.13(1)(a) but does not include specific reference to "land-based primary production on highly productive land"; an amendment is sought to reflect this wording and better link in with provisions GRUZ-P3 and SUB-P5. | Amend wording to align with NPS-HPL Clause 3.13(1)(a) by inserting: land-based primary production on highly productive land. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O3 | S94.195 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Support this objective | Retain as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O4 | S94.196 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Primary production is not synonymous with land-based primary production; the latter is reliant on the soil resource of the land, which has different implications for the productive capacity of land. In order to give full effect to the NPS-HPL, this objective should be amended to align with the wording in Clause 3.12(1)(a). | Amend as follows: Primary production activities are enabled, and highly productive land is prioritised for use in land-based primary production , and other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone are enabled where they are not incompatible with primary production or land-based primary production activities. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O5 | S94.197 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Gives effect to the NPS-HPL, specifically Clause 3.13(b). | Retain as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O6 | S94.198 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The submitter considers that the recommended amendment strengthens this objective in line with the clear direction in the NPS-HPL, specifically Clause 3.8. | Amend Clause (a) as follows: Rural lifestyle subdivision is managed in a way that avoids additional fragmentation |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | of highly productive land and its productive capacity or potential. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-07 | S94.199 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The submitter strongly support this objective, which gives effect to the NPS-HPL and acknowledges the direction to protect land which may be mapped as highly productive due to characteristics other than soil type classification. | Retain as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | New provision request | S94.200 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Amend | The submitter considers a new objective is required in addition to GRUZ-07 to give full effect to the NPS-HPL, specifically Clause 3.12(1)(b). | Insert new objective into GRUZ chapter as follows: Productive capacity of highly productive land. Opportunities that maintain or increase the productive capacity of highly productive land are enabled, but only where those opportunities are not inconsistent with: a. any matter of national importance under section 6 of the Act; or b. any environmental outcomes identified in accordance with the NPS-FM 2020. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P1 | S94.201 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | In line with strong national direction on protecting highly productive land, the submitter considers that this policy should be amended due to the allowance for rural lifestyle development provided for in clause (c). They consider that a reference to land-based primary production (which is reliant on soil resource) adequately captures the need to protect highly productive land. | Amend as follows: Compatible activities: a. Enable primary production and land-based primary production activities that are compatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone. b. Provide for other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located in the General Rural Zone that are not incompatible with primary production. c. Provide for rural lifestyle development |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | in appropriate locations where GRUZ-P1(a) and GRUZ-P1(b) are enabled or provided for. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P2 | S94.202 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | An amendment is sought to strengthen direction to protect highly productive land. In addition, the proposed new clause better gives effect to the NPS-HPL, specifically clause 3.13(1)(c) which requires consideration of the cumulative effects of activities on highly productive land, which is not provided for elsewhere. | Amend as follows: Avoid activities and development that: a. are incompatible with the purpose, character, and amenity of the General Rural Zone; b. will result in fragmentation of highly productive land and loss of the productive capacity potential of land; or c. will result in reverse sensitivity effects and/or conflict with permitted activities in the General Rural Zone including primary production and ancillary activities; or d. have the potential to cause negative cumulative effects on the availability and productive capacity of highly productive land. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P3 | S94.203 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | An amendment is necessary to link in with GRUZ-O2 and SUB-P5 and give better effect to NPS-HPL clause 13.3(a). Given other strong direction on protection of highly productive land and issues and threats to that land raised elsewhere in the proposed Plan, the submitter considers it valuable to explicitly include reference to highly productive land amongst the character and amenities of the General Rural Zone. | Amend clause (c) as follows: enabling primary production, land-based primary production on highly productive land , and ancillary activities; |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P4 | S94.204 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Support this policy as protection of highly productive land from inappropriate subdivision is adequately addressed in GRUZ-P9. | Retain as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P5 | S94.205 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The NPS-HPL implementation guidance provides for small-scale farm quarries to be enabled on highly productive land, but other | Insert new sub-clause to (b) as follows: x. any impact on the productive capacity or reduction in area of highly |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | quarrying activities must pass several tests to be carried out on highly productive land. The submitter seeks an amendment to provide strong direction to protect highly productive land from other quarrying activities. | productive land is avoided. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P9 | S94.206 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | This policy adequately addresses the direction from the NPS-HPL to protect highly productive land. | Retain as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | New provision request | S94.207 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Amend | A new policy is required to give full effect to the NPS-HPL, specifically Clause 3.11(1)(a) and (b). | Insert new policy into GRUZ chapter as follows: Existing activities on highly productive land Enable the maintenance, operation, or upgrade of any existing activities on highly productive land, and minimise any loss of highly productive land from those activities. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R8 | S94.208 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The submitter notes that the reference in the section 32 report to managing activities over productive land mistakenly refers to GRUZ-R6 (agricultural aviation), where it presumably means to refer to GRUZ-R8 (residential activities). Although Clause 3.9(1) of the NPS-HPL includes strong direction to avoid the inappropriate use or development of highly productive land that is not land-based primary production, clause 3.9(2)(a) does provide for residential activities as supporting activities; these must pass the test of supporting land-based primary production, which neither GRUZ-S4 nor GRUZ-S7 refer to specifically. In order to give better effect to the NPS-HPL we seek amendments to GRUZ-S4 to reflect the prioritisation of using highly productive land for land-based primary production, as well as to align with the proposed amendment to GRUZ-R8. | Amend clause (b) as follows: b. Where the site is located within the Martinborough Soils Overlay or within highly productive land the number of residential units must not exceed: i. one residential unit per site; and ii. one minor residential unit that has a gross floor area iii. of no more than 80m ² per site; and the residential units must directly support land-based primary production. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R12 | S94.209 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Amend in line with relief sought on GRUZ-P5. | Insert highly productive land to the matters of discretion. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R13 | S94.210 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Strongly support the provision for papakāinga. | Retain as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S4 | S94.211 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Amend in line with relief sought on GRUZ-R8 in order to give full effect to the NPS-HPL. | Amend matters of discretion (1) as follows: Whether it can be demonstrated that the residential unit(s) provides ancillary accommodation for landowners and/or workers involved with primary production or land-based primary production on sites over 40 ha. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-R10 | S94.212 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Strongly support the provision for papakāinga. | Retain as notified. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-S5 | S94.213 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The standard provides appropriate direction for on-site services. | Retain as notified. |
| NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone | | S94.214 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The submitter seeks that the neighbourhood zone provisions appropriately support transport accessibility via multiple transport modes for consistency with NPS-UD Policy 1 and RPS Change 1. | Amend provisions to recognise the benefits of neighbourhood centre zones in supporting residents to safely access their daily needs via active and sustainable transport modes. Refer to amendments to the Town Centre Zone provisions for examples. |
| NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone | NCZ-P1 | S94.215 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | <p>The submitter notes that residential activities are only minimally provided for in the neighbourhood centre zone.</p> <p>NPS-UD Policy 5 directs the enabling of greater building heights and densities in areas with a range of commercial activities and community services, along active or public transport routes, or where there is relative demand.</p> <p>It may be that some parts of Masterton determined to be neighbourhood centre zones meet this test, and are appropriate for</p> | Amend to enable a greater level of intensification within the neighbourhood centre zones in Masterton, and amend NCZ-P1 and relevant rules/standards accordingly. The policy framework has already taken a 'district-specific' approach with several matters, so this could also be done here to distinguish Masterton neighbourhood centre zones from those in South Wairarapa. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | greater levels of density than what is proposed. | |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | | S94.216 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Provision for papakāinga that has been added in other zone chapters should not be excluded from the mixed-use zone. | Insert provision for papakāinga in this chapter. *submission point refers to whole chapter |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | | S94.217 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Provision for papakāinga that has been added in other zone chapters should not be excluded from the town centre zone | Insert provision for papakāinga in this chapter. Submission point refers to whole chapter. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-O1 | S94.218 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Submitter supports this objective. | Retain as notified. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-O2 | S94.219 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Amend to reflect NPS-UD Policy 1 on well-functioning urban environments. | Amend as follows: Town centres are safe, well-functioning , and attractive urban environments, containing well-designed structures that contribute positively to a sense of place, provide community focal points, and are of low- to medium-density scale. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-O3 | S94.220 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The submitter supports this objective, and seek amendments to reflect NPS-UD Policy 1 on well-functioning urban environments and RPS Change 1 direction on transport emissions, as well as better link to TR-O1 (c)-(e). | Amend as follows: Town centres provide an accessible and safe environment for people to live, work, and play, and support the use of, and linkages for, active and sustainable transport modes. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-O7 | S94.221 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The submitter supports this direction to support pedestrian access in town centres. | Retain as notified. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-P3 | S94.222 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The submitter supports this policy, and note that the RPS is supportive of mixed use development given its recognition in urban design practice and multiple benefits, including the vibrancy, viability and safety of centres and accessibility to support reductions | Amend as follows: Provide for residential activity, including multi-unit housing , where: ... f) the level of density reflects the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>in transport-related emissions.</p> <p>The submitter notes that Policy 31(b) of RPS Change 1 applying to Wairarapa councils identifies town centre zones is appropriate for higher building heights and urban form densities, partly to implement NPS-UD Policy 5. NPS-UD Policy 5 directs the enabling of greater building heights and densities in areas with a range of commercial activities and community services, along active or public transport routes, or where there is relative demand.</p> <p>Therefore, the submitter seeks greater recognition of the potential for intensification and multi-unit housing in the town centre zone, to complement the existing higher densities in town centre zones.</p> | scale, form, and appearance, and generally more intensive forms of development, of the town centre zone. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-P9 | S94.223 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The submitter supports this direction to support pedestrian access in town centres. | Retain TCZ-P9, 10 and 11 as notified. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-R1 | S94.224 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | <p>The RPS supports mixed use development given its recognition in urban design practice and multiple benefits, including the vibrancy, viability and safety of centres and accessibility to support reductions in transport-related emissions.</p> <p>The submitter notes that Policy 31(b) of RPS Change 1 applying to Wairarapa councils identifies town centre zones as appropriate for higher building heights and urban form densities, partly to implement NPS-UD Policy 5. The submitter therefore seeks greater recognition of the potential for intensification and multi-unit housing in the town centre zone. NPS-UD Policy 5 directs the enabling of greater building heights and densities in areas with a range of commercial activities and community services, along active or public</p> | <p>Amend rule to be more enabling of appropriate residential activities, including of higher densities.</p> <p>Amend TCZ-R1 as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>c. For residential units:</p> <p>i. no more than two residential units occupy the site;</p> <p>ii. any residential unit is located entirely above ground floor or at the rear of a commercial or other permitted activity;</p> <p>and iii. compliance is achieved with TCZ-S5.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>transport routes, or where there is relative demand.</p> <p>TCZ-R1 as drafted is highly restrictive of residential activities and does not recognise the potential for greater densities where appropriate, to complement the greater existing densities in town centre zones.</p> | |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-P2 | S94.225 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Regarding point a), the submitter considers it is unclear to refer to the character and amenity values of the Future Urban Zone; by definition it does not have its own distinct character and amenity values, and this is recognised by FUZ-O2. Instead, it is clearer to refer. | <p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Only allow activities in the Future Urban Zone and areas in immediately adjoining zones where it can be demonstrated that:</p> <p>a. the site design, layout and scale of the activity is compatible with the purpose character and amenity values of the Future Urban Zone;</p> <p>...</p> <p>h. Enable additional infrastructure and services that support the future use of the area, including active and public transport connections.</p> |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-R6 | S94.226 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | Strongly support the provision for papakāinga. | Retain as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-P1 | S94.227 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The provision of commercial activities including home business and rural produce retail should not be limited to small-scale given the enabling direction in MPZ-O1. | <p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Allow activities that are compatible with the role, function, and predominant character of the Māori Purpose Zone, including marae, papakāinga, customary use, cultural, and small-scale commercial activities while ensuring their scale, design, and intensity is appropriate in the Zone and the wider environmental</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|--|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | context of the site. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R10 | S94.228 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Home business activities are restricted by clauses in this rule, conflicting with the enabling intent of MPZ-P2. | Amend to lessen restrictive requirements for permitted activity status. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R14 | S94.229 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | Rural produce retail activities are restricted by clauses in this rule, conflicting with the enabling intent of MPZ-P2. | Amend to lessen restrictive requirements for permitted activity status. |
| Designations | GWRC - Greater Wellington Regional Council | S94.230 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support | The existing designations from this Requiring Authority (Greater Wellington Regional Council) are for the purpose of flood protection and mitigation or the conveyance of water for flood mitigation. | Retain GWRC-C-01 -GWRC-C-04, GWRC-M-01 - GWRC-M-05, GWRC-S-06, GWRC-S-26 as notified. |
| Designations | GWRC - Greater Wellington Regional Council | S94.231 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The designation is currently 'Soil conservation and forestry' but it is publicly owned land and also used for recreation activities. It may be classified under the Reserves Act in future and/or become a regional park. | Insert recreation as an activity to GWRC-S-02: Hiwinui Forest |
| Designations | GWRC - Greater Wellington Regional Council | S94.232 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The designation is currently 'Soil conservation and forestry' but it is publicly owned land and also used for recreation activities. It may be classified under the Reserves Act in future and/or become a regional park. | Insert recreation as an activity to GWRC-S-03: Rough Hill Forest |
| Designations | GWRC - Greater Wellington Regional Council | S94.233 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The designation is currently 'Soil conservation and forestry' but it is publicly owned land and also used for recreation activities. It may be classified under the Reserves Act in future and/or become a regional park. | Insert recreation as an activity to GWRC-S-04: Stoney Creek Forest |
| Designations | GWRC - Greater Wellington Regional Council | S94.234 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The designation is currently 'Soil conservation and forestry' but it is publicly owned land and also used for recreation activities. It may be classified under the Reserves Act in future and/or become a regional park | Insert recreation as an activity to GWRC-S-05: Tauanui Forest |
| Appendix 3 - Centres Design Guide | Centres Design Guide | S94.235 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The centres design guide, being semi-statutory, is an ideal location to support measures to holistically seek that new development supports emissions reduction and climate resilience. The submitter acknowledges and strongly supports the | Amend the Centres Design Guide to strengthen direction for measures to support emissions reduction and climate resilience through development in centres zones. Example measures include retaining and increasing indigenous vegetation and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|--------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | direction on pages 14 and 15, however they consider this can go further. | mitigating adverse effects of heat. This amendment will achieve CCR-O1, CCR-O2, CCR-O4, TR-O1, and align with the RPS Change 1. |
| Appendix 3 - Centres Design Guide | Centres Design Guide | S94.236 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports this direction, however, there currently is no reference to indigenous vegetation or water sensitive urban design for the purpose of managing water quality as well as quantity.</p> <p>NPS-IB clause 3.22(4) states, 'Local authorities must promote the increase of indigenous vegetation cover in their regions and districts through objectives, policies, and methods...' NPS-FM clause 3.5(4) states, 'Every territorial authority must include objectives, policies, and methods in its district plan to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments'.</p> <p>They therefore seek that the design guide promotes the use of indigenous vegetation and water sensitive urban design to reduce impacts of urban development on freshwater, which is also consistent with the RPS.</p> | <p>Insert direction to promote retention and planting of indigenous vegetation and use of water sensitive urban design to manage potential adverse effects of development on stormwater quality as well as quantity.</p> <p>*Centres Design Guide - page 14.</p> |
| Appendix 4 - Residential Design Guide | Residential Design Guide | S94.237 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | <p>The residential design guide, being semi-statutory, is an ideal location to support measures to holistically seek that new development supports emissions reduction and climate resilience. The submitter acknowledges and strongly supports the direction on pages 20 and 21, however this direction only applies to multi-unit housing, which according to the current policy framework is only expected to occur in discrete areas. They consider this can go further.</p> | <p>Amend to strengthen direction for measures to support emissions reduction and climate resilience through development in residential zones, and apply this direction beyond just multi-unit housing. Example measures include retaining and increasing indigenous vegetation (including tree canopy and street trees in subdivisions), reducing water demand, increasing water resilience, and mitigating adverse effects of heat.</p> <p>Amendments will achieve CCR-O1, CCR-O2, CCR-O4, TR-O1, and align with RPS Change</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|--------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | 1. |
| Appendix 4 - Residential Design Guide | Residential Design Guide | S94.238 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The diagram on how to use the guide does not make sense and needs to be revised for clarity. The diagram does not cover the situation that residential development requires a resource consent but is not multi-unit or heritage, implying that the design guide is not relevant in these instances. | Amend flow diagram and its application to residential development requiring a resource consent. * this relates to Page 12 |
| Appendix 4 - Residential Design Guide | Residential Design Guide | S94.239 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | A lot of these design principles (which we support, noting our request for more emphasis on climate change) are relevant to any residential development rather than just multi-unit housing, and would assist in achieving well-functioning urban environments (as required by the NPS-UD) and the outcomes sought by RPS Change 1. | Amend to apply as guidance to all residential development (noting the submitters previous submission point that Page 12 does not make this clear). *this point applies to Multi-Unit design guide. |
| Appendix 4 - Residential Design Guide | Residential Design Guide | S94.240 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports this direction, however, there currently is no reference to indigenous vegetation or water sensitive urban design for the purpose of managing water quality as well as quantity.</p> <p>NPS-IB clause 3.22(4) states, 'Local authorities must promote the increase of indigenous vegetation cover in their regions and districts through objectives, policies, and methods...' NPS-FM clause 3.5(4) states, 'Every territorial authority must include objectives, policies, and methods in its district plan to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments'.</p> <p>The submitter therefore seeks that the design guide promotes the use of indigenous vegetation and water sensitive urban design to reduce impacts of urban development on</p> | Insert direction to promote retention and planting of indigenous vegetation and use of water sensitive urban design to manage potential adverse effects of development on stormwater quality as well as quantity. *this point relates to Page 20. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|--------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | freshwater, which is also consistent with the RPS. | |
| Appendix 4 - Residential Design Guide | Residential Design Guide | S94.241 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The submitter supports the guidance to provide a safe street environment for pedestrians and cyclists. However, the guidance could go further to improve the attractiveness and liveability of streets for people walking/cycling. It could also encourage the identification and provision of active mode connections/links/short-cuts within the development to any nearby public transport stops/services. | Amend to further to improve the attractiveness and liveability of streets for people walking/cycling. Amend to encourage the identification and provision of active mode connections/links/short-cuts within the development to any nearby public transport stops/services. *this point relates to Site-Layout - Access and Movement. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S94.242 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Oppose | <p>The western Future Urban Zone is on LUC class 2 land, while the area by Cashmere Oaks is LUC class 3 land. There are also a few pockets of land being zoned to residential, including a site by Old Orchard Road, which is LUC class 3 land.</p> <p>The submitter notes these areas have not been identified for future urban development (as discussed by the Future Urban Zones Section 32 report), and so are subject to the interim requirements in NPS-HPL clause 3.5(7), including the direction to avoid subdivision and zoning to urban zones.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the General Residential Zone chapter does not adequately promote intensification and infill, and that the Medium Density Residential Precinct could be applied more widely across Masterton.</p> | Amend the proposed new residential zoning of land near South Road. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S94.243 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Support in part | The submitter supports the efforts to provide for intensification through the medium density residential precinct in Masterton. The submitter notes that a lot of this area overlaps with the flood hazard mapping, so in reality there may be a limit to how much the densities in this area will be permitted to increase by the natural hazards rule framework of the Proposed District Plan. | Amend to include other locations in Masterton, such as Kuripuni or north Masterton, that might be suitable for medium density. See original submission (Attachment 2) with suggestions of potentially suitable locations for the medium density residential precinct in Masterton and Carterton. Support the Featherston masterplan which identifies |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>The submitter seeks that a risk-based approach to natural hazards is taken, and therefore seek that other suitable locations in Masterton are also identified for the medium density residential precinct. MDC is required to give effect to the objectives and policies of the NPS-UD, including to enable heights and densities in appropriate locations according to Policy 5 of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>RPS Change 1 seeks an emphasis on intensification and reductions in transport emissions, and this direction applies to the Wairarapa towns. Featherston, Carterton and other parts of Masterton have good access to the train network in close proximity to town centres, rapid population growth, and changing demographics seeking smaller homes, which make them appropriate for higher densities in suitable areas.</p> <p>The S32 report (page 67) states that the medium density residential precinct was not expanded to Carterton due to its additional complexity in the rule framework without much benefit. The submitter does not feel this is adequate justification for why greater intensification has not been enabled in suitable parts of Carterton.</p> <p>The submitter acknowledges that the Featherston master planning process is underway, however maintain their view that the medium density precinct should also apply in Featherston.</p> | <p>suitable areas for medium density.</p> |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S94.244 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Oppose | <p>The submitter notes that the Low Density Residential Precinct is justified in two different ways in the Section 32 report; to manage infrastructure servicing constraints, and to maintain the low density character values of Greytown, Martinborough and parts of</p> | <p>Amend to use infrastructure and subdivision rules and standards to manage infrastructure servicing constraints instead of a low density residential precinct.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>Masterton. The submitter notes that character is distinct from heritage; and if the Councils consider that heritage protections or character precinct provisions are necessary, this should be done through alternative and less all encompassing means.</p> <p>Applying a low density residential precinct is not the most effective and efficient way to manage infrastructure servicing constraints; the rule frameworks in the subdivision and zones chapters should manage this. The proposed approach artificially constrains the potential for existing urban areas to be able to respond to demand for housing and business demand where infrastructure capacity can be provided in a coordinated, safe and efficient way.</p> | |
| <p>TCZ - Town Centre Zone</p> | <p>TCZ-R12</p> | <p>S94.245</p> | <p>Greater Wellington Regional Council</p> | <p>Support in part</p> | <p>The RPS supports mixed use development given its recognition in urban design practice and multiple benefits, including the vibrancy, viability and safety of centres and accessibility to support reductions in transport-related emissions.</p> <p>The submitter notes that Policy 31(b) of RPS Change 1 applying to Wairarapa councils identifies town centre zones as appropriate for higher building heights and urban form densities, partly to implement NPS-UD Policy 5. The submitter therefore seek greater recognition of the potential for intensification and multi-unit housing in the town centre zone. NPS-UD Policy 5 directs the enabling of greater building heights and densities in areas with a range of commercial activities and community services, along active or public transport routes, or where there is relative demand.</p> <p>TCZ-R1 as drafted is highly restrictive of residential activities and does not recognise</p> | <p>Amend rule to be more enabling of appropriate residential activities, including of higher densities.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | the potential for greater densities where appropriate, to complement the greater existing densities in town centre zones. | |
| FC - Financial Contributions | New provision request | S98.001 | Greytown Community Board Warren Woodgyer | Support | Submitter comments on rising development costs and ensuring that financial contributions can be levied according to actual costs and adjusted as needed. Considers developers should front the costs of required infrastructure as part of developments rather than the ratepayers. | Insert provisions for financial contributions to be levied according to costs which can be altered rather than having set fees which may not suffice. |
| FC - Financial Contributions | FC-P1 | S98.002 | Greytown Community Board Warren Woodgyer | Support | Submitter comments on rising development costs and ensuring that financial contributions can be levied according to actual costs and adjusted as needed. Considers developers should front the costs of required infrastructure as part of developments rather than the ratepayers. | Retain FC-P1 as notified (inferred). |
| FC - Financial Contributions | FC-P5 | S98.003 | Greytown Community Board Warren Woodgyer | Support | Submitter comments on rising development costs and ensuring that financial contributions can be levied according to actual costs and adjusted as needed. Considers developers should front the costs of required infrastructure as part of developments rather than the ratepayers. | Retain FC-P5 as notified (inferred). |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S135.001 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The proposed Open Space Zone within the Greytown Historic Heritage Precinct is more appropriate than the existing Commercial zone. | Retain zoning at Stella Bull Park Greytown as notified. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S135.002 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose | The planning map shows part of the Fresh Choice Carpark as General Residential Zone. This should be Town Centre Zone. | Amend zoning of the Fresh Choice Carpark in Greytown from General Residential Zone to Town Centre Zone. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S135.003 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose in part | The planning maps show part of the carpark and supermarket as Town Centre Zone without being a part of the Historic Heritage Precinct. Submitter recommends that the Historic Heritage Precinct be extended to these sites and along West Street between Hastwell and Kuratāwhiti. [Refer to Appendix A] | Amend parameters of the Historic Heritage Precinct to extend along West Street between Hastwell and Kuratāwhiti. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S135.004 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The proposed Town Centre Zone is more appropriate than the existing Residential | Amend parameters of the Historic Heritage Precinct to include the Working Men's Club |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | Zone. The Historic Heritage Precinct should be extended here. [Refer to Appendix A]. | Carpark. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S135.005 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose in part | The three lots north of the Menz Shed would be better zoned as Town Centre Zone within the Historical Heritage Precinct. The submitter understands that the residential property was sold due to noise generated from the Menz Shed and that the residential property to the north is also owned with the ambition for commercial use. It makes sense to intensify the current Town Centre accordingly. [Refer to Appendix A] | Amend zoning of three lots to the north of the Menz Shed from General Residential Zone to Town Centre Zone and change parameters of the Historic Heritage Precinct to include these lots. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S135.006 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose | These 7 lots would be better zoned as Town Centre Zone within the Historical Heritage Precinct to provide a complete block facing West Street of Town Centre Zoned properties and a condensed Town Centre. [Refer to Appendix A] | Amend zoning of lots from General Residential Zone to Town Centre Zone within the Historical Heritage Precinct. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S135.007 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose | Retain the existing zoning to the north of Kuratāwhiti Street/ Jellicoe Street. The heart of Greytown should be primarily bound between the northern point of Kuratāwhiti Street/ Jellicoe Street and the southern point of Stella Bull Park (including 'Design Library') and Wood Street in the South (recognising that Hastwell Street is an informal boundary for most retail footfall). [Refer to Appendix A] | Retain existing Town Centre Zone as existing at Main Street (i.e. ending at Kuratāwhiti Street/ Jellicoe Street). Amend zoning to extend Town Centre Zone between Kuratāwhiti and Hastwell Streets at West Street to Town Centre Zone within Historic Heritage Precinct. Amend zoning to General Residential (low density) within Historic Heritage Precinct to the north of Kuratāwhiti Streets (as it is now). |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S135.008 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose | The Fire Station should have a Designation and retain its General Residential Zone within the Historic Heritage Precinct. [Refer to original submission as to where the Town Centre Zone should be located] | Amend Zoning of the Fire Station to General Residential (Low Density) within the Historic Heritage Precinct. Provide a designation - Fire Station. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S135.009 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose | Amend zoning north of Kuratāwhiti Street/ Jellicoe Street to General Residential (low density) within Historic Heritage Precinct. Extend Town Centre Zone (all within Historical Heritage Precinct) between Kuratāwhiti and Hastwell Streets to West | Amend zoning north of Kuratāwhiti Street/ Jellicoe Street to General Residential (low density) within Historic Heritage Precinct. Amend to extend Town Centre Zone (all within Historical Heritage Precinct) between Kuratāwhiti and Hastwell Streets to West |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | Street. [Refer to original submission] | Street. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | Precinct 2 | S135.010 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose in part | The submitter is concerned for the lack of requirements for Open Space Zones/ Sport and Active Recreation Zones within the Greytown Future Development Area and the Future Urban Zone. These need to be a requirement and pre-eminent to ensure the health and wellbeing of the community. | Insert requirements for Open Space Zones/ Sport and Active Recreation Zones within the Greytown future Development Area and the Future Urban Zone. |
| OSZ - Open Space Zone | | S135.011 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose | The submitter is concerned for the lack of requirements for Open Space Zones/ Sport and Active Recreation Zones within the Greytown Future Development Area and the Future Urban Zone. These need to be a requirement and pre-eminent to ensure the health and wellbeing of the community. | Insert requirements for Open Space Zones/ Sport and Active Recreation Zones within the Greytown Future Development Area and the Future Urban Zone. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S135.012 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose | Greytown needs to retain the Sports Ground it has. There have previously been plans to sell the land occupied by the Greytown Rugby Club for residential purposes. This land needs to be zoned Sport and Active Recreation Zone to provide enduring protection. | Amend zoning of Greytown Rugby Club from General Residential Zone to Sport and Active Recreation Zone. |
| Planning Maps | | S135.013 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose | The Greytown Bowling Club needs to be zoned Sports and Active Recreation Zone to provide protection. | Amend zoning of Greytown Bowling Club from General Residential Zone to Sport and Active Recreation Zone. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S135.014 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose | The Cobblestones Heritage Museum needs to be zoned Sport and Active Recreation Zone/ Open Space Zone to provide protection. The submitter notes that a 99-year lease was reported as being granted in the Times Age 14th November 2023. Zoning as either Open Space zone or Sport and Active Recreation Zone aligns more appropriately. | Amend zoning of Cobblestones Heritage Museum from General Residential Zone to either Open Space Zone or Sport and Active Recreation Zone within Historic Heritage Precinct. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-S1 | S135.015 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose | The submitter considers that poles and towers should be prohibited (or not visible) in the Greytown Historic Heritage Precinct. If they do need to be included, heights should be no more than the maximum building heights within the Greytown Historic Heritage Precinct. | Amend Standard NU-S1 to prohibit electricity poles and towers within Greytown Historic Heritage Precincts. or; (if this is not possible) Amend Standard NU-S1 to limit height of electricity poles and towers to be no taller than the maximum building heights within the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | Greytown Heritage Precincts. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-S2 | S135.016 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | Supports the requirements to comply with height, setback and height in relation to boundary. As the design of these types of buildings is usually at odds with Historic Heritage they need to be designed to be as unobtrusive as possible. The submitter seeks to see a requirement for this. The Auckland Design Manual has some relevant examples. | Amend to require mandatory compliance with Design Guides with regards to Historic Heritage within the Historic Heritage Precinct. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P11 | S135.017 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports the proposed Policy. They consider this initiative important for the health and vibrancy of the Greytown Town Centre. The proposed extension to the Greytown Centre to the north on Main Street will not tangibly under-pin this. The submitters proposal to extend the Greytown Town Centre westward to West Street would support this and mean that cyclists could largely avoid travelling on a traffic-heavy Main Street. | Retain Policy TR-P11 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R5 | S135.018 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports this rule and considers that it provides much better clarity for Plan users. Supports the requirement for an independent, suitably qualified and experienced traffic engineer to undertake the assessment. | Retain Rule TR-R5 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S9 | S135.019 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter supports the compatibility with heritage character in Historic Heritage Precincts as a matter of discretion. Seeks clarification around the inclusion of a design panel. States that this needs to have members who are familiar with the granular detail required within each area - particularly the Historic Heritage Precincts. The submitter notes that in the past there has been a lack of identifiable background within the SWDC planning department. | Retain Standard TR-S9 as notified and create a design panel to review such matters. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S15 | S135.020 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter supports the Standard. They consider adding a matter of discretion regarding compatibility with heritage character in Historic Heritage Precincts. This sensitivity ensures the retention of heritage values. | Amend TR-S15 to include a matter of discretion: Compatibility with heritage character in Historic Heritage Precincts. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| TR - Transport | TR-S16 | S135.021 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose | A minimum requirement for parking bays in Greytown would be detrimental to the character and vibrancy of the Town Centre - Historic Heritage Precinct and would have a result which is contrary to UFD-O5 Vibrant Town Centres. The submitter seeks for Greytown Town Centre to primarily be a foot and bicycle traffic environment, to retain and enhance its heart. Parking detracts from the street view of heritage buildings. | Amend TR-S16 to have no minimum requirement in Greytown's Town Centre. As a matter of discretion (for all other zones): Compatibility with and sensitivity for heritage character in Historic Heritage Precincts. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S17 | S135.022 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | While the submitter supports the Standard, they consider adding a matter of discretion with regards to compatibility with heritage character in Historic Heritage Precincts. States that this is important in retaining heritage values. | Amend TR-S17 to include a matter of discretion: Compatibility with heritage character in Historic Heritage Precinct. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S21 | S135.023 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter supports compatibility with heritage character in Historic Heritage Precincts as a matter of discretion. Seeks for this to be extended to include driveways. | Amend TR-S21 to include driveways in the matters of discretion. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S22 | S135.024 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter supports the requirement to ensure there is no reversing onto/ off a State Highway or Transit Corridor. However, with the requirements of TR-S16 this would require further carparking/ driveway space and would be detrimental to the character and vibrancy of Greytown's Town Centre - Historic Heritage Precinct and would have a result which is contrary to UFD-O5. The submitter supports the matter of discretion - Compatibility with heritage character in Historic Heritage Precincts. | Amend TR-S16 to have no minimum requirement for carparking/driveway space in Greytown's Town Centre. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S23 | S135.025 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports this Standard. Considers it a great step forward - and important for Greytown and TR-P11. A safe cycling route is required also - could be along West Street, identifiably zoned and with access to the Town Centre (i.e. extending behind West Street). | Retain TR-S23 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S24 | S135.026 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports the matter of discretion. | Retain TR-S4 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| TR - Transport | TR-S26 | S135.027 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose | The submitter considers that this Standard is not possible in the Greytown Town Centre and would be detrimental to the character and vibrancy of Greytown's Town Centre - Historic Heritage Precinct and would have a result which is contrary to UFD-O5. | Amend TR-S26 to exclude requirement for Greytown Town Centre Zone and to add a matter of discretion: Compatibility with heritage character in Historic Heritage Precincts. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S27 | S135.028 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter considers that there is a need to recognise the desire for compatibility with heritage character in Historic Heritage Precincts, as a matter of discretion. | Amend TR-S27 to include a matter of discretion: Compatibility with heritage character in Historic Heritage Precincts. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S135.029 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Amend | The submitter would like to be considered an affected party on every Main Street resource consent application and any development larger than two lots elsewhere in Greytown. At present the submitter is consulted on an ad hoc basis and have not been deemed an affected party. This limits their ability to influence or contest any decisions and does not provide for robust processes to ensure Greytown's heritage is protected. This would provide a second point of view for the Council. | Insert a note to all Rules which would activate a Resource Consent within the Greytown Historic Heritage Precinct. Note XX: If a resource consent application is made under this rule for a property within the Greytown Historic Heritage Precinct, the Greytown Heritage Trust will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | | S135.030 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter supports the inclusion of this chapter. Their concerns focus on some of the buildings listed in the schedule. They typically do not address items within the curtilage (which often forms part of the context) or interiors. At present there is little material provided defining the heritage fabric, identifying what is important, determining context, or attributing the historic value of early inhabitants. Concerned that once there is an intervention it may not be retrievable - and risks becoming irreparable. The submitter proposes implementing some guidance around how work to Historic Heritage should be completed. | Amend this chapter to better protect Scheduled buildings and curtilage. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P3 | S135.031 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter is concerned about clause 3. These buildings, and other items in the curtilage (such as fences, sheds, etc.) contribute to the Heritage Precinct as a whole. These should only be allowed to be demolished after rigorous and appropriate research establishing that the built features are not an important or integral element to the heritage precinct. | Amend HH-P3 to remove clause 3 - Demolition of non-scheduled buildings within a heritage precinct. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P5 | S135.032 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter is concerned that heritage is being considered as the external features only, and that consideration needs to be given to how important internal features are. This should be applied to all parts of the policy. Regarding Item 3, the work should be as non-invasive as possible, reversible and not interfere with the heritage fabric, which is best heritage practice. | Amend HH-P5 to add: Minimising the impact of additions and alterations on the scheduled building or item by being as non-invasive as possible, reversible and not interfering with the heritage fabric. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P9 | S135.033 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter states that in the past, cost and advice (with inadequate basis) has been given for the reasons for demolition. There should be a requirement for evidence of both cost and advice. Costs should be evaluated by a registered Quantity Surveyor. | Amend HH-P9 to suit reasoning provided. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R2 | S135.034 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose | The submitter proposes that this be a restricted discretionary activity for reasons previously stated. | Amend HH-R2 to a restricted discretionary activity and insert a note as follows: Note 1. If a resource consent application is made under this rule for a property within the Greytown Historical Heritage Precinct the Greytown Heritage Trust will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R3 | S135.035 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter proposes that all activities under this rule be a Restricted Discretionary activity status. See previous reasoning. | Amend HH-R3 to make all activities Restricted discretionary, and add note as follows: Note 1. If a resource consent application is made under this rule for a |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | property within the Greytown Historic Heritage Precinct, the Greytown Heritage Trust will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R4 | S135.036 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter proposes that this be a Restricted discretionary activity - heritage buildings must not be considered as, or reduced to, facades. | Amend HH-R4 to make all activities Restricted Discretionary, and add the following note to HH-R4(1) and HH-R4(2) as follows: Note 1. If a resource consent application is made under this rule for a property within the Greytown Historic Heritage Precinct, the Greytown Heritage Trust will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R5 | S135.037 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | Refer to earlier reasonings. | Amend HH-R5 to add matters of discretion, and add a note as follows: Note 3. If a resource consent application is made under this rule for a property within the Greytown Heritage Precinct, the Greytown Heritage Trust will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R9 | S135.038 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter proposes that this be a Restricted Discretionary activity - heritage buildings must not be considered as, or reduced to, facades. | Amend HH-R9 to add a note to HH-R9(1) and HH-R9(2) as follows: Note 1. If a resource consent application is made under this rule for a property within the Greytown Historic Heritage Precinct, the Greytown Heritage Trust will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R10 | S135.039 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | See earlier reasonings. | Amend HH-R10 to add a note as follows: Note 1. If a resource consent application is made under this rule for a property within the Greytown Historic Heritage Precinct, the Greytown Heritage Trust will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R11 | S135.040 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | See earlier reasoning. | Amend HH-R11 to add a note as follows: Note 1. If a resource consent application is made under this rule for a property within the Greytown Historic Heritage Precinct, the Greytown Heritage Trust will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-O1 | S135.041 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter supports the inclusion of this chapter and the Objectives in particular. Ideally there should be a process for trees to be more easily added if owners request or if they are of a certain size. | Amend TREE-O1 to add process for the protection of trees above a certain girth and height. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-O2 | S135.042 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports the Objective; there is a need for overt referencing of the registration process. | Retain TREE-O2 as notified. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-P4 | S135.043 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter supports the Policy but believes that the root protection should be specifically noted. | Amend TREE-P4 as follows: 'TREE-P4 Subdivision of sites with notable trees ... c. the location of any necessary network utilities; and d. the likelihood of any serious threat to people or property from the tree(s); and. do not compromise the root protection areas and the long term health of the notable tree.' |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-P5 | S135.044 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter considers that a robust peer review of the qualified arborist's work is required. If a second opinion had not been sought on the West Street Oak, it would have been removed. | Amend TREE-P5 as follows: 'TREE-P5 Removal of notable trees ... b. the tree is dead or is in terminal decline as assessed and certified by a qualified arborist and peer reviewed by a qualified arborist.' |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-P8 | S135.045 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter considers that a robust peer review of the qualified arborist's work is required. If a second opinion had not been sought on the West Street Oak it would have been removed. | Amend TREE-P8 as follows: 'TREE-P8 Removal of street trees ... b. the tree is dead or in terminal decline as assessed and certified by a qualified arborist and peer reviewed by a qualified arborist; or and c. the removal...' |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | | S135.046 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | Not stated. | No decision requested. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O1 | S135.047 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports the objective, particularly SUB-O1(e). | Retain SUB-O1 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R1 | S135.048 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter believes that another layer of protection is needed with regards to the Greytown Historic Heritage Precinct. | Amend SUB-R1 to add note as follows: Note 1. If a resource consent application is made under this rule for a property within the Greytown Historic Heritage Precinct, the Greytown Heritage Trust will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R2 | S135.049 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter believes that another layer of protection is needed with regards to the Greytown Historic Heritage Precinct. | Amend SUB-R2 to add note as follows: Note 1. If a resource consent application is made under this rule for a property within the Greytown Historic Heritage Precinct, the Greytown Heritage Trust will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R8 | S135.050 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter believes another layer of protection is needed with regards to the Greytown Historic Heritage Precinct. | Amend SUB-R8 to add note as follows: Note 1. If a resource consent application is made under this rule for a property within the Greytown Historic Heritage |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | Precinct, the Greytown Heritage Trust will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R9 | S135.051 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter believes that another layer of protection is needed with regards to the Greytown Historic Heritage Precinct. | Amend SUB-R9 to add note as follows: Note 1. If a resource consent application is made under this rule for a property within the Greytown Historic Heritage Precinct. the Greytown Heritage Trust will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided. |
| SIGN - Signs | SIGN-O1 | S135.052 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports the inclusion of heritage in this Objective. | Retain SIGN-O1 as notified. |
| SIGN - Signs | SIGN-P2 | S135.053 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports this Policy particularly with regards to existing character and amenity. | Retain SIGN-P2 as notified. |
| SIGN - Signs | SIGN-P4 | S135.054 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter supports this policy and proposes it be extended to include signs which are out of character with the Historic Heritage Precinct. | Retain SIGN-P4 and amend to include signs which are out of character with the Historic Heritage Precinct. |
| SIGN - Signs | SIGN-P5 | S135.055 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports this policy particularly a., b., c., d., e., and f., and when it is read to include the Historic Heritage Precinct. | Retain SIGN-P5 as notified. |
| SIGN - Signs | SIGN-P7 | S135.056 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter supports this policy. This policy may be more appropriate in the rules - there needs to be acknowledgement that highly illuminated windows are not appropriate. Display/ advertising windows should be lit in a subtle manner in the Historic Heritage Precinct. | Retain SIGN-P7 and amend to acknowledge that highly illuminated windows are not appropriate within the Historic Heritage Precinct. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| SIGN - Signs | SIGN-P8 | S135.057 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports the policy. | Retain SIGN-P8 as notified. |
| SIGN - Signs | | S135.058 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter states that this is an area where lack of understanding and knowledge prompted a Style Guide to assist retailers in understanding what would be considered appropriate. | Amend SIGN chapter rules to include note as follows where necessary - Note 1. If a resource consent application is made under this rule for a property within the Greytown Historic Heritage Precinct, the Greytown Heritage Trust will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided. |
| SIGN - Signs | SIGN-R2 | S135.059 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | Sign design and placement should respect historic buildings and the heritage character of Greytown. Signs should not obscure building details or important vistas. Ideally hand-painted (by a sign writer) on the building, provided they do not alter or obscure parts of the building. Alternatively, signs can be styled to replicate historically resonant signs. Brackets and frames need to be considered as part of the sign. All signs should be in frame and not aluminum (or similar) directly onto a building. [see original submission for full reasoning] | Amend SIGN-R2 as follows: 'SIGN-R2 Signs in the scheduled heritage precincts listed in SCHED2 Heritage Precincts ... a. For signs on buildings, no individual sign shall exceed 2m2 1m2 in area (all faces). Total signage on buildings on a site shall not exceed 4m2 2m2 in area; ... e. There is no more than one free-standing sign per site, and it shall not exceed 0.5m2 in all area (all faces) and 7.5m 4.5m in height. ... Residential Zones: 3. Activity status: Restricted discretionary ... d. No free standing sign shall exceed 2m 3.5m in height |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | ...' |
| SIGN - Signs | SIGN-R8 | S135.060 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose | Digital signs should be prohibited in the Historic Heritage Precincts. | Amend SIGN-R8 to prohibit digital signs in Historic Heritage Precincts. |
| SIGN - Signs | SIGN-S3 | S135.061 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose in part | The submitter seeks to increase the maximum height of signs permitted in the GRZ from 2m to 3.5. They consider that the proposed height is too low to be able to walk under. States that there also needs to be a rule so that these signs must not project over the footpath. | Amend SIGN-S3 as follows: SIGN-S3 Maximum height above ground level of free standing signs ... Residential Zones: 2-2m 3.5m ...' |
| SIGN - Signs | SIGN-S9 | S135.062 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter considers that this Standard needs to include lighting directed to the sign, and self illuminated signs. | Amend SIGN-S9 to include lighting which is shining on the sign and self-illuminated signs. |
| SIGN - Signs | SIGN-S10 | S135.063 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter considers that there should be commentary around freestanding signs (footpath signs) and the banners/ flags which are becoming more common. States there needs to be a requirement for projecting signs, requiring them to be 2.5m clear of footpaths (there are/ have been signs in Greytown's Residential Historic Heritage Precinct extension which are not). | Amend SIGN-S10 to include requirement for projecting signs to be 2.5m clear of footpaths. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-O2 | S135.064 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter supports GRZ-O2. However, considers that the proposed maximum height of 12m in the Town Centre is too high as is the 10m proposed in the General Residential Zone. Proposes a limit of two storeys and a maximum of 10m in the Town Centre, and 8m in Residential Zones (or at least the Historic Heritage Precinct). [see submission for complete reasoning] | Amend GRZ-O2 to provide a limit of two storeys and a maximum of 8m height in the Residential Zones (or at least the Historic Heritage Precinct). |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-O4 | S135.065 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports the proposed Objective. | Retain GRZ-O4 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P4 | S135.066 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter supports the Policy particularly GRZ-P4(2). They note that the rules may need to be adjusted to achieve this. | Retain GRZ-P4 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P5 | S135.067 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter supports the Policy - particularly GRZ-P5(2). They note the rules may need to be adjusted to achieve this. | Retain GRZ-P5 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P8 | S135.068 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports GRZ-P8 as proposed. | Retain GRZ-P8 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | | S135.069 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter seeks to add a note to GRZ Rules that if a resource consent application is made for a property within the Historic Heritage Precinct, the Greytown Heritage Trust will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application where written approval is not provided. | Amend GRZ chapter Rules where applicable to add note as follows: Note 1. if a resource consent application is made under this rule for a property within the Historic Heritage Precinct, the Greytown Heritage Trust will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application where written approval is not provided. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R4 | S135.070 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports GRZ-R4 as proposed. | Retain GRZ-R4 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R8 | S135.071 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports GRZ-R8 as proposed. | Retain GRZ-R8 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R10 | S135.072 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose | The submitter considers that tiny homes are typically 40sqm or less, 80sqm, at double the size and close to the average floor areas of mid-century houses, is far too large, particularly within the LDRP. The submitter proposes a 40sqm maximum. | Amend GRZ-S10 as follows: 'GRZ-R10 Minor residential unit 1. Activity status: Permitted ... b. the gross floor area of the minor residential unit does not exceed 40m² 80m ² ; and ...' |
| GRZ - General | GRZ-S1 | S135.073 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose | The submitter considers that the proposed height is too high and it needs to be clear that there is a maximum of two storeys allowed. | Amend GRZ-S1 to provide a limit of two-storeys and a maximum of 8m height in residential zones (or at least the Historic |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Residential Zone | | | | | | Heritage Precinct). |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-S8 | S135.074 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter considers that the minimum capacity should be tied to the size of the dwelling - they propose that it is 5000L for 150sqm and an additional 5000L for each 100sqm above this. | Amend GRZ-S8 as follows: 'GRZ-S8 Rainwater collection and storage 1. Rainwater storage tank(s) with a minimum capacity of 5,000L for 150sqm of a residential unit and an additional 5000L for each 100sqm above this. This must be provided for each new residential unit. The tank must collect stormwater runoff from the roof of the residential unit for non-potable use. Matters of discretion: 1. Supply, storage, and use of non-potable water to the residential unit.' |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | Introduction | S135.075 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports the 2nd paragraph in the introduction of TCZ. It is important that the 1-2 storey nature of the area and historic heritage is both supported and enhanced. | Retain Introduction for TCZ - Town Centre Zone as notified. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-O1 | S135.076 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter supports that the Town Centre Zone is the principal focal point of the community and needs to provide a safe and vibrant area where a range of appropriately scaled activities are enabled. They consider that key words are safe (propose adding), vibrant, focal point, and appropriately scaled. It is important that the 1-2 storey nature remains with the towns previously most important buildings (Bank, Council Chambers, and Churches) being its tallest. | Retain TCZ-O1 and consider amending to add the word ' safe ' where appropriate. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-O2 | S135.077 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports TCZ-O2 as proposed. The submitter is pleased to see that well-designed and contributing to a sense of place and community focal points have been added. | Retain TCZ-O2 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-O4 | S135.078 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter supports TCZ-O4. They note that the proposed extension of the Town Centre Zone beyond Kuratāwhiti and Jellicoe Street does not align with this Objective. It unnecessarily stretches rather than constrains the town, makes reliance on cars greater, impacts on safety and impacts on a greater number of Residential neighbours. [Refers to Appendix A attached to submission] | Retain TCZ-O4 as notified. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-O8 | S135.079 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports TCZ-O8 as proposed. | Retain TCZ-O8 as notified. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-O9 | S135.080 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports TCZ-O9 as proposed. | Retain TCZ-O9 as notified. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-P1 | S135.081 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports TCZ-P1 as proposed - in particular TCZ-P1(b). | Retain TCZ-P1 as notified. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-P2 | S135.082 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter generally supports this but suggests that the list of incompatible activities be enhanced or guided by smart growth principles including aesthetic consideration, limitation of sprawl, enhancement of quality of life, convenience of amenities, diminished pollution, greater pedestrian comfort, opportunity for increased physical exercise. | Retain TCZ-P2 as notified and amend the list of incompatible activities to enhance them further. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-P3 | S135.083 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports this - particularly TCZ-P3(a) and (e). | Retain TCZ-P3 as notified. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-P4 | S135.084 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter is generally supportive of the Policy. However, notes that parking and vehicle access should not be at the front of buildings of any property in the Historic Heritage Zone. States that TCZ-P10 notes this - the submitter suggests enhancing this for the Historic Heritage Precinct. | Retain TCZ-P4 and amend to prohibit parking at the front of any property in the Historic Heritage Precinct. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-P11 | S135.085 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports TCZ-P11 as proposed. However, notes that the proposed extension of the Town Centre Zone beyond Kuratāwhiti and Jellicoe Streets does not align with this. Linear sprawl unnecessarily stretches rather than constrains the town, creates a greater reliance on cars, impacts safety and reduces the town centre as a focal point. The submitter states that research points to the negative consequences of retail fragmentation in linear development - frustrating both traders and customers. | Retain TCZ-P11 as notified. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-P12 | S135.086 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose | When relocated into the Historic Heritage Precinct there may need to be further controls around the design and effect a building may have. The submitter opposes TCZ-P12(b) - notes that the Old Church from Fordell (75 Main Street) and the Old relocated Masonic Building in Stella Bull Park (formerly library), the White Swan are not used for the same purpose and it is unlikely that a building relocated within the Historic Heritage Precinct would retain the same use. | Amend TCZ-P12 to insert additional provisions around buildings in the Historic Heritage Precinct. Reconsider wording of TCZ-P12(b) - particularly with regard to the Historic Heritage Precinct. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-R4 | S135.087 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose | The submitter believes that business services should be further restricted - for instance the Council facilities occupying the retail spaces on the corner of Kuratāwhiti and Main Street is not appropriate and has a negative impact on the town. This type of use should not be permitted and should be restricted to non-street facing, or upper level parts of buildings. | Amend TCZ-R4 to change the activity status of Business services to discretionary/ non-complying when it is inside a heritage precinct. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-S11 | S135.088 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose | Refer to previous reasoning at TCZ-P12. | Amend TCZ-S11 to include additional rules around buildings in the Historic Heritage Precinct. Reconsider wording of TCZ-S11(3)(a) - particularly with regard to the Historic Heritage Precinct. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | | S135.089 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Oppose in part | The submitter is concerned at the apparent lack of requirements for Open Space Zones/ Active Recreation Zones within the Greytown Future Development Area and the Future Urban Zone. These need to be a requirement | Insert requirements for Open Space Zones/ Sport and Active Recreation Zones within the Greytown Future Development Area and the Future Urban Zone. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | to ensure the health and wellbeing of the community. | |
| Appendix 3 - Centres Design Guide | Centres Design Guide | S135.090 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter is concerned that much of this design is for Residential. While this is important, more direction is needed for other types of buildings. | Amend Appendix 3 - General: to provide more direction of non-residential buildings. |
| Appendix 3 - Centres Design Guide | Centres Design Guide | S135.091 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports the Principles for South Wairarapa. They note that the proposal for the extension of the Town Centre Zone beyond Kuratāwhiti and Jellicoe Streets does not align with this. It unnecessarily stretches rather than constrains the town, makes reliance on cars greater, impacts safety and reduces the town centre as a focal point. It makes it less accessible with more roads to cross (try crossing Kuratāwhiti Street at Main Street in a wheelchair or crutches - let alone that traffic often does not give way). Extend Town Centre Zone (all within Historic Heritage Precinct) between Kuratāwhiti and Hastwell Streets to West Street rather than as currently proposed. | Amend Appendix 3 - Design guide principles: to extend the Town Centre Zone (all within Historic Heritage Precinct) between Kuratāwhiti and Hastwell Streets to West Street rather than as currently proposed. |
| Appendix 3 - Centres Design Guide | Centres Design Guide | S135.092 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter seeks that the Greytown Heritage Trust is considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application where written approval has not been provided, for resource consent applications within the Historic Heritage Precinct. They seek for a design panel to support this. The panel needs to have members who are familiar with the granular detail required within each area - particularly the Historic Heritage Precincts. | Amend Appendix 3 - For any resource consent application within the Historic Heritage Precinct, the Greytown Heritage Trust would be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided. A design review panel be established with experts with granular knowledge of the towns. |
| Appendix 3 - Centres Design Guide | Centres Design Guide | S135.093 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter considers that there is not enough detail provided in the advice notes. | Amend Appendix 3 - Heritage Advice Notes: Provide more detail surrounding Historic Heritage Precincts and establish an experienced design review panel which includes experts with granular knowledge of each of the precincts. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Appendix 3 - Centres Design Guide | Centres Design Guide | S135.094 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter considers that there needs to be detail provided regarding Heritage for this. They consider the plan needs to ensure that the situation with prime retail having obscured windows is not replicated. This should be an enhancement of the Active frontage advice notes. | Amend Appendix 3 - Siting and Street Frontage to provide detail regarding how this is addressed for Heritage. |
| Appendix 3 - Centres Design Guide | Centres Design Guide | S135.095 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | Not stated. | Amend Appendix 3 - Private and Communal Outdoor Space to include the following points: Point 13 - Amend to recognise the need for shade during the summer months. Point 15 - Amend so 'reduced overlooking' is strengthened to all but prevention. Point 17 - Functional elements such as heat pumps, and other building services need to be as visually unobtrusive as possible. |
| Appendix 3 - Centres Design Guide | Centres Design Guide | S135.096 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | No reasoning provided. | Amend Appendix 3 - Public Outdoor Space Point 18 and 19 - Delete 'where possible' Point 20 - Delete 'consider the need to' Point 21 - Delete 'where relevant' Point 23 - Amend to include a note about Greytown's frosts. If it is somewhere people will walk in winter (other than grass/grave), it needs to be covered beyond one step/300mm past edge of walkway. |
| Appendix 3 - Centres Design Guide | Centres Design Guide | S135.097 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter considers there needs to be further advice notes for Historic Heritage Precinct. There is a style guide produced by the Greytown Heritage Trust which would be useful to include. States that it is important for those who have never worked in Heritage Precincts before. They also consider that the language used needs to be more certain/direct; where possible too easily becomes a subjective opt-out clause. | Amend Appendix 3 - Built form and Appearance to include additional requirements for Historic Heritage Precincts such as window modulation, size, shape, proportion of windows, details and trim, shadow and light, sizes of trim, materials and scale. Delete 'where possible' from Points 36, 37, and 44. Delete 'where relevant' from Point 46. Consider the Historic Heritage Precinct holistically in Point 46. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| Appendix 3 - Centres Design Guide | Centres Design Guide | S135.098 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter suggests deleting 'for residents' so that this is considered for all building users/occupants. | Amend Appendix 3 - Built form and appearance - Privacy and safety as follows: It is important to provide a balance between expected privacy for residents (on new and neighbouring developments) while providing opportunities for passive surveillance and safety. |
| Appendix 3 - Centres Design Guide | Centres Design Guide | S135.099 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The wording needs to be more direct. | Amend Appendix 3 - Amenity, landscape and sustainability as follows: '50. Where possible, r Retain existing mature and healthy vegetation and integrate into the site development. ... 52. Where possible, p Provide and locate trees that will provide shade in summer and allow light in winter. ... 57. Where possible Generally , design dwellings with habitable spaces facing north, west or east to maximise sunlight access. |
| Appendix 3 - Centres Design Guide | Centres Design Guide | S135.100 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter considers that westerly aspect often overheat more than northern ones - this should be added. The wording for Point 58 needs to be more direct. The submitter also considers that Point 59 needs a complimentary clause for overheating. | Amend Appendix 3 - Amenity, landscape and sustainability - Sunlight, daylight and wind as follows: '... 56. Consider the use of eaves or strategic screening to help limit sunlight penetration in summer, to prevent applicable indoor spaces (particularly those with a norther and western aspect) from overheating. ... |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>58. Consider using Use solar exposure and local wind patterns to capitalise on natural forms of heating and window ventilation and reduce the need for mechanical systems.</p> <p>59. Limit the total window surface on south facing facades to prevent heat loss in winter. x. Limit the total window surface on north and west facing facades to prevent overheating in summer.</p> <p>...'</p> |
| Appendix 3 - Centres Design Guide | Centres Design Guide | S135.101 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter seeks to add to the explanatory note at the end 'and area'. Buildings need to be seen in the context of the context of the whole Historic Heritage Precinct. | <p>Amend Appendix 3 - Signage in Heritage Areas as follows:</p> <p>'Signage in Heritage Areas The size, location and colours of signs can detract from the character of the streetscape. The size and choice of lettering should also be sympathetic to the style and proportions of the frontage. Signs should keep in style with the building and area.</p> <p>...'</p> |
| Appendix 3 - Centres Design Guide | Centres Design Guide | S135.102 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter considers the wording needs to be more direct. This should also apply to the whole precinct not just heritage buildings. | <p>Amend Appendix 3 - Signage in Heritage Areas as follows;</p> <p>'... 64. Where relevant, Ensure signs do not obscure historic building details or important vistas.</p> <p>...'</p> |
| Appendix 3 - Centres Design Guide | Centres Design Guide | S135.103 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Amend | The submitter considers the photos provided are poor examples - better ones can be found in Greytown. | Delete and replace photos with better examples in Appendix 3 - Signage in Heritage Areas. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Appendix 3 - Centres Design Guide | Centres Design Guide | S135.104 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter considers more information needs to be provided. For instance, signs should be within a frame, there should only be one free standing sign allowed for premises who do not have street frontage - there is already too much clutter on the footpath. There is no commentary on roof signs - these should not be permitted. [refer to Greytown Heritage Trust's Heritage Style Guide] | Amend Appendix 3 - Signage in Heritage Areas to only allow one freestanding sign for premises without street frontage, signs should be within a frame. Further information is needed. |
| Appendix 4 - Residential Design Guide | Residential Design Guide | S135.105 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter supports the inclusion of this design guide. They seek clarification about how and who will have input to deciding what is appropriate. | Amend Appendix 4 - Greytown Heritage Precinct add a note as follows For properties within the Greytown Historic Heritage Precinct, the Greytown Heritage Trust would like to be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided. |
| Appendix 4 - Residential Design Guide | Residential Design Guide | S135.106 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Amend | The submitter is unable to find Table 1 to be able to comment on. | Amend Appendix 4 - Front and side boundaries to insert missing table. |
| Appendix 4 - Residential Design Guide | Residential Design Guide | S135.107 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support in part | The submitter has proposed, in section 2 Creating a more beautiful Greytown by 2030 of their style guide. | Retain appendix and ensure the district plan encourages the planting of trees - particularly street trees. |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S135.108 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Amend | The submitter states that this building was constructed in 1931 and let to Plunket by Greytown Trustlands Trust. The land is part of the original section 26, Greytown Town Belt. It is used once a week by a pre-school group. It is an original building with charming, stained wood paneling inside and pleasing windows. The submitter disagree that this building lacks significant overall heritage values - the | Insert the following to SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items: xxx Plunket Building 10 McMaster Street, Greytown (Lot 2 DP 32660) |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | Cultural values and value to the community are high. | |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S135.109 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Amend | Originally a small 19th century cottage, this has been recently repiled, restored and added onto with modern facilities at rear. The house/ cottage was build around 1885 on an original 40-acre block. The land is part of Section 8, Greytown Small Farms Settlement. The submitter disagrees that this building lacks significant overall heritage values - the historical value and value of the community is high. [refer to original submission for full reasoning] | Insert the following to SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items: xxx Cottage 26 Kempton Street, Greytown (Lot 2 DP 397363) |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S135.110 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Amend | The submitter disagrees that this building lacks significant overall heritage values - the historical value and value of the community is high. [see submission for full reasoning] | Insert the following to SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items: xxx Tate House 5 Kuratāwhiti Street, Greytown (Lot 4 DP 21041) |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S135.111 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Amend | The submitter disagree that this building lacks significant overall heritage values. The "Gardeners Cottage", name was a relatively recent attribution. Originally built in c1910 and added to at a later date. The land was originally owned by J. Hawke. | Insert the following to SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items: xxx Gardener's Cottage 34 Kuratāwhiti Street, Greytown (Lot 2 DP 30704) |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S135.112 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Amend | The submitter disagrees that this element lacks significant overall heritage values - the historical value and value to the community is high. [refer to original submission] | Insert the following to SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items: xxx Gas flute/ chimney 139 Kuratāwhiti Street, Greytown (Sec 14 & 16 Greytown Small Farm Sett Blk) |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S135.113 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Amend | The submitter states the assessment provided is incorrect. Accent architects have not practiced from this building for the past 7 years. The house was not built in 1910 but in stages from 1854 - with the most recent addition in 1965. [refer to Appendix D in original submission for additional information]. The submitter disagrees that this building lacks significant overall heritage values. This | Insert the following to SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items: xxx Cottage 30 Main Street, Greytown (Lot 1 DP 315591) |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | has a high historical value being the home of one of the first six settlers. That it has been added to over time is important and reflects how buildings continue to evolve. | |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S135.114 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Amend | The submitter disagrees that this building lacks significant overall heritage values - the historical value and value to the community is high. [see original submission] | Insert the following to SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items: xxx Shy Cottage 39 Main Street, Greytown (Lot 1 DP 43512) |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S135.115 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The submitter supports this building being scheduled as a Heritage Building - it is a good example of a sympathetic insertion on Main Street which protects the Lime Trees and respects the old BNZ building. | Retain site at 75 Main Street, Greytown (Lot 1 DP 76572 SUBJ TO R/W) (Former St Andrew's Church, Fordell near Whanganui) on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings and Items |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S135.116 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Support | The Hall was originally built in 1967 on the corner of West and Kuratāwhiti Streets. It was then moved to 79 Main Street in 1917 and was used as a movie theatre. The submitter supports this being added to the schedule as a Heritage Building. | Retain Site at 79 Main Street, Greytown (Lots 1 2 DP 13440 Sub to & Int in Row DP) (The Former Forester's Hall) on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings and Items. |
| SCHED3 - Schedule of Notable Trees | Notable Trees | S135.117 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Amend | The submitter proposes that a copper beech tree sited on the corner of the 134 Main Street section owned by Woolworth's NZ Ltd be added to SCHED3. The tree has significant heritage values and is held in high regard by the community. | Insert the following to SCHED3 - Notable Trees: xxx Copper beech (fagus sylvatica) 134 Main Street, Greytown (Lot 3 DP 18242) |
| SCHED3 - Schedule of Notable Trees | Notable Trees | S135.118 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Amend | The submitter proposes that this tree be scheduled as a notable tree due to its heritage, amenity and high value to the Historic Heritage Precinct of Greytown. [see submission for complete reasoning] | Insert the following to SCHED3 - Notable Trees: xxx Horokea/Lancewood (psuedopanax crassifolius) 134 Main Street, Greytown (Lot 3 DP 18242) |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S135.119 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Amend | The submitter states that the double iron gate celebrates the consecration of the Church in 1876 and its subsequence 75 years up to its 1926 Jubilee. The submitter disagrees that these elements lack significant overall heritage values - the historical value and value to the community is high. [see submission for complete reasoning] | Insert the following to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings and Items: xxx Stone fencing and double iron gate 135 Main Street, Greytown (Lot 1 DP 23295 LOT 2 DP 86779) |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|------------------------------|------------------|---|----------------|---|--|
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S135.120 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Amend | [see submission for complete reasoning] | Insert the following to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings and Items:xxx Redwood Country House 53 Udy Street, Greytown (Lot 14 DP 82671) |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S135.121 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Amend | The submitter disagrees with the Section 32 Report's comments that this building lacks significant overall heritage values - the historical value and value to the community is high. | Insert the following to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings and Items:xxx Barrett's Cottage 210 West Street, Greytown (Lot 1 DP 90330) |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S135.122 | Greytown Heritage Trust | Amend | Greytown used to have gasworks - to supply domestic gas to householders. This is one of two 'flute' type structures remaining. The submitter considers it is arguably unique - a special piece of 'industrial heritage'. It is located in a front garden and is fairly crowded out by vegetation. The submitter believes that this should be included as a special piece of industrial heritage. [see submission for complete reasoning] | Insert the following to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings and Items:xxx Gas Flute/ Chimney 50 Wood Street, Greytown (PT Lot 1 DP 7436) |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | Introduction | S213.001 | Haami Te Whaiti | Oppose | The submission notes concerns around consultation and categorization of Maori land in the Maori Purpose Zone and notes further consultation should be done with land owners and trustees where applicable. | Amend the consultation process to undertake sufficient consultation before including land in the Maori Purpose Zone. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S58.001 | Hamish Qualtrough | Oppose | States that site at 75 Evans Road is located on unproductive soil, provides safe vehicular access and minimal effects on road frontage with an established shelter belt. Notes there is a shortage of suitable land for housing within the region. With environmental protections and enhancements, communities can be enhanced without negatively affecting productive land. | Amend zoning of property located at 75 Evans Road, Upper Plain, Masterton General Rural Lifestyle Zone or General Residential Zone. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S32.001 | Harvey Norman Properties (N.Z.) Limited | Oppose in part | Submitter opposes the proposed Neighbourhood Centre Zone that encompasses the site at 230 High Street, Solway, Masterton. States that the current retail activities on this site do not fit the | Amend zoning that encompasses the site at 230 High Street, Masterton and rezone the site from Neighborhood Centre Zone to Commercial Zone. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | description of this zoning and would be better suited to a Commercial Zone. | |
| Planning Maps | Specific Controls | S32.002 | Harvey Norman Properties (N.Z.) Limited | Amend | The State Highway Noise Boundary Overlay has been applied to the frontage of the Site located at 230 High Street, Solway, Masterton. The associated rules contained within the Noise Chapter do not apply to commercial zones. The presence of the overlay across the Site is redundant and should therefore be removed. | Amend to remove the State Highway Noise Boundary overlay from the site located at 230 High Street, Solway, Masterton. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S32.003 | Harvey Norman Properties (N.Z.) Limited | Support | Definition is clear and appropriate and has the same meaning as the National Planning Standards. | Retain definition for Commercial Activity. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S32.004 | Harvey Norman Properties (N.Z.) Limited | Support | Definition is clear and appropriate. | Retain definition for Drive-through Activities. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S32.005 | Harvey Norman Properties (N.Z.) Limited | Support | Definition is clear and appropriate. | Retain the definition for Retail Activity |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S32.006 | Harvey Norman Properties (N.Z.) Limited | Support in part | Considers adding a definition for Large Format Retail Store. Seeks to add specific definition for this activity to distinguish it from a standard retail activity. | Insert definition for Large Format Retail Store: LFR - Large Format Retail Store Large retail stores, usually on one level and with associated car parking; these include discount department stores, others offer items such as household furniture and furnishings, appliances, garden supplies. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O5 | S32.007 | Harvey Norman Properties (N.Z.) Limited | Support | Supports the proposed objective. | Retain UFD-O5 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O6 | S32.008 | Harvey Norman Properties (N.Z.) Limited | Support | Supports the proposed objective. | Retain UFD-O6 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | Introduction | S223.001 | Helios Energy Ltd | Support in part | Considers some commentary in the Introduction of the General Rural Zone to provide a linkage to Council's anticipation of the establishment of renewable energy activities in the General Rural Zone would be | Amend GRUZ-Introduction: Activities and developments typically associated with urban areas are not provided for in the General Rural Zone. However, it is anticipated that |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | useful (such commentary is only found in the Energy Section 32 report). | the General Rural Zone will play a critical locational role for the establishment of new renewable energy activities (such as wind and solar) given this zone contains many key features that renewable energy activities require, including the key feature of adequate space and proximity to existing enabling electricity infrastructure such as substations or transmission / distribution lines. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | Introduction | S223.002 | Helios Energy Ltd | Support in part | The discussion in the Introduction about the National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land (NPSHPL) would benefit from aligning/being consistent with the intent, policy direction, provisions and terminology found in the NPS-HPL regarding 'productive capacity' (particularly clause 3.9(3) of the NPS-HPL which requires territorial authorities to take measures to ensure that any use or development on highly productive land: (a) minimises or mitigates any actual loss or potential cumulative loss of the availability and productive capacity of highly productive land in their district. | Amend GRUZ-Introduction: Activities that are not land based primary production can be provided for in line with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land are but need to be carefully managed where they are located on highly productive land to ensure there is no significant loss of or there is the ability to minimise or mitigate any actual loss or potential cumulative loss of the availability and productive capacity of highly productive land. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P2 | S223.003 | Helios Energy Ltd | Support in part | The submitter believes that it would be useful to iterate in this policy that there are activities that do not necessarily fit the absolute purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone, but do have a functional or operational need to be in the General Rural Zone e.g. solar farms, wind farms, electricity | Amend GRUZ-P2: ... a. are incompatible with the purpose, character, and amenity of the General Rural Zone unless the activity has a functional need or operational need to be located |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | transmission and distribution. This additional commentary would be useful to also provide a linkage to Policy GRUZ-04 Enable compatible activities which does also identify that 'other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone are enabled'. | in the General Rural Zone;... |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S3 | S223.004 | Helios Energy Ltd | Oppose in part | Does not support the 10m minimum setback distance for buildings or structures from a surface waterbody, as this would constrain and reduce the available usable space for buildings and structures on a GRZ site, particularly for a solar farm development. Notes the Section 32 report identifies feedback from the Water Races Committee, but does not provide reasons as to how the proposed increase in minimum setback would be dealt with when inconsistent with the bylaw setback requirement of 5m would work for an applicant. Seeks a 5m setback from a surface waterbody. Regarding sediment entering the water race from 5m setback, it is noted that the water race water is primarily used for irrigation and therefore sedimentation is not a key issue, and there will be minimal earthworks associated with establishing structures or buildings with a solar farm activity. Considers concerns about sedimentation would be negligible from a solar farm (initial piling of solar arrays, then re-grass and then ongoing grazing) in comparison to other land-based primary production cropping, horticulture or other activities requiring seasonal/cyclical soil disturbance. Notes the Wellington Natural Resources Plan permits a new structure in, on or under the bed of a river or lake, including a pipe, duct, or cable which is located over or under the bed where no bed occupancy limits apply. Considers a 10m setback creates an inconsistent regulatory consenting regime between the Regional and District Council | Amend GRUZ-S3: 1. Buildings or structures must not be located within: ... e. 10 5m of any surface waterbody. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | and the current water race bylaw. The submitter considers the bylaw approval process adequately addresses any requirements in relation to structures in proximity to water races. | |
| NU - Network Utilities | Introduction | S223.005 | Helios Energy Ltd | Support in part | Notes correspondence with staff regarding the relationship of Rule NU-R6, which requires substations or battery energy storage systems not enclosed by a building to have an applicable rule and standards, and if these cannot be met, to require consent as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Staff confirmed that the intent of the Energy Chapter is to be integrated to ensure that plan users can use this as the one stop shop for renewable electricity generation activities. The discretionary activity rule is intended to account for all associated infrastructure from large scale renewable energy, including substations and battery energy storage systems. While the Network Utilities chapter does contain rules relating to network utilities, those rules would only apply to network utility operators (as defined in the proposed plan). | Amend NU-Introduction to provide additional commentary to inform Plan Users that components of large-scale renewable electricity generation activities will be controlled by Rule ENG-R6 in the Energy Chapter, and therefore the Network Utility Chapter will not apply. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-S1 | S223.006 | Helios Energy Ltd | Support in part | Considers it unclear from the Noise Section 32 report as to the reason why there is proposed to be a reduction from the operative District Plan dBA Lmax limit of 75 dBA (9.00pm - 7.00am) to the Proposed District Plan 70 dB LAmax for the period of 10.00pm to 7.00am. Helios seeks the status quo of the operative District Plan dBA Lmax limit of 75dBA for the period of 10.00pm - 7.00am. | Amend NOISE-S1: ... d. Night time: (10.00pm to 7.00am): 75 dB LAmax. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-O2 | S223.007 | Helios Energy Ltd | Support in part | Seeks terminology is consistent with higher order documents such as the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management, National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land, the National Planning Standards, which all use terminology of 'operational need' and 'functional need'. Further these two terms are defined in the | Amend ENG-O2: Renewable electricity generation activities are designed and located to minimise adverse effects on communities and the environment while recognising their operational or locational constraints operational and functional needs. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | National Planning Standards, and therefore consistent terminology would be useful. | |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P4 | S223.008 | Helios Energy Ltd | Support in part | Considers clause (a) should recognise resilience benefits in line with small-scale and community-scale electricity generation activities - more so as large-scale renewable electricity generation activities provide resilience benefits at a far greater scale than small and community scale. Considers clause (b) should have an additional 'functional need' consideration, and removal of the term 'constraints' to be replaced with 'needs' to be consistent with higher order national documents who consistently use the terminology relating to 'operational and functional needs'. Considers clause (j) could better align with Clause 3.9(3) of the NPS-HPL which requires territorial authorities to take measures to ensure that any use or development on highly productive land. | Amend ENG-P4: ... a. benefits of large-scale renewable electricity generation including resilience benefits ; b. any locational, functional , technical, or operational constraints-needs ; ... j. potential effects on the productive capacity of the land, including the ability to protect minimise or mitigate any actual loss or potential cumulative loss of the availability and productive capacity of highly productive land;... |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R6 | S223.009 | Helios Energy Ltd | Support in part | Through the proposed General Rural Zone objectives and policies, it is clear what the purpose, key values, objectives and policies are for the General Rural Zone. Therefore, the submitter considers it more appropriate to have a Restricted Discretionary activity status assigned to the large-scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone because there are a limited number of matters of discretion that can be developed for establishing these activities in the General Rural Zone. Whilst there is a low anticipation by Council that other zones would be used as much as the General Rural Zone for establishing large-scale renewable electricity generation activities, given the amendment the submitter seek for the change in activity status for the General Rural Zone, the submitter also seeks amendment for these activities to have a Discretionary activity status in all other zone. Considers a Non-complying activity status is not an appropriate | Amend Rule ENG-R6: General Rural Zone: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary All other zones: 2. Activity status: Non-complying Discretionary |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | as it does not recognise or support renewable energy activities across the district. | |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R6 | S223.010 | Helios Energy Ltd | Support in part | Considers 'upgrade of existing large-scale renewable electricity generation activities' should be a standalone rule with consistent activity classifications in line with those proposed under the recent consultation process for improved policy direction in the NPS-REG and a new NES for upgrading and repowering existing REG. Full reasons are set out in "Strengthening national direction on renewable electricity generation and electricity transmission (APRIL 2023) Consultation Document 1". | Amend Rule ENG-R6 Large-scale renewable electricity generation activities or upgrade of existing large-scale renewable electricity generation activities And add new rule: Rule ENG-RX - Upgrade or repowering of existing large-scale renewable electricity generation activities. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S223.011 | Helios Energy Ltd | Support | Supports addition of 'battery energy storage system' to the definition of 'large-scale renewable energy generation activity' | Retain the definition of 'large-scale renewable energy generation activity' as notified |
| ENG - Energy | Introduction | S223.012 | Helios Energy Ltd | Support | Supports commentary in ENG-Introduction that acknowledges solar energy is area constrained due to several factors similar to wind energy generation. | Retain ENG-Introduction as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-O3 | S223.013 | Helios Energy Ltd | Support | Supports wording that captures Wairarapa's intentions to be energy self-sufficient and increase energy efficiency. | Retain ENG-O3 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P3 | S223.014 | Helios Energy Ltd | Support | The matters noted in ENG-P3 are applicable to both community-scale and large-scale renewable energy generation, and ensures high quality proposals are put forward to Council. | Retain ENG-P3 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | | S264.001 | Henare Manaena | Not Stated | The submission discusses that a non-notifiable resource consent can be used by developers to build a compliant house which can be then sold at the expense of a disadvantaged community that are not protected in the RMA, and District Councils to seriously consider that affected communities must be part of the consenting process to safeguard the character of their suburbs and to prevent slum style developments. The | Amend the General Residential Zone to notify resource consent applications of negative developments in neighbourhoods which can be long-lasting and irreversible (inferred). |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|--------------------------------|------------------|---|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | submission also discusses wastewater issues, social housing issues and school issues. | |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S249.001 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Oppose | Notes that although a definition for archaeological site is contained in the Historic Heritage chapter - Introduction, considers it useful to keep definitions together. | Insert new definition of "Archaeological site": Has the same meaning as given in the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (HNZPT Act) (as set out below): means, subject to section 42(3) of the HNZPT Act,-- a. any place in New Zealand, including any building or structure (or part of a building or structure), that-- i. was associated with human activity that occurred before 1900 or is the site of the wreck of any vessel where the wreck occurred before 1900; and ii. provides or may provide, through investigation by archaeological methods, evidence relating to the history of New Zealand; and b. includes a site for which a declaration is made under section 43(1) of the HNZPT Act. |
| Planning Maps | Historical and Cultural Values | S249.002 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Amend | Considers that while the definition of 'heritage curtilage' is suitable, the lack of mapping of curtilage means that provisions relating to heritage curtilage may not work as intended. | Amend the planning maps to show the curtilage around scheduled heritage buildings and items, subject to the requisite work being undertaken. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S249.003 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports this definition of maintenance in relation to heritage buildings. | Retain definition of 'maintenance'. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S249.004 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports this definition of repair of heritage buildings and items. | Retain definition of 'repair'. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|----------|--|---|
| Tangata Whenua | | S249.005 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT is supportive of this chapter and the approach taken by council to acknowledge Tangata Whenua in the Proposed Plan. | Retain the Tangata Whenua chapter subject to any amendments requested by mana whenua. |
| Strategic Direction | HC-O1 | S249.006 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports strategic objectives for the protection and management of historic and cultural heritage. | Retain HC-O1 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | HC-O2 | S249.007 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports strategic objectives for the protection and management of historic and cultural heritage. | Retain HC-O2 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P3 | S249.008 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports this policy, particularly the regard to adverse effects on heritage and other special features. | Retain ENG-P3 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P4 | S249.009 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports this policy, particularly the regard to adverse effects on heritage and other special features. | Retain ENG-P4 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R4 | S249.010 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Oppose | Considers the list of restricted areas under this rule should also include sites containing scheduled heritage features and heritage precincts. This change will ensure that the rule will more effectively implement ENG-P4(i). | Amend ENG-R4: a. The activity is not located within: ...x. sites containing Historic Heritage items and Historic Heritage precincts. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R5 | S249.011 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Oppose | Considers list of restricted areas in this rule should also include sites containing scheduled heritage features and heritage precincts. This change will ensure that the rule will more effectively implement ENG-P4(i). | Amend ENG-R5: a. The activity is not located within: ...x. sites containing Historic Heritage items and Historic Heritage precincts. |
| NU - Network Utilities | | S249.012 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports the rules framework which include, under matters of discretion, the effects on historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Māori. | Retain the rules framework of the Network Utilities chapter, particularly the matters of discretion including effects on historic heritage and other sensitive areas. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | Introduction | S249.013 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports the introduction to the historic heritage chapter, including reference to archaeological sites. | Retain HH-Introduction as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-O1 | S249.014 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports the recognition of heritage as important. | Retain HH-O1 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-O2 | S249.015 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports the protection of heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. | Retain HH-O2 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P1 | S249.016 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports the identification of historic heritage. | Retain HH-P1 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P2 | S249.017 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports policy HH-P2 regarding the protection of historic heritage. | Retain HH-P2 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P3 | S249.018 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports the policy but notes rule framework does not appropriately reflect the intention of the third clause of this policy (further elaborated in subsequent submission points on heritage precincts) | Retain HH-P3 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P4 | S249.019 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports this policy. | Retain HH-P4 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P5 | S249.020 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports this policy. | Retain HH-P5 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P6 | S249.021 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports the intent of the policy of allowing for new buildings and structures, or alterations and additions to existing buildings and structures located in the curtilage of scheduled heritage items, but considers it would be a stronger and clearer policy if each curtilage area was defined on the plan maps. | Retain HH-P6 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P7 | S249.022 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports the policy controlling new buildings and structures in heritage precincts. | Retain HH-P7 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P8 | S249.023 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support in part | Supports the intent of the policy of limiting relocation of heritage buildings, unless special circumstances exist is supported, but notes that the phrase 'provide for a significant public benefit' could be interpreted in unintended ways. Considers the policy should give direction that 'reasonable alternatives' to relocation have been considered. | Amend HH-P8: 1. There are no reasonable alternatives to retain the heritage item in its current location, 1- 2. The work is necessary to: i. Reduce risk from natural hazards; or ii. Provide for a significant public benefit that could not otherwise be achieved; |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P9 | S249.024 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support in part | Supports the intent of minimising demolition of heritage buildings and items, but notes the terms 'discourage' and 'importance attributed to the heritage item by the wider community' could create interpretation problems. To | Amend HH-P9: Avoid Discourage demolition of scheduled heritage buildings and items unless it can |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | correct this, suggests the term 'discourage' be replaced by the more familiar term 'avoid' as used in policy HH-P8. Also notes that good design features of a proposed replacement building are not considered to sufficiently mitigate against the loss of an identified heritage building or structure. | be demonstrated that there are no reasonable alternatives, and having regard to the following matters: ... 6. Appropriateness, compatibility, and appearance of any replacement building in relation to heritage value |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P10 | S249.025 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports the policy to increase the public awareness and appreciation of historic heritage. | Retain HH-P10 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P11 | S249.026 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports the policy of controlling subdivision of sites containing scheduled heritage buildings or structures, or sites within heritage precincts. | Retain HH-P11 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P12 | S249.027 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports the proposed policy intended to safeguard archaeological sites. It would be beneficial to include archaeological sites on the District Plan maps as an 'alert layer' | Retain HH-P12 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R1 | S249.028 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports providing for a range of maintenance and repair activities to scheduled heritage items as a permitted activity. | Retain HH-R1 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R2 | S249.029 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support in part | Supports this rule for the demolition of a non-scheduled building on a site containing a scheduled heritage structure or building but notes there may be a gap in the rule framework for non-contributing buildings within a heritage precinct. Notes this can be addressed by amending HH-R2, or HH-R10. Notes the assumption is that the precincts currently contain both contributing and non-contributing buildings. If every building within a precinct is contributing to heritage values, then no amendment is necessary. | Amend HH-R2: Demolition of a non-scheduled building or structure within heritage curtilage of a heritage building or item listed in SCHED1 Heritage Buildings and Items and non-contributing buildings within a heritage precinct. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R3 | S249.030 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports Rule HH-R3 | Retain HH-R3 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R4 | S249.031 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports the rule to provide for internal safety improvements as a permitted activity. | Retain HH-R4 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R5 | S249.032 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports the rule to make new or relocated buildings or structures in the vicinity of a heritage building a Restricted Discretionary activity. | Retain HH-R5 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R6 | S249.033 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports rule HH-R6 | Retain HH-R6 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R7 | S249.034 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports HH-R7 for the demolition of scheduled heritage buildings and items. | Retain HH-R7 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R8 | S249.035 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports this rule. | Retain HH-R8 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R9 | S249.036 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports this rule. | Retain HH-R9 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R10 | S249.037 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support in part | Supports this rule regarding demolition of existing contributory buildings within heritage precincts. Notes the activity status of Discretionary appears to be inconsistent with the current wording of HH-P3 which refers to the "Enable the...demolition of non-scheduled buildings within a heritage precinct". Notes Council may wish to be more enabling of the demolition of any non-contributing buildings within the precincts. | Retain HH-R10, unless contributing and non-contributing buildings can be identified within each precinct. In which case, the rule should differentiate to enable demolition of non-contributing, whilst protecting contributory buildings from demolition. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R11 | S249.038 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support in part | Supports this rule which controls the design and appearance of new and relocated buildings in a heritage precinct. Notes it may also be beneficial to consider a restricted discretionary status, so that the matters for consideration are limited to the matters listed in HH-P7. | Amend HH-R11: Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. The matters listed in HH-P7 |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | Introduction | S249.039 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support in part | Commends the work carried out in association with iwi to identify additional SASM sites in South Wairarapa District. Notes the District Plan maps include three types of SASM - some are just a marker (yellow dot), some are 'small extents' and | Amend SASM-Introduction to explain the mapping of SASM sites (points, small extents, and large extents), and subject to any amendments requested by mana whenua. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | some are 'large extents'. The SASM chapter does not differentiate between these three. Suggests a note be included in the introductory section of the SASM chapter on the mapping of sites to assist plan users. Encourages the Council to prioritise the comprehensive investigation and mapping of other potential sites in the three Wairarapa Districts. | |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-O1 | S249.040 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports the objective | Retain SASM-O1 as notified. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P1 | S249.041 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports the general intent of the policy. | Retain SASM-P1 as notified subject to feedback from mana whenua. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R1 | S249.042 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support in part | Supports the general intent of the rules. Considers it may be problematic interpreting how some of the rules would apply to the identified sites which do not have a mapped extent, for example rules relating to land disturbance and earthworks. | Retain SASM-R1, subject to any feedback from mana whenua. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R5 | S249.043 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support in part | Notes a typo in SASM-R5 - no permitted activity standard (a). Considers permitted standard (c) seems irrelevant, as this rule relates to demolition and removal of existing buildings, not alterations. | Amend SASM-R5: ... a. b. The works do not involve any land disturbance... c. for alterations, there is no change to the size or location of the foundation or footprint of the existing building or structure. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R8 | S249.044 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Oppose | It is noted that the SASM rules (with the exception of SASM-R1) do not apply in Settlement Zones. Considers that while it is reasonable to expect a differentiated rule framework for the Settlement Zone, there needs to be some level of control and protection for SASMs which lie within | Amend SASM-R8: All zones except Settlement Zone |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | settlement zones and SASM-R8 should therefore apply to all zones. | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O1 | S249.045 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports reference to providing for historic heritage values in the consideration of subdivision. | Retain SUB-O1 as notified |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P3 | S249.046 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports the management of subdivision on scheduled sites to ensure the protection of historic heritage and SASM. | Retain SUB-P3 as notified |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R8 | S249.047 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports Restricted Discretionary activity status for the subdivision of sites containing a scheduled heritage item, or within a heritage precinct. Notes the matters of discretion should refer to HH-P11 and SUB-P3. Suggests some changes to rule drafting to provide better clarity and direction. Notes additional policies relate to this type of development, in addition to those currently listed as a matter of discretion. | Amend SUB-R8: Matters of discretion: 1. The matters set out in policies HH-P11 , HH-P12 , SUB-P1 , SUB-P2 and SUB-P3 . |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R12 | S249.048 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status for subdivision in this zone, and also the inclusion of effects on historic heritage, archaeological sites and SASM as a matter of discretion. | Retain SUB-R12 as notified |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R13 | S249.049 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status for subdivision in this overlay, and the inclusion of effects on historic heritage, archaeological sites and SASM as a matter of discretion. | Retain SUB-R13 as notified |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R14 | S249.050 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports the discretionary activity status for the subdivision of land containing a SASM. | Retain SUB-R14 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O1 | S249.051 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports the objective referring to the maintenance of historic and other values of the coastal environment. | Retain CE-O1 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P4 | S249.052 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports the management of subdivision, use and development in this sensitive environment. | Retain CE-P4 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal | CE-P7 | S249.053 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports the policy for the recognition and management of archaeological sites. | Retain CE-P7 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| Environment | | | | | | |
| SIGN - Signs | SIGN-P7 | S249.054 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports the policy for managing signage on scheduled heritage buildings and within heritage precincts. | Retain SIGN-P7 as notified |
| SIGN - Signs | SIGN-R1 | S249.055 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support in part | HNZPT supports the exclusion of heritage precincts from general signage provisions. It is suggested that the wording of the rule is slightly amended, to make clear that the exclusion also applies to scheduled heritage buildings. | Amend SIGN-R1: Signs, except those located on a site containing a scheduled heritage building listed in SCHED1 Heritage Buildings and Items or in a scheduled heritage precinct listed in SCHED2 Heritage Precincts. |
| SIGN - Signs | SIGN-R2 | S249.056 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support in part | HNZPT supports restrictions on signage within scheduled heritage precincts. However, the rule has inadequate control over the potential effects of signage on heritage buildings within precincts. For example, a sign of up to 4m ² fixed to the front façade of a commercial building could detract from the character and values of a heritage precinct, particularly if it obstructed a key architectural feature of the building. The addition of a permitted activity clause relating to architectural features would address this concern. | Amend SIGN-R2:... f. Signs do not obscure windows or architectural features. |
| SIGN - Signs | SIGN-R9 | S249.057 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports the ability to consider a wide range of matters in any application for signage affixed to the exterior of a scheduled heritage building. | Retain SIGN-R9 as notified. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-O8 | S249.058 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports the objective referring to the heritage and character of the South Wairarapa town centres. | Retain TCZ-O8 as notified |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-P11 | S249.059 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports this policy which recognises the heritage and special character of the South Wairarapa town centres. | Retain TCZ-P11 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|------------------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| Appendix 3 - Centres Design Guide | Centres Design Guide | S249.060 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT supports the provision of guidance, particularly the special references to design in heritage areas. | Retain Centres Design Guide |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S249.061 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support in part | The Introduction notes that the Heritage Inventory contains more detail on each heritage item. Considers it would be beneficial if the heritage inventory for each item could be linked to the entry in the schedule, so that plan users can readily access the information and understand the characteristics and values of each place. | Amend SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings and Items to insert a link to the heritage inventory for each listed building or item. |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S249.062 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support in part | HNZPT supports the inclusion of this item on the heritage schedule. It is requested that additional details of the item be included on the schedule including its address and HNZPT list reference. | Amend entry HC53 (Korarau Power Station) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings and Items: Te Wharau Road, GladstoneHNZPT List 7814, Category 2 |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S249.063 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support in part | HNZPT supports the inclusion of this item on the heritage schedule. It is requested that additional details of the item be included on the schedule including its address and HNZPT list reference. | Amend entry HS158 (Featherston Military Camp) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings and Items: HNZPT Ref 9661 Category 1 |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S249.064 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support in part | HNZPT supports the addition of Carkeek Observatory to the schedule, seeks to add HNZPT listing reference. | Amend entry HS159 (Carkeek Observatory) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings and Items: List number 9808, Category 1 |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S249.065 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Oppose | This Joinery Factory was entered on the heritage list in 1983. It is included in the Operative Plan schedule as Hs071. It has been recommended for deletion by the engaged heritage expert, because of its dilapidated condition. The Report states "In Revans Street is a late 19th century large weatherboarded joinery factory building (NZHPT Registered Category II List 2867). This building and an associated villa are largely hidden from public view and are not accessed easily. This is a good thing. Both buildings are in a dilapidated condition". | Amend SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings and Items to add a new entry: Joinery Factory, 26 Revans Street (HNZPT number 2867, Category 2) |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|------------------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | (Section 32 Report (Heritage), Appendix 2). The Section 32 report writer has not undertaken an assessment of the values of the place, instead relying on its condition as a reason to not include it in the schedule. Building condition does not equate with heritage value. HNZPT submits that the heritage values of the place need to be assessed, and if the assessment warrants, include the place in Schedule 1. | |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S249.066 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Oppose | Waihenga was entered on the Heritage List in 1983, and is included in the Operative Plan schedule as Hs041. In the Section 32 Heritage Report (Appendix 2) Operative Plan schedule number HS041 is referenced, but there is no assessment of the place nor any reason provided for the recommendation to delete from schedule. The only comment is that the land is being subdivided. Subdivision in itself is not a reason for removing a heritage item from the schedule. HNZPT submits that the heritage values of the place need to be assessed, and if the assessment warrants, include the place in Schedule 1. | Amend SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings and Items to insert a new entry: Waihenga, List No. 1314 (Category 2 historic place) located at 154A Jellicoe Street, Martinborough |
| SCHED2 - Schedule of Heritage Precincts | Heritage Precincts | S249.067 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support in part | Notes there is no description of the precincts, and there is no differentiation between contributing and non-contributing buildings. Notes this differentiation is a common feature of heritage precincts and areas in many district plans. Notes HH-P3 is not supported by the rule framework, as HH-R10 provides for a discretionary activity for the demolition of any building within the precinct. Considers it possible for each demolition proposal to be assessed on its merits in terms of the contribution it makes to the overall heritage values of the precinct, but considers this places an unnecessary burden on the owner of a non-heritage building within the precinct. Considers it better practice to assess each site within each precinct and make a determination of its contribution to the overall | Retain SCHED2 - Heritage Precincts, unless contributing and non-contributing buildings can be identified within each precinct, in which case it should be amended to include a description of the characteristics and values of each precinct. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|--|------------------|---|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | heritage value of the precinct, as well as a description of the characteristics and values of the precincts. This information would be valuable in aiding assessment of each existing building, and of any new buildings within the precincts. Acknowledges that this may be a piece of work beyond the scope of this process, but it would be a worthwhile investment. | |
| SCHED2 - Schedule of Heritage Precincts | Heritage Precincts | S249.068 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Oppose | Notes Matakītaki a Kupe is included in Schedule 2 as a Heritage Precinct, and the same area (with a slightly different boundary) is also included in Schedule 4 - TWS92. Notes the provisions relating to heritage precincts in the HH chapter are geared to the protection of built heritage values, while the SASM provisions are tailored for sites like Matakītaki a Kupe, and provide an appropriate level of protection. Considers there is no need to include this area in both schedule 2 and schedule 4. | Delete Matakītaki a Kupe from SCHED2 - Heritage Precincts, acknowledging that the same area is included in SCHED4 - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori. |
| SCHED4 - Schedule of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | S249.069 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | HNZPT acknowledges the work that has gone into the SASM schedule, including the identification and mapping of sites, and the importance of protecting these sites through the district plan provisions. | Retain SCHED4 - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori, subject to any amendments suggested by mana whenua |
| Planning Maps | Historical and Cultural Values | S249.070 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Oppose | The PDP includes provisions relating to heritage curtilage, and also a definition of the same. However, these provisions would be much clearer if the curtilage of each place were to be shown on the plan maps. For most urban places this would be 'the entire site', whereas for larger properties a defined curtilage would assist plan users to know when and where the curtilage rules apply. | Amend the planning maps to show heritage curtilage for each historic heritage building and structure on the planning maps. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S249.071 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports reference to "New Zealand Heritage List Rārangī Kōrero" | Retain reference to "New Zealand Heritage List Rārangī Kōrero" throughout the Plan. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|--------------------------------|------------------|---|----------|---|---|
| Interpretation | Definitions | S249.072 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Considers the definition of heritage curtilage is appropriate, subject to work being undertaken to enable mapping of heritage curtilages. | Retain definition of 'heritage curtilage' |
| Planning Maps | Historical and Cultural Values | S249.073 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | To support implementation of HH-P12. | Amend planning maps to add known (recorded) archaeological sites. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-O2 | S249.074 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports the objective | Retain SASM-O2 as notified. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-O3 | S249.075 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports the objective | Retain SASM-O3 as notified. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P2 | S249.076 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports the intent of the policy | Retain SASM-P2 as notified subject to feedback from mana whenua. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P3 | S249.077 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports intent of the policy | Retain SASM-P3 as notified subject to feedback from mana whenua. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P4 | S249.078 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports intent of policy | Retain SASM-P4 as notified subject to feedback from mana whenua. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P5 | S249.079 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports intention of policy | Retain SASM-P5 as notified subject to feedback from mana whenua. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P6 | S249.080 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports intention of policy, particularly avoiding removal and destruction of sites and areas of significance | Retain SASM-P6 as notified subject to feedback from mana whenua. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---|----------|--|--|
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P7 | S249.081 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports intention of policy | Retain SASM-P7 as notified subject to feedback from mana whenua. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P8 | S249.082 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports intent of policy | Retain SASM-P8 as notified subject to feedback from mana whenua. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P9 | S249.083 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports intent of policy | Retain SASM-P9 as notified subject to feedback from mana whenua. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R2 | S249.084 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports the general intent of the rules. Considers it may be problematic interpreting how some of the rules would apply to the identified sites which do not have a mapped extent, for example rules relating to land disturbance and earthworks. | Retain SASM-R2 as notified subject to feedback from mana whenua. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R3 | S249.085 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports the general intent of the rules. Considers it may be problematic interpreting how some of the rules would apply to the identified sites which do not have a mapped extent, for example rules relating to land disturbance and earthworks. | Retain SASM-R3 as notified subject to feedback from mana whenua |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R4 | S249.086 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports the general intent of the rules. Considers it may be problematic interpreting how some of the rules would apply to the identified sites which do not have a mapped extent, for example rules relating to land disturbance and earthworks. | Retain SASM-R4 as notified subject to feedback from mana whenua |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R6 | S249.087 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports the general intent of the rules. Considers it may be problematic interpreting how some of the rules would apply to the identified sites which do not have a mapped extent, for example rules relating to land disturbance and earthworks. | Retain SASM-R6 as notified subject to feedback from mana whenua |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of | SASM-R7 | S249.088 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) | Support | Supports the general intent of the rules. Considers it may be problematic interpreting how some of the rules would apply to the | Retain SASM-R7 as notified subject to feedback from mana whenua |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|----------|--|--|
| Significance to Māori | | | | | identified sites which do not have a mapped extent, for example rules relating to land disturbance and earthworks. | |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.001 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | <p>The submitter supports the use of the National Planning Standards definition of 'earthworks' but seek that the plan includes a definition and activity for 'ancillary rural earthworks' to provide for day to day earthworks for primary production. This will support GRUZ-R5, NU-R20, SASM-P3, and NFL-S1.</p> <p>The 'ancillary rural earthworks' definition should also include the burial of material infected by unwanted organisms under the Biosecurity Act 1993.</p> | <p>Insert the following definition: Ancillary ruralearthworks Means the disturbance of soil, earth or substrateland surfaces ancillary to primary productionthat includes: - Land preparation and cultivation (includingestablishment of sediment and erosioncontrol measures), for planting and growingoperations and harvesting of agriculturaland horticultural crops (farming)- Burying of material infected by unwantedorganisms as declared by Ministry forPrimary Industries Chief Technical Officer oran emergency declared by the Ministerunder the Biosecurity Act 1993</p> |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.002 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter seeks a definition for 'artificial crop protection structures' to support NU-R19. | <p>Insert the following definition: Artificial crop protection structure Means a structure with material used to protect crops and/or enhance growth (excluding greenhouses). Note: For the avoidance of doubt artificial crop protection structures are not a building.</p> |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.003 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter seeks a definition for 'crop support structures' to support NU-R19. | <p>Insert the following definition: Crop support structure Means an open structure on which plants are grown.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|----------|--|---|
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.004 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the use of the National Planning Standards definition for 'Earthworks'. | Retain 'earthworks' definition as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.005 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | A definition for 'greenhouses' is essential to ensure this efficient growing system, well-suited for climate adaptation, is not caught by burdensome rules meant for other activities. | Insert the following definition: Greenhouse Means a structure enclosed by glass or other transparent material and used for the cultivation or protection of plants in a controlled environment but excluding artificial crop protection structures. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.006 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports this definition as it is aligned with the Proposed National Policy Statement for Natural Hazard Decision-making. | Retain definition for 'Hazard areas' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.007 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the identification of hazard sensitive activities that are most vulnerable to natural hazards. | Retain definition of 'Hazard sensitive activities' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.008 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter strongly supports the inclusion of a definition of 'highly productive land' and provisions to support it within the plan. Using the definition from the NPS-HPL ensures consistency with national direction. Note that "Highly Productive Land" does not need the first letter of each word capitalised. | Retain definition of 'Highly productive land' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.009 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports horticulture not being considered as intensive primary production, since it is an efficient land use. | Retain definition of 'Intensive primary production' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.010 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the use of the National Planning Standards definition and that greenhouses are not considered intensive indoor primary production. Greenhouses are highly efficient systems with minimal environmental impacts. | Retain definition of 'Intensive indoor primary production' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.011 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports this definition and that horticulture is not an intensive outdoor primary production activity. It is a highly efficient production system. | Retain definition of 'Intensive outdoor primary production' as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.012 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | <p>The submitter supports the inclusion of a definition of land based primary production and provisions to support it within the plan. Using the definition from the NPS-HPL ensures consistency with national direction.</p> <p>Note that some greenhouses are land-based and plant directly into the soil, just under cover. These growing systems should be enabled on highly productive land alongside other soil-based production.</p> | Retain definition of 'Land based primary production' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.013 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose in part | <p>Accessory buildings used for non-habitable purposes are a very low natural hazard risk. Buildings associated with primary production are also non-habitable.</p> <p>The submitter seeks clarity that ancillary buildings and structures for horticulture are not caught in an urban-focused natural hazard risk framework. Note that this definition does not match the list provided in NH - Natural Hazards chapter.</p> | <p>Amend the definition for 'Less hazard sensitive activities'</p> <p>Means activities that are less sensitive to natural hazards, which are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Accessory buildings used for non-habitable purposes; b. Park facilities; management activity; and c. Parks furniture; ed. Buildings and structures associated with temporary activities; e. Buildings associated with primary production; and f. Rural industry activities. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.014 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The diagram contained in the definition of 'National Grid subdivision corridor' does not match the definition of 'National Grid Yard'. | Amend the diagram contained in the definition of 'National Grid subdivision corridor' to match the 'National Grid Yard' definition - 10m from the centreline, not 12. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.015 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The definition of 'National Grid Yard' states an area of 10 m on either side of the centreline of an overhead National Grid transmission line, but the diagram still shows 12 m. | Amend the diagram contained in the definition for 'National Grid Yard' to match the text - 10m from the centreline, not 12m. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.016 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose in part | The submitter opposes inclusion of fuel burning equipment as a noxious or offensive industry. Such operations will require | Amend definition of 'Noxious or offensive industry' as follows: Means an industrial activity involving: |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | consents under the regional plan for discharges to air and are best managed through that process. The effects will depend on the location and so a blanket classification is not supported. All clauses should also have the same numbering system. | a. blood or offal... i. b. flax pulping... ii. c. slaughtering... iv. any other processes involving fuel burning equipment, which individually or in combination with other equipment, have a fuel burning rate of up to 1000 kg/hr; v. d. burning out of the residual content of metal containers used for the transport or storage of chemicals... ... |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.017 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The ECO-1 schedule is limited to plants identified in the Wellington Regional Pest Management Strategy. There should be recognition that unwanted organisms are pests but not yet identified in the strategy because they are still unknown or have not yet reached the region. | Amend definition of 'Pest plant species' as follows: Means any plant species identified in Appendix ECO-1 - Schedule of Pest Plant Species and unwanted organisms identified under the Biosecurity Act 1993 by Ministry of Primary Industries. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.018 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose | Buildings associated with primary production and rural industry activities pose minimal risk to human life and safety. People do not sleep at primary production businesses, which means they are more alert to hazards than people in residential dwellings. In addition, primary production involved fewer people on more land than urban activities. The Building Code has Building Importance categories, and non-habitable buildings are importance level 1 (the lowest) as they are buildings which pose low risk to human life or the environment, or a low economic cost. Unnecessary restrictions on where horticulture can operate is a risk to local food supply. Horticultural businesses need to operate close to their ancillary activities like | Amend definition of 'Potentially hazardsensitive activities' as follows: Means activities that are potentially sensitive to natural hazards, which are: a) Buildings associated with primary production; b) Commercial activities; or c) Industrial activities.; or d) Rural industry activities. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | packhouses and greenhouses due to the perishable nature of fresh produce. | |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.019 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the use of the National Planning Standards Definition of Primary Production. | Retain definition of 'primary production' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.020 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the inclusion of a definition for productive capacity and provisions to support it within the plan. Using the definition from the NPS-HPL ensures consistency with national direction. | Retain definition for 'productive capacity' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.021 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose in part | Visitor accommodation should be a short-term stay. Ninety days is not short term. Such a length of stay should be regarded as a residential activity. The National Planning Standards definition of visitor accommodation should apply. Any limitation on the length of stay should be in the relevant rules. | Delete the definition of 'residential visitor accommodation'. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.022 | Horticulture New Zealand | Not Stated | <p>This term is used frequently throughout the plan, so it should have a definition. Reverse sensitivity applies to a range of activities, including primary production and network utilities, but it retains the same meaning. This approach is well-established in most district plans. Rules should be clear about which activity is being protected from reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p>Rural sensitivity is one of the biggest issues facing horticulture at the urban-rural interface.</p> | Insert the definition for 'Reverse sensitivity' contained in the Draft Wairarapa Combined District Plan: Reverse sensitivity Means the vulnerability of an existing lawfully established activity to other activities in the vicinity which are sensitive to adverse environmental effects that may be generated by such existing activity, thereby creating the potential for the operation of such existing activity to be constrained. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.023 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The Strategic Directions for RE - Rural Environment use the undefined term 'rural environment'. It is not clear if this term equates to the rural zones on the planning maps as this term sometimes includes open space in other planning documents. | Insert the following definition for 'Rural environment': Rural Environment Means land zoned General Rural or Rural Lifestyle. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.024 | Horticulture New Zealand | Amend | The submitter states that the word 'operation' would be more appropriate than 'site'. Growers may have multiple sites where they grow (meaning land with different certificates | Amend definition of 'Rural produce retail': Means the use of land and/or buildings on, or within which, rural produce grown or |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | of title). These sites could be in close proximity to each other but produce from multiple land parcels are brought together to be sold in one place. | produced by the same operation on site , and products manufactured by them from it , are offered for sale. This includes the further processing of products manufactured by the same operation on site . |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.025 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the definition of 'seasonal worker accommodation'. Seasonal workers also work at postharvest facilities such as packhouses to prepare produce for market. Work as packhouses follows the same seasonal patterns as other horticultural labour based on when produce is harvested. | Amend definition of 'Seasonal worker accommodation': Means the use of land and buildings for the sole purpose of accommodating the short-term labour requirement of a primary production activity, and rural industry or post harvest facility . |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.026 | Horticulture New Zealand | Amend | The NPS-ET has a narrower definition of sensitive activities. If this definition is going to be used with regard to the National Grid Yard, its scope should be narrowed. Otherwise, a new definition should be introduced for sensitive activities in the National Grid Yard. | Amend the definition of 'sensitive activities' as follows or insert a new definition of sensitive activities in the National Grid Yard. Has the same meaning as in the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission (as set out below): Means schools, residential buildings and hospitals. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.027 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the definition of 'Significant hazardous facility', especially exclusion c. | Retain exclusion c. of the 'Significant hazardous facility' definition as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.028 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports provisions for shelterbelts, which are important for horticulture. | Retain definition of 'shelterbelts and small woodlots' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.029 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose | The submitter does not support the inclusion of special amenity landscapes. There are no rules that relate to them, so they should be removed from the plan. | Delete definition of 'special amenity landscapes'. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S221.030 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose | The definition of waterbody in the RMA does not include artificial channels or water races. The submitter believes the definition should | Amend definition of 'surface waterbody' as follows: Means a body of freshwater in a river, |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | be consistent with the Act. Concerns regarding obstruction of artificial channels and waterways does not mean they merit the same level of protection as natural water bodies. | lake, stream, pond, water race, artificial channel, or wetland. |
| Strategic Direction | CCR-O1 | S221.031 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the transition to a low emissions economy and recognises that horticulture is a low emissions activity. | Retain CCR-O1 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | CCR-O2 | S221.032 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports climate change adaptation, including using the opportunity of climatic changes to the Wairarapa for horticultural expansion. | Retain CCR-O2 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | CCR-O4 | S221.033 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports planning for water resilience and recognises that more efficient activities support this objective. | Retain CCR-O4 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O2 | S221.034 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports preserving the productive capacity of the General Rural Zone for primary production activities. | Retain RE-O2 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O3 | S221.035 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports recognition of highly productive land. Hydroponic growing (like for lettuce) and the use of growing mediums (like strawberries in coconut coir) should also be supported, since these are primary production activities appropriate to the rural environment. | Amend RE-O3 as follows: Highly productive land is protected for use inland-based primary production, both now and for future generations. |
| Strategic Direction | New provision request | S221.036 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | Activities that support primary production activities are essential to the effective and productive functioning of the rural zone. Horticultural success in the Wairarapa will require packhouses, freight, agricultural aviation and other ancillary activities. This is a strategic matter to actively enable appropriate use of the rural zone for a thriving rural economy. | Insert a new objective as follows: RE-OX Supporting activities The rural environment includes activities that support primary production activities such as rural industry. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O2 | S221.037 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | Urban growth should be planned such that it does not infringe on the productive capacity of the rural zone, in alignment with the NPS-HPL. | Amend UFD-O2 as follows: The Wairarapa's urban areas grow in a planned, efficient, and structured way to meet future needs in a responsive manner that: 1. provides for a variety of housing types that respond to a range of community needs; 2. enables greater densities of development in areas with sufficient infrastructure capacity |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | and located close to centres, services, open spaces and/or public transport; 3. is compatible with the character and amenity of the urban areas; 4. does not compromise the productive capacity of the rural environment. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O6 | S221.038 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | It should be clear that commercial activities outside of town centres do not infringe on the productive capacity of the rural environment. | Amend UFD-O6 as follows: Commercial activities located outside of town centres do not undermine the function and viability of the Wairarapa's town centres or the productive capacity of the rural environment. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P3 | S221.039 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | Community-scale electricity generation will reduce the costs of decarbonising rural industry. The submitter supports that this policy recognises the need to protect the productive capacity of highly productive land when siting this new infrastructure. This will mitigate land use conflicts. | Retain ENG-P3(c) as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R1 | S221.040 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports that any actual or potential loss of highly productive land is a matter of discretion for these activities. | Retain ENG-R1(2)(7) as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R2 | S221.041 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports any actual or potential loss of highly productive land is a matter of discretion for these activities. | Retain ENG-R2(2)(2) as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R3 | S221.042 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter strongly supports operation of wind turbines being a controlled activity in the General Rural Zone and highly productive land being considered under these rules. | Retain ENG-R3(2)(4) and ENG-R3(3)(4) as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R4 | S221.043 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter strongly supports community-scale solar being a controlled or restricted discretionary activity not located on highly productive land. | Retain ENG-R4(1) and ENG-R4(3) as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R5 | S221.044 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports community-scale wind electricity generation being a controlled or restricted discretionary activity not located on | Retain ENG-R5(1) as notified. Amend ENG-R5(2) Matters of discretion as follows: x. Actual and potential loss of |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | highly productive land. Highly productive land should be a matter of discretion for wind generation in the General Rural Zone where it does not comply with ENG-R5(1)(b). | highly productive land. |
| NU - Network Utilities | Introduction | S221.045 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The 5th paragraph would be clearer and recognise that many land uses do not have adverse effects on network utilities if it focused on incompatible land uses. | Amend Network Utilities Introduction as follows: Likewise, incompatible land uses adjacent to network utilities can have the potential to impart an adverse effects on the ongoing function and operation of network utilities. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O3 | S221.046 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose in part | With regard to reverse sensitivity, the NPS-ET's requirement under Policy 10 is that "decision-makers must to the extent reasonably possible manage activities to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on the electricity transmission network". The policy does not suggest that plans "protect" network utilities. Managing activities to avoid reverse sensitivity would be the approach most aligned with national direction. | Amend NU-O3 as follows: Incompatible subdivision, use and development are managed to avoid reverse sensitivity effects, to the extent reasonably possible, on the safe function and operation of network utilities. The safe function and operation of network utilities is protected from the adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, of incompatible subdivision, use, and development. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O4 | S221.047 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose | With regard to reverse sensitivity, the NPS-ET's requirement under Policy 10 is that "decision-makers must to the extent reasonably possible manage activities to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on the electricity transmission network". This is different than the absolute "avoid" directive in the objective as written. NU-O4 should reflect the intent of the NPS-ET. | Amend NU-O4 as follows: Subdivision, use, and development are is managed to avoid reverse sensitivity effects, to the extent reasonably possible , on the National Grid and ensure that the operation, maintenance, repair, upgrading, and development of the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | National Grid is not compromised. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P4 | S221.048 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | <p>Supports management of the adverse effects of network utilities.</p> <p>The submitter has a Memorandum of Understanding with Transpower that states that restrictions on horticultural buildings, structures, and activities for health and safety needs near electricity infrastructure "should not place unnecessary limitations on growers". As such, the submitter seeks that primary production activities are included in this policy to avoid unnecessary limitations on the ability to use productive land, which is a physical resource.</p> | Amend NU-P4 to include another clause: g. mitigating adverse effects on primary production activities. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P6 | S221.049 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose in part | <p>In the NPS-ET, sensitive activities includes "schools, residential buildings and hospitals" which is much narrower than the PDP definition.</p> <p>Policy 11 requires that local authorities consult with the national grid operator "to identify an appropriate buffer corridor within which it can be expected that sensitive activities will not generally be provided for in plans and/or given resource consent". This policy does not require an absolute "avoid" clause for the establishment or expansion of sensitive activities. It also suggests that a specific buffer zone should be identified. The current PDP wording of "near" the National Grid is imprecise.</p> | <p>Amend NU-P6 to align with definition of sensitive activities in the NPS-ET or include a separate definition of "sensitive activities in the National Grid Yard".</p> <p>NU-P6 Manage subdivision, use, and development near the National Grid to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. avoid generally not provide for the establishment or expansion of schools, residential buildings and hospitals in the National Grid Yard sensitive activities; b. ensure that the safe and efficient operation, maintenance, repair, upgrading, removal, and development of the National Grid is not compromised; and c. to the extent reasonable possible, avoid incompatible activities in the National Grid Yard that could lead to ensure that reverse sensitivity effects |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | on the National Grid are avoided. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R3 | S221.050 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The provision should include a condition that replacement conductors are the same voltage. The NZ Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances requires greater clearance distances for buildings and other activities the greater the voltage of a conductor (See Tables 1 and 2 of the NZECP34:2001). This increase can adversely affect landowners. | Amend NU-R3(1)(a) to include: viii. replacement conductors are the same voltage. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R16 | S221.051 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | Supports a matter of discretion that considers the adverse effects of the network utility on existing land uses. | Retain NU-R16(1)(4) as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R19 | S221.052 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | <p>In the NPS-ET, sensitive activities includes "schools, residential buildings and hospitals" which is much narrower than the PDP definition. Either align with definition of sensitive activities in the NPS-ET or include a separate definition of "sensitive activities in the National Grid Yard".</p> <p>The term "intensive farming activities" is no longer defined in the plan and should be substituted for "intensive primary production".</p> <p>"Produce packing facilities" is not a define term, so it is unclear what scale of the activity is considered. As such, it should be removed.</p> <p>The submitter supports the rules as proposed for commercial greenhouses, artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures.</p> | <p>Retain NU-R19(1) as follows:</p> <p>a) The activity is not a school, residential building or a hospital sensitive activity;</p> <p>b) Buildings or structures comply with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP34:2001) and are:</p> <p>i. for a network utility;</p> <p>ii. a fence not exceeding 2.5m in height above ground level;</p> <p>iii. a non-habitable building or structure used for agricultural and horticultural activities including irrigation that is not a milking shed/dairy shed (excluding the stockyards and ancillary platforms), a wintering barn, a building for intensive primary production farming activities, or a commercial greenhouse, or</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | produce packing facilities; or ... Retain NU-R19(1)(c)(iii) as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R20 | S221.053 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The land disturbance exception for horticultural cultivation should also include ancillary rural earthworks, such as land preparation. The default activity status should be restricted discretionary, not non-complying. Restricted discretionary is the more appropriate status when permitted activity standards cannot be met. | Amend NU-R20(1)(f)(i) as follows: i. land disturbance undertaken as part of agricultural, horticultural or domestic cultivation, ancillary rural earthworks , or repair or resealing of a road, footpath, driveway, or farm track; Amend NU-R20(2) to restricted discretionary activity status. |
| TR - Transport | TR-O1 | S221.054 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | Well-functioning roads are needed to facilitate the movement of fresh fruits and vegetables to market. Fresh produce is highly perishable, and its sale relies on an efficient transportation network. | Retain TR-O1(b) as notified. |
| CL - Contaminated Land | | S221.055 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports reliance on the NES-CS. They also support that the Proposed Plan is clear that Clause 5 of the NES-CS sets out the situations in which it applies, which excludes production land that continues to be in production | Retain Contaminated Land chapter as notified. |
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | | S221.056 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the approach in the Hazardous Substances section. | Retain Hazardous Substances chapter as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | Introduction | S221.057 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose in part | Buildings associated with primary production and rural industry activities pose minimal risk to human life and safety. People do not sleep at primary production businesses, which means they are more alert to hazards than people in residential dwellings. Primary production involves fewer people on more land than urban activities. The Building Code has Building Importance categories, and non-habitable buildings are importance level 1 (the lowest) as they are buildings which pose low | Amend Natural Hazards Introduction as follows: Potentially hazard sensitive activities comprise the following: Buildings associated with primary production; - Commercial activities; and - Industrial activities; and Rural industry activities. Less hazard sensitive activities comprise |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>risk to human life or the environment, or a low economic cost.</p> <p>Unnecessary restrictions on where horticulture can operate is a risk to local food supply. Horticultural businesses need to operate close to their ancillary activities like packhouses and greenhouses due to the perishable nature of fresh produce.</p> | <p>thefollowing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Buildings associated with primary production;- Rural industry activities; - Accessory buildings used for non-habitable purposes... |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P1 | S221.058 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports an approach that considers vulnerability/sensitivity of activities, likelihood and consequences when determining natural hazard risk. They caution that rural primary production activities carry a lower sensitivity than activities involving a dense or vulnerable population and should be designated as such. | Retain NH-P1 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P5 | S221.059 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports this approach to allowing less sensitive activities to proceed where they do not pose additional risk to other people or activities. Rural primary production like fruit and vegetable growing is best suited to this hazard designation, including the non-habitable associated structures and buildings. | Retain NH-P5 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P8 | S221.060 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports the need for continued infrastructure upgrade and establishment in hazard areas, especially roads to support rural communities to evacuate during emergencies. Roads are also needed to continue to move fresh produce efficiently when primary production continues in high natural hazard risk areas. | Retain NH-P8 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R2 | S221.062 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports less hazard sensitive activities being permitted in all hazard areas and considers that primary production activities, including associated structures and non-habitable buildings, should be included under this rule. | Retain NH-R2 as notified |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R3 | S221.063 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports this approach, but buildings associated with primary production should fall under NH-R2 as less hazard sensitive activities due to their low risk to human wellbeing. | Amend the definition of 'less hazard sensitive activities' to include buildings for primary production. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R5 | S221.064 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | There should be provision for earthworks for normal rural production activities in the General Rural Zone within flood hazard areas as long as they do not increase flood risk. | Amend NH-R5 as follows: NH-R5 Earthworks (including ancillary rural earthworks) within flood hazard areas |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P3 | S221.065 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | This policy should also provide for ancillary rural earthworks such that primary production activities can continue on privately-owned land. This aligns with the approach taken in SASM-R2 and SASM-R6. | Amend SASM-P3 as follows: Allow for... b. Other earthworks, including ancillary rural earthworks , on, or in proximity to sites and areas of significance to Māori only where it can be demonstrated that the identified values will be protected, having regard to... |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P4 | S221.066 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | This policy should also provide for cultivation such that primary production activities can continue on privately-owned land. This aligns with the approach taken in SASM-R2 and SASM-R6. | Amend SASM-P4 as follows: a. Land disturbance and cultivation... |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P6 | S221.067 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The policy as written does not clarify what types of activities are avoided. This policy should be more specific to not contradict the other policies and rules in this chapter. Allow some activities like cultivation to take place within sites and areas of significance to Māori. | Amend SASM-P6 to clarify which activities are avoided while allowing for those activities captured in SASM-R2, SASM-R4, SASM-R5 and SASM-R6. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R2 | S221.068 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | Submitter supports provisions for land disturbance necessary to everyday horticultural activities on privately-owned land, including installation of water pipes, gardening, cultivation and maintenance or repair of existing tracks and culverts. | Retain SASM-R2 as notified. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of | SASM-R6 | S221.069 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | Submitter supports permitted activity status for maintaining or repairing primary production structures within a site of | Retain SASM-R6 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Significance to Māori | | | | | significance, especially artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures. | |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | Introduction | S221.070 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | <p>A biosecurity incursion of unwanted organisms is a hazard and risk that should be managed. The pea weevil incursion is a case in point which had significant effects on the Wairarapa community.</p> <p>While biosecurity incursions of unwanted organisms are managed by MPI, there are actions that may need to be taken which should be provided for in the district plan. Such actions include the burial of infected material or removal and destruction of vegetation, including indigenous vegetation if it is infected. The submitter seeks provisions that provide for such activities to be undertaken as permitted given the necessity to act rapidly. The Biosecurity Act 1993 does not give MPI the ability to override the RMA, except when the Minister declares an emergency, and that has never occurred.</p> | Insert the following issue to the chapter introduction. If biosecurity provisions are better suited to the GRUZ chapter, insert them there. Biosecurity risks to primary production activities are significant and could have serious impact on both urban and rural communities, particularly the production of food. There needs to be active management to ensure that threats do not enter the country and if they do that pest incursions are able to be addressed. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-O1 | S221.071 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The term "biological diversity" is undefined. The RMA uses the terms "indigenous vegetation" and "significant habitats of indigenous fauna", which are more appropriate for this objective. ECO-O1 and ECO-O2 could be combined given the overlap discussing significant habitats. | Amend ECO-O1 as follows: The biological diversity of indigenous species and habitats Indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna within the Wairarapa is are maintained and enhanced, or restored where degraded and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-O2 | S221.072 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose in part | This objective can be combined with ECO-O1. | Delete ECO-O2. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | New provision request | S221.073 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | <p>A biosecurity incursion of unwanted organisms is a hazard and risk that should be managed. The pea weevil incursion is a case in point which had significant effects on the Wairarapa community.</p> <p>While biosecurity incursions of unwanted organisms are managed by MPI, there are actions that may need to be taken which should be provided for in the PDP. Such actions include the burial of infected material or removal and destruction of vegetation including indigenous vegetation if it is infected. The submitter seeks provisions that provide for such activities to be undertaken as permitted given the necessity to act rapidly. The Biosecurity Act 1993 does not give MPI the ability to override the RMA, except when the Minister declares an emergency.</p> | Insert a new objective as follows in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter (or the GRUZ chapter if deemed more appropriate): ECO-OX: Take an integrated management approach to biosecurity risks to ensure that rural production is not adversely affected by incursions of pests and unwanted organisms. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P5 | S221.074 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose in part | <p>There should be provision for existing primary production activities to continue.</p> <p>NPS-IB Policy 10 states that, "Activities that contribute to New Zealand's social, economic, cultural, and environmental wellbeing are recognised and provided for as set out in this National Policy Statement."</p> <p>The NPS-IB also states that, "Local authorities must include objectives, policies, and methods in their policy statements and plans to enable specified established activities... to continue where the effects of the activity on an SNA [are managed]".</p> | Amend ECO-P5 as follows: g. maintenance of existing primary production activities |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P7 | S221.075 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | Where landowners have planted indigenous vegetation, they should be able to appropriately manage such vegetation. Otherwise, there is a perverse outcome of discouraging planting of indigenous vegetation - e.g. for shelterbelts or amenity planting. | Retain ECO-P7(f) as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-R1 | S221.076 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | Submitter supports the recognition of the need to remove infected material for biosecurity purposes. | Retain ECO-R1(1)(a)(viii) as notified. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-R2 | S221.077 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | Submitter supports the recognition of the need to remove infected material for biosecurity purposes. | Retain ECO-R2(1)(k) as notified. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P1 | S221.078 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The definition of surface waterbodies includes water races and artificial channels, which do not have natural character. To better achieve NATC-O1, reference should be to rivers, lakes and natural inland wetlands. | Amend NATC-P1 as follows: Manage the design, location, and scale of subdivision, use, and development to preserve the special qualities and natural character of adjoining surface waterbodies, rivers, lakes and natural inland wetlands so they preserve the special qualities and natural character of surface waterbodies. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P3 | S221.079 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the recognition of irrigation and water supply infrastructure needs. | Retain NATC-P3 as notified. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P5 | S221.080 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose in part | It is important that pump sheds for irrigation can be located adjacent to rivers to serve their function and purpose. This needs to be clear to enable water use for primary production activities. | Amend NATC-P5 as follows: ...Waterbodies across all zones and only allow buildings and structures within these setbacks where: a. there is a functional need or operational need for their location within the setback, such as pump sheds; ... |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P6 | S221.081 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | Modification of vegetation should also include removal of material infected by unwanted organisms under the Biosecurity Act 1993. The submitter supports recognition of the | Amend NATC-P6 as follows: Allow modification of vegetation within 25m of Significant Waterbodies where it involves pest plant species, disposal of infected |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | modification of vegetation associated with pest plant species and primary production. | material for biosecurity purposes, treatment of areas to manage incursions of unwanted organisms or is associated with primary production, and only allow other modification of vegetation when... |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-R1 | S221.082 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the inclusion of water supply infrastructure, including irrigation | Retain NATC-R1(1)(a)(ii) as notified. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-R2 | S221.083 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | Modification of vegetation should also include removal of material infected by unwanted organisms under the Biosecurity Act 1993. This rule should not be restricted to existing primary production activities. | Amend NATC-R2(1) as follows: ... b. The modification of vegetation associated with an existing primary production activity and there is no modification of indigenous vegetation; orc. The removal of material infected by unwanted organisms under the Biosecurity Act 1993. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-O2 | S221.084 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose | Submitter does not support inclusion of special amenity landscapes. NFL-O2 is not just informational, as it directs maintenance or enhancement of special amenity landscapes. | Delete NFL-O2. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P2 | S221.085 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose | Submitter does not support inclusion of special amenity landscapes. The criteria in NFL-P1 are related to Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, and they are not appropriate for other landscapes. | Delete NFL-P2. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P3 | S221.086 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | There needs to be provision for primary production activities to continue within an ONL or ONF. | Amend NFL-P3 to include: ... vii. Enabling primary production activities to operate. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P5 | S221.087 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | There needs to be a provision for primary production activities to continue within an ONL or ONF. | Amend NFL-P5 as follows: Allow subdivision, use, and development within an Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes where: ai. it is associated with conservation activities; aii. it is associated with primary production; a. it relates to the maintenance, repair... |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-R1 | S221.088 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose in part | Submitter requests a provision for primary production activities to continue within an ONL or ONF. | Amend NFL-R1 by adding: 1) ... b) Earthworks, modification of indigenous vegetation, or buildings and structures associated with conservation activities or primary production activities; ... |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-S1 | S221.089 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports an exemption for maintaining farm tracks, fence lines, water supply infrastructure and access ways. These activities all fall under the definition of ancillary rural earthworks. | Amend NFL-S1 as follows: This standard does not apply to: a. Earthworks associated with maintaining existing farm tracks, fence lines, water supply infrastructure and access ways Ancillary rural earthworks are exempt from the above standards but must comply with NFL-S1(1)(a). |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-S2 | S221.090 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose in part | Modification of vegetation should also include removal of material infected by unwanted organisms under the Biosecurity Act 1993 and removal of weeds and pests. | Amend NFL-S2 as follows: This standard does not apply to modification of indigenous vegetation that is: ... d. For the removal of material infected by unwanted organisms under the Biosecurity Act 1993. |
| NFL - Natural | NFL-S3 | S221.091 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose in part | This standard should provide for buildings and structures for primary production activities | Amend NFL-S3 to include an exemption for buildings and structures for primary |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Features and Landscapes | | | | | | productionactivities. |
| PA - Public Access | PA-O1 | S221.092 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | It is important that public access to surface waterbodies on primary production land is not required, as that would pose significant health and safety risks and disrupt the rural working environment. There are reverse sensitivity issues if the public is given access to walk alongside a horticultural operation, which has a need to spray, make noise, etc. which is all appropriate in the rural environment. | Amend PA-O1 as follows: ... b. minimises incompatibility of providing Provides public access with adjoining activities only when incompatibility with adjoiningactivities can be minimised. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O1 | S221.093 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | Amend small grammatical error. | Amend SUB-O1 as follows: Subdivision and developments createallotments and patterns of land use anddevelopment that... f. respond to the risks of natural hazards andis are resilient to climate change. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P5 | S221.094 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports enabling primary production and ancillary activities through these provisions. A small change is suggested to align with the NPS-HPL. | Retain SUB-P5(c) and (d) as notified. Amend SUB-P5(h) as follows: h. avoiding, remedying, or mitigating potential reverse sensitivity effects. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P6 | S221.095 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports protections for highly productive land and its use for primary production activities | Retain SUB-P6 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P7 | S221.096 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | Protections for existing rural activities from reverse sensitivity effects are supported by the submitter. | Retain SUB-P7(e) as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P8 | S221.097 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | Recognition of the NPS-HPL is strongly supported. | Retain SUB-P8 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R2 | S221.098 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | Managing reverse sensitivity effects is essential to a productive rural environment. The submitter supports subdivision when it directly enables primary production. Horticultural businesses are highly efficient | Retain SUB-R2(2)(15) as notified. Retain SUB-R2(10) as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | and can be profitable on lot sizes much smaller than 40 ha. | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R5 | S221.099 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports provisions that protect the General Rural Zone from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. It should be recognised that primary production activities, in particular, need protection from reverse sensitivity effects that could degrade the productive potential of the Rural Zone. | Retain SUB-R5(3) as notified. Amend SUB-R5(3)(6) as follows: 6. Management of potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing land uses, including primary production activities , network utilities, or significant hazardous facilities. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB - Table 1 | S221.100 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | 40ha minimum allotments size for the GRUZ is supported to protect productive land from fragmentation. Limited exceptions for subdivision for the explicit purpose of primary production is supported. Horticultural businesses can be profitable on lot sizes far smaller than 40ha. | Retain GRUZ minimum allotment size as notified. |
| LIGHT - Light | LIGHT-O3 | S221.101 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | Artificial lighting is needed for horticultural activities that may occur at night including harvesting, spraying, and packing produce into trucks. Lighting protects the health and safety of workers and provides for security on-farm. | Retain LIGHT-O3 as notified. |
| LIGHT - Light | LIGHT-P3 | S221.102 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | Artificial light is compatible with the rural zone to support primary production activities. Amenity values should not take precedence over primary production in its appropriate zone. | Amend to exclude the General Rural Zone from LIGHT-P3, since light is necessary for health and safety on a seasonal basis. |
| LIGHT - Light | LIGHT-P4 | S221.103 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | Artificial lighting is needed for horticultural activities that may occur at night including harvesting, spraying, and packing produce into trucks. Lighting protects the health and safety of workers and provides for security on-farm. | Retain LIGHT-P4 as notified. |
| LIGHT - Light | LIGHT-S1 | S221.104 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose | The standard should be effects-based. Artificial lighting is a normal part of rural primary production activities, including nighttime harvesting, spraying and loading produce for distribution. Different requirements are needed based on the zone, time of day and distance from residential | Delete LIGHT-S1 and insert an effects-based standard based on zones that provides for lighting required for people's health and safety. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | activities. Light should be measured from the notional boundary of a dwelling, not the site boundary. Otherwise, light standards in the General Rural Zone restrict light necessary for health and safety to provide amenity to pasture and sheep. | |
| NOISE - Noise | | S221.105 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports recognition that the rural environment is inherently noisy and that rural activities should be able to continue in their appropriate zone, unhindered by reverse sensitivity effects. | Retain recognition of the noise characteristics of the rural environment. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-O1 | S221.106 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose in part | This objective contains three discrete ideas that should be separated for clarity. | Amend NOISE-O1 and split into three objectives: O1 - The benefits of activities that generate noise are recognised and provided for. O1a) - Noise should be compatible with the character and purpose of the relevant zone. O1b) - Excessive noise does not cause adverse effects on the public health, safety and wellbeing of people and communities. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-O2 | S221.107 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports recognition of reverse sensitivity effects. | Retain NOISE-O2 as notified |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P1 | S221.108 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The policy should clearly link to the zone in which the activity is occurring. This aligns with NOISE-O2 to ensure that noise generating activities appropriate to their zone are not compromised by reverse sensitivity effects from noise sensitive activities. | Amend NOISE-P1 as follows: Enable the generation of noise from activities that: a. maintain the predominant character and amenity values of the zone in which the activity is occurring receiving environment by controlling the types of activities and levels of noise permitted in each zone... |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P8 | S221.109 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter strongly supports provisions to enable horticulture, in particular audible bird scaring devices, frost protection devices and harvesters. | Retain NOISE-P8 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| NOISE - Noise | | S221.110 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the list of activities which are provided for in the plan, especially horticultural activities, including agricultural vehicles, agricultural aviation, helicopter landing areas, machinery, frost protection equipment and equipment used on a seasonal or intermittent basis. | Retain exclusions from NOISE Rules, particularly (d), as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-R1 | S221.111 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The title of this rule should be clear that it does not include exempted activities. | Amend NOISE-R1 title: Emission of noise (nototherwise provided for or exempted in thischapter) |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-R4 | S221.112 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | Provision for audible bird scaring devices is supported by the submitter. | Retain NOISE-R4 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-R5 | S221.113 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | Provision for frost protection devices is supported by the submitter. | Retain NOISE-R5 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-R8 | S221.114 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | Helicopter landing areas for agricultural, horticultural or conservation use are exempt from this chapter's rules. | Amend NOISE-R8 to ensure that exemption for aircraft for primaryproduction activities is clear. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-S2 | S221.115 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports specific provisions for bird scaring devices. Bird scaring devices are used just before sunrise and until just after sunset.</p> <p>The purpose of a noise standard is to manage the level of noise - regardless of the number of emitting sources. Noise levels from the same device may vary based on land contours and location, so noise level - not number of devices - should be the main threshold to manage potential adverse effects.</p> | Amend NOISE-S2(2) to allow the operation of bird scaring devices from ½ hour before sunrise to ½ hour after sunset. Delete NOISE-S2(2)(d). |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-S2 | S221.116 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The proposed rule for frost protection fans is consistent with other rules in district plans. Provisions are sought below for noise insulation in new residential dwellings which is also consistent with rules in other district plans. See discussion in the section on Frost Protection Devices (Frost Fans) of this submission. | Retain NOISE-S2 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| NOISE - Noise | New provision request | S221.117 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | Temporary short duration noises (such as those created by frost fighting wind machines, bird scaring devices, harvesting at night etc) have been exempt from this chapter's noise restrictions so as not to unduly restrict seasonal agricultural operations. It is also considered appropriate that where a new noise sensitivity activity locates next to an activity that generates noise, the developer of the new activity should take steps to mitigate the effects of that noise. The cost should not be borne by the existing activity. | Insert new rule NOISE-RX: NOISE-RX Residential activities within 300m of a frost protection device General Rural Zone 1. Activity status: Permitted Where:a) Compliance is achieved with NOISE-S4. 2. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary Where compliance is not achieved with NOISER16(1).Matters of discretion1. 1. Ability to meet internal noise standards2. 2. Potential reverse sensitivity effects.3. Mitigation methods. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-S4 | S221.118 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | A new section is sought by the submitter with standards for acoustic insulation in dwellings within 300m of a frost protection device. Temporary short duration noises (such as those created by frost fighting wind machines, bird scaring devices, harvesting at night etc.) have been exempt from this chapter's noise restrictions so as not to unduly restrict seasonal agricultural operations. It is also considered appropriate that where a new noise sensitive activity locates next to an activity that generates noise, the developer of the new activity should take steps to mitigate the effects of that noise. The cost should not be borne by the existing activity. | Amend NOISE-S4 to include the following: Residential activity within 300m of a frost protection device Any new residential activity locating within 300m of an existing frost fan on a separate site in different ownership must be designed and constructed to ensure that the noise level inside any bedroom will not exceed 30dB LAeq when windows are closed and frost protection devices are operating. Written certification of such compliance from an appropriately qualified and experienced acoustic engineer shall be submitted with the building consent application for residential activity. |
| SIGN - Signs | SIGN-P1 | S221.119 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | It is important that signs for health and safety are provided for in the plan. | Retain SIGN-P1 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | Introduction | S221.120 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | Recognition of the NPS-HPL is supported. Recognition that some land outside of LUC I-III is still highly valued for primary production due to its climatic, soil and proximity to other rural activities is supported. | Retain GRUZ Introduction as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O1 | S221.121 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The purpose is consistent with the description in the National Planning Standards. | Retain GRUZ-O1 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O2 | S221.122 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | Horticulture should be specifically recognised in addition to crops. Cropping more commonly refers to arable crops and crops for animal feed. Recognition of seasonal worker accommodation and the seasonal nature of primary production is supported. Some areas of primary production have closer development, particularly where there are post-harvest facilities or greenhouses. | Amend GRUZ-O2 as follows: The predominant character of the General Rural Zone are maintained and enhanced, which include: a. areas of viticulture, horticulture , crops, pasture, forestry (indigenous and plantation), and the presence of a large number of farmed animals; b. sparsely developed generally well-spaced landscape but includes areas with closer development ; with open space between c. buildings that are predominantly used for agricultural, pastoral and horticultural activities, including indoor primary production (e.g. greenhouses, barns and sheds), low density rural living (e.g. farmhouses, seasonal worker accommodation, and a small degree of rural lifestyle), and community activities (e.g. rural halls, domains, and schools); d. ... |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O3 | S221.123 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports this provision. | Retain GRUZ-O3 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O4 | S221.124 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports enabling primary production activities. The approach should align with GRUZ-P1 to provide for other activities while primary production is enabled. | Amend GRUZ-O4 as follows: Primary production activities are enabled, and other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone are provided for enabled where they are not incompatible with primary production activities. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O5 | S221.125 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose in part | Sensitive activities shouldn't locate in the General Rural Zone unless there is a functional need for them to locate - such as rural schools. Where they do locate in the zone they should avoid potential for reverse sensitivity effects. | Amend GRUZ-O5 as follows: Sensitive activities are designed and located to avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects and incompatibility with primary production, other land uses activities and key transport corridors in the General Rural Zone. Potential for reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities is avoided by ensuring that sensitive activities do not inappropriately locate in the General Rural Zone. If they have a functional need to locate in the zone, potential reverse sensitivity effects are mitigated. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O6 | S221.126 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose in part | Rural lifestyle should be directed to the Rural Lifestyle Zone consistent with the directions in the National Planning Standards. Rural lifestyle is to be avoided in the Rural Zone to mitigate reverse sensitivity effects on primary production and protect productive land. There is no specific policy for rural lifestyle, which should be implemented so the direction is clear. The second part of the objective is a policy, not an objective. | Amend GRUZ-O6 as follows: Rural lifestyle subdivision and development is managed in a way that avoid additional fragmentation of productive land and its productive potential avoids fragmentation of highly productive land and reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities. productive land and reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities. |

501

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O7 | S221.127 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports this direction. | Retain GRUZ-O7 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P1 | S221.128 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose in part | <p>The purpose of the General Rural Zone is predominantly for primary production activities. There should not be a limitation of compatibility for primary production activities when the zone is designed for them.</p> <p>Rural lifestyle directions are set in GRUZ-O6, and the submitter does not support rural lifestyle scattered through the General Rural Zone.</p> | <p>Amend GRUZ-P1 as follows:</p> <p>a. Enable primary production activities and associated ancillary activities that are compatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone.</p> <p>b. Provide for other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located in the General Rural Zone that are not incompatible with primary production and the character of the General Rural Zone.</p> <p>c. Provide for rural lifestyle development in rural lifestyle zones appropriate locations where GRUZ-P1(a) and GRUZ-P1(b) are enabled or provided for.</p> |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P2 | S221.129 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | Incompatible activities should be avoided. | Retain GRUZ-P2 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P3 | S221.130 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The listed activities and values are supported. | Retain GRUZ-P3 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P4 | S221.131 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | Highly productive land must be protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, which is directly relevant to this policy. | <p>Amend GRUZ-P4 as follows:</p> <p>...c. avoiding subdivision of highly productive land, fragmentation of primary production land, and reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities. d. seeking consistency with the purpose and character of the zone.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P6 | S221.132 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | Avoiding establishment of new sensitive activities is the most appropriate mechanism for avoiding reverse sensitivity effects. The burden of preventing reverse sensitivity effects should be on the new sensitive use, not on existing users. | Amend GRUZ-P6 as follows: ... b. managing potential reverse sensitivity effects caused by the establishment of new sensitive activities near other primary production activities, including through the use of setbacks and separation distances for the sensitive activity ; ... |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P7 | S221.133 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | There is significant land outside of LUC 1-3 that has unique characteristics that make it well suited to horticulture, including climate, soil and proximity to other primary production activities. | Retain GRUZ-P7 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P8 | S221.134 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | Horticulture is similar to viticulture and similarly high value. Orcharding, in particular, closely resembles viticulture. | Amend GRUZ-P8 as follows: a. enabling and promoting primary production activities, in particular viticulture and horticulture ; b. providing for the activities that are directly associated with primary production activities including viticulture and horticulture by... |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P9 | S221.135 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | Recognition of the NPS-HPL is supported. | Retain GRUZ-P9 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | New provision request | S221.136 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | A separate rule for artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures is needed since they have specific requirements. There is potential for horticulture to expand in Wairarapa, and artificial crop protection is likely to expand in the future due to climate change pressures. | Insert a new rule for artificial crop protection structures: GRUZ-RX - Artificial Crop Protection Structures and Crop Protection Structures Activity Status: Permitted 1. The establishment of a new, or expansion of an existing artificial crop protection structure or crop support structure. Where: a. The height of the structure does not |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>exceed 6m; and either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Green or black cloth is used on any vertical faces within 30m of a property boundary, including a road boundary, except that a different colour may be used if written approval of the owner(s) of the immediately adjoining property or the road controlling authority (in the case of a road) is obtained and provided to the Council; or c. the structure is setback 3m from the boundary. <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: Restricted Discretionary. When compliance with GRUZ-RX 1) is not achieved: Matters of discretion: 1. Assessment of the potential glare on neighbouring properties (or road users) from the colour of the cloth.</p> |
| <p>GRUZ - General Rural Zone</p> | <p>GRUZ-R4</p> | <p>S221.137</p> | <p>Horticulture New Zealand</p> | <p>Oppose in part</p> | <p>Specific provisions for seasonal worker accommodation and permitted status for this activity are supported. Seasonal workers may be used for any type of primary production, not just "land-based".</p> <p>There is no reason why there should only be one seasonal worker accommodation building per site, and it is inappropriate that five seasonal worker accommodation buildings should be permitted in the MPZ while only one is permitted in the GRUZ.</p> <p>Seasonal worker accommodation is already tightly regulated by national rules to provide for the wellbeing of workers. More rules are</p> | <p>Amend GRUZ-R4 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Activity status: Permitted <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Compliance is achieved with: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. GRUZ-S1; ii. GRUZ-S2; and iii. GRUZ-S3; and b. Is used primarily to meet labour requirements for land-based primary production; c. Comprise of communal kitchen and eating area and separate sleeping and ablution facilities; d. The accommodation provides for no more than 12 workers; and e. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>not needed in the district plan to achieve this. Seasonal worker accommodation is a supporting activity for primary production and should be allowed to locate on highly productive land under clause 3.9 (2) (a) of the NPS-HPL.</p> | <p>Compliance is achieved with the Code of Practice for Able Bodied Seasonal Workers, published by the Department of Building and Housing 2008. c. There is no more than one seasonal worker accommodation building per site; d. The gross floor area of the seasonal worker accommodation building is no more than 150m²; e. The seasonal worker accommodation building is not located on highly productive land or the Martinborough Soils Overlay. 2. Activity status: Controlled Where: a. Compliance is achieved with GRUZ-R4(1)(a)-(d); and b. Compliance is not achieved with GRUZ-R4(1)(e). Matters of control: 1. The siting and location of the seasonal worker accommodation building; and 2. Measures to avoid and minimise any potential loss of highly productive land.</p> <p>3. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with GRUZ-R4(1). or GRUZ-R4(2). Matters of discretion: 1. The effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard and the matters of discretion of any standard that is not met. 2. Number of workers accommodation</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | required to enable the land-based primary production activity. 3. The effect of the intensity and scale of the activity. 4. The building design, siting, form, and external appearance is compatible with the General Rural Zone. 5. Potential methods to avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects on existing activities, including the provision of screening, landscaping and methods for noise control. 6. The extent to which the application complies with the Code of Practice for AbleBodied Seasonal Workers, published by Dept of Building and Housing 2008. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R5 | S221.138 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter specifically seeks that ancillary rural earthworks are provided as part of primary production activities. | Amend GRUZ-R5 to add ancillary rural earthworks. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R6 | S221.139 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | Agricultural aviation is important for horticultural and biosecurity purposes. | Retain GRUZ-R6 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R7 | S221.140 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose | Stays of 90 days are not 'visitor' accommodation, they are residential. The submitter seeks deletion of the definition and rule. | Delete GRUZ-R7. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R8 | S221.141 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports recognition of highly productive land and the Martinborough Soils Overlay. | Retain GRUZ-R8 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R9 | S221.142 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports a rule for intensive primary production that is consistent with the National Planning Standards, so long as the definition of intensive primary production remains as notified. | Retain GRUZ-R9, provided the definition of 'intensive primary production' is retained as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R11 | S221.143 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | A permitted activity for small rural produce is supported. | Retain GRUZ-R11, but amend definition of 'ruralproduce retail'. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R15 | S221.144 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | A discretionary activity for visitor accommodation in the General Rural Zone is supported. | Retain GRUZ-R15 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R16 | S221.145 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose | A discretionary activity status is not supported for an activity that is anticipated to occur in the GRUZ. There should be provision for small-scale rural industry as permitted activity and an RDA for larger scale rural industry. | Delete GRUZ-R16 and Insert a permittedactivity status for small scale rural industry and a restricted discretionary activity statusfor larger scale rural industry. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R18 | S221.146 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | Commercial and industrial activities are not anticipated in the General Rural Zone, so it is appropriate that they are discretionary. However, rural industry should not require the same activity status. If rural industry is kept as discretionary, then GRUZ-18 should be non-complying. | Retain GRUZ-R18 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | New provision request | S221.147 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | Permitted activity status and a supporting definition for greenhouses is essential to ensure this efficient growing system, well suited for climate adaptation, is not caught by rules meant for other activities. Greenhouses are a primary production activity and should be enabled as such in the General Rural Zone. | Insert new rule: GRUZ-RX Greenhouses1. Activity status: Permitted Insert suggested supporting definition ofGreenhouses. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S1 | S221.148 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | 15m height for frost fans is appropriate. | Retain GRUZ-S1(1)(b) as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S3 | S221.149 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose in part | A building setback of 10m for any other boundary is not sufficient to mitigate reverse sensitivity effects. A larger boundary is sought for residential activities where reverse sensitivity effects are most likely to be generated. The submitter does not support the setback for surface waterbodies which includes artificial waterbodies. Any setback would be linked to the size of the waterbody. | Amend GRUZ-S3 as follows: 1. Buildings or structures must not be locatedwithin: a. 10m of any front road boundary of sealed roads; b. 10m of any other boundary; c. 25m of any front boundary ofunsealed roads; d. 25-20m of any significant waterbody; and e. 10m of any surface waterbody wider than3m. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>2. Residential units must also not be located within:</p> <p>a. 40 m of the edge of a plantation forest under separate ownership;</p> <p>b. 300m of a boundary with untreated agricultural effluent disposal areas;</p> <p>c. 300m of an effluent holding pond; and</p> <p>d. 500m of an intensive primary production activity under separate ownership.; and. 30 m from any other boundary....</p> <p>Retain GRUZ-S3 matters of discretion (7).</p> |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S4 | S221.150 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports that the number of seasonal worker accommodation buildings is in addition to the number of residential units on a site. | Retain the exemption for seasonal worker accommodation. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S5 | S221.151 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports a rule for intensive primary production that is consistent with the National Planning Standards, so long as the definition of intensive primary production remains as notified. | Retain GRUZ-S5, provided the definition of 'intensive primary production' is retained as notified. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-O1 | S221.152 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | RLZ-O1 is consistent with the description in the National Planning Standards. | Retain RLZ-O1 as notified. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-O3 | S221.153 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | It is unclear what 'light' primary production activities are. The National Planning Standards description does not differentiate primary production activities. | Amend RLZ-O3 as follows: Residential activities, light primary production activities, and ancillary activities that are compatible with the character and amenity values of the Rural Lifestyle Zone are provided for |
| RLZ - Rural | RLZ-P1 | S221.154 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | RLZ-P1 is consistent with the description in the National Planning Standards. | Retain RLZ-P1 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Lifestyle Zone | | | | | | |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-P2 | S221.155 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | Reference to Rural Production Zone should be to General Rural Zone. | Amend reference to Rural Production Zone with General Rural Zone. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-P3 | S221.156 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | Consideration for reverse sensitivity and setbacks from primary production activities are supported. This will enable primary production to continue in the rural zones without risking social license to operate. | Retain RLZ-P3(e)(iv) and (f) as notified. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-R5 | S221.157 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports primary production being a permitted activity status. | Retain RLZ-R5 as notified. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-R7 | S221.158 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports rural produce retail being a permitted activity status. | Retain RLZ-R7 as notified. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-R8 | S221.159 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports shelterbelts being a permitted activity status. | Retain RLZ-R8 as notified. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | New provision request | S221.160 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | Permitted activity status and a supporting definition for greenhouses is essential to ensure this efficient growing system, well suited for climate adaptation, is not caught by rules meant for other activities. Greenhouses are a primary production activity and should be enabled as such in the Rural Lifestyle Zone. | Insert new rule: RLZ-RX Greenhouses 1. Activity status: Permitted Insert suggested supporting definition of 'Greenhouses'. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-S3 | S221.161 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose in part | The submitter seeks that there is a larger setback to the boundary with primary production activities. Setbacks are an important tool to avoid, or otherwise mitigate any potential reverse sensitivity effects from rural lifestyle development that could affect primary production, especially on highly productive land. | Amend RLZ-S3 as follows: 1. All buildings and structures must not be located within: a. 10m of any boundary; b. 25m of a significant waterbody; and c. 5m of any surface waterbody; andd. 30m from a boundary with the General Rural Zone. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | ... |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-O3 | S221.162 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | Existing uses should not be burdened by reverse sensitivity effects. | Retain FUZ-O3(f) as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-P2 | S221.163 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose in part | Rules for the Future Urban Zone should not apply to or compromise activities in adjacent zones, including primary production activities. | Amend FUZ-P2 as follows: Only allow activities in the Future Urban Zone and areas in immediately adjoining zones where it can be demonstrated that: ... |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-P3 | S221.164 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | Existing uses should not be burdened by reverse sensitivity effects. | Retain FUZ-P3(e) as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-R9 | S221.165 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports a permitted status for primary production in the Future Urban Zone. References to intensive farming should be amended to intensive primary production. | Amend FUZ-R9 as follows: Primary production, excluding keeping of goats, quarrying activities, intensive primary production farming , and rural industry ... |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-R11 | S221.166 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | The submitter supports the permitted activity status for rural produce retail in the Future Urban Zone. | Retain FUZ-R11 as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-R13 | S221.167 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose in part | Seasonal worker accommodation should be a permitted activity in the Future Urban Zone to meet the needs of existing primary production activities. Seasonal worker accommodation is a type of housing, so it is suitable for the Future Urban Zone and will use similar infrastructure to other housing development. | Amend FUZ-R13 as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with: i. FUZ-S1; ii. FUZ-S2; and iii. FUZ-S3; and b. Is used primarily to meet labour requirements for primary production; c. Comprise of communal kitchen and eating area and separate sleeping and ablution facilities; d. Compliance is achieved with the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>Code of Practice for Able Bodied Seasonal Workers, published by the Department of Building and Housing 20082. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with FUZ-R13(1). Matters of discretion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Number of workers accommodation required to enable the primary production activity. 2. Alignment with any relevant growth strategy, master plan, or structure plan. 3. The effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard and the matters of discretion of any standard that is not met. 4. Potential methods to avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects on existing activities, including the provision of screening, landscaping and methods for noise control. 5. The extent to which the application complies with the Code of Practice for Able Bodied Seasonal Workers, published by Dept of Building and Housing 2008. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-S1 | S221.168 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | The submitter supports the 15m maximum height for frost protection fans. | Retain FUZ-S1(1)(b) as notified. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-S3 | S221.169 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose in part | The submitter seeks that there is a larger setback to the boundary with primary production activities. Setbacks are an important tool to avoid, or otherwise mitigate any potential reverse sensitivity effects from | Amend FUZ-S3 as follows: ... 4. Residential units must also not be located within: a. 40m of the edge of a plantation forest |

511

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | future urban development that could affect primary production, especially on highly productive land. | under separate ownership; b. 300m of a boundary with untreated agricultural effluent disposal areas; c. 300m of an effluent holding pond; or d. 500m of an intensive farming activity under separate ownership; ore. 30m from a boundary with the General Rural Zone or a primary production activity under separate ownership ... |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R16 | S221.170 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support in part | <p>Permitted status for seasonal worker accommodation in the Māori Purpose Zone is supported. It is recognised that multiple seasonal worker accommodation buildings per site enables a "village" accommodation style that creates a community environment. The number and size of accommodation buildings will also be wholly dependent on the workforce size of the primary production activity.</p> <p>There is no reason why there should be five seasonal worker accommodation building per site in the Māori Purpose Zone and one per site in the General Rural Zone.</p> <p>Seasonal worker accommodation is already tightly regulated by national rules to provide for the wellbeing of workers. More rules are not needed in the district plan to achieve this.</p> | Amend MPZ-R16 as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. There is a maximum of five seasonal worker accommodation buildings per site; b. The gross floor area of any seasonal worker accommodation building is no more than 150m². Is used primarily to meet labour requirements for primary production; b. Comprise of communal kitchen and eating area and separate sleeping and ablution facilities; and c. Compliance is achieved with the Code of Practice for Able Bodied Seasonal Workers, published by the Department of Building and Housing 2008. |
| SCHED8 - Schedule of Significant Amenity Landscapes | Special Amenity Landscapes | S221.171 | Horticulture New Zealand | Oppose | The submitter does not support the inclusion of special amenity landscapes. There are no rules that relate to them, so they should be removed from the plan. | Delete SCHED-8. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------|----------|---|--|
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | New provision request | S221.172 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | <p>A biosecurity incursion of unwanted organisms is a hazard and risk that should be managed. The pea weevil incursion is a case in point which had significant effects on the Wairarapa community.</p> <p>While biosecurity incursions of unwanted organisms are managed by MPI, there are actions that may need to be taken which should be provided for in the PDP. Such actions include the burial of infected material or removal and destruction of vegetation including indigenous vegetation if it is infected. The submitter seeks provisions that provide for such activities to be undertaken as permitted given the necessity to act rapidly. The Biosecurity Act 1993 does not give MPI the ability to override the RMA, except when the Minister declares an emergency.</p> | Insert a new policy as follows in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter (or the GRUZ chapter is deemed more appropriate): ECO-PX: Enable disposal of infected material for biosecurity purposes and treatment of areas to manage incursions of unwanted organisms. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-O1 | S221.173 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | An objective to preserve the natural character of rivers, lakes and wetlands and their margins is consistent with s6(a) of the RMA. | Retain NATC-O1 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | New provision request | S221.174 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | Rural lifestyle should be directed to the Rural Lifestyle Zone consistent with the directions in the National Planning Standards. Rural lifestyle is to be avoided in the Rural Zone to mitigate reverse sensitivity effects on primary production and protect productive land. There is no specific policy for rural lifestyle, which should be implemented so the direction is clear. The second part of the objective is a policy, not an objective. | Insert new GRUZ-PX as follows: Rural lifestyle1. Rural lifestyle subdivision and development is directed to the Rural Lifestyle zones. 2. Rural lifestyle is avoided on highly productive land. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S20.001 | hyslop homes | Amend | To provide more future urban areas for developers to have the opportunity to purchase and develop, as currently the large future urban zone near Chamberlain Road blocks are owned by only 2 landowners. It is not viable for developers to develop the land if it is under 2ha, as the cost for urbanising a rural area requires a certain amount of sections to be viable. | Amend the extent of the Future Urban Zone boundaries to include the west side of Chamberlain Road. |

513

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|----------|--|--|
| ENG - Energy | | S277.001 | Ingrid Ward | Oppose | Supports the submission made by the South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group (SWWAG). | Amend provisions as requested in the submission by SWWAG (Submission number 207). |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-S1 | S74.001 | Jack Cameron | Oppose | When rural roads are closed, such as Hinakura, helicopters are used for delivery of essential supplies. Rural airstrips, like on submitters property, also get used for training purposes. | Amend wording of NOISE-R1 to include the use of rural airstrips for non-commercial general aviation to be a permitted activity. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | | S74.002 | Jack Cameron | Amend | There is no provision in GRUZ for non-commercial rural airstrips not associated with primary production/agricultural aviation. Compliance is required through application of NOISE-R1 and specifically NOISE-S1 of 55dB LAeq (15min), which would severely limit the ability of a rural airstrip to be used by aircraft, especially if in an occasion, multiple aircraft were to visit a rural airstrip. | Insert provision in General Rural Zone for non-commercial rural airstrips not associated with primary production/agricultural aviation. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O1 | S222.001 | Jack Wass | Amend | The submitter is concerned that the PDP proposes to replace the ODP provisions on subdivision and maximum number of residential dwellings in the General Rural Zone with a far more restrictive set of requirements. GRUZ-O1 adopts a blunt approach to lifestyle subdivision, and does not accommodate the possibility of lifestyle subdivision which does not compromise the productivity of the land. | Amend GRUZ-O1 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to subdivision and minimum dwellings, without compromising the amenity and productivity of rural land. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O2 | S222.002 | Jack Wass | Amend | The submitter is concerned that the PDP proposes to replace the ODP provisions on subdivision and maximum number of residential dwellings in the General Rural Zone with a far more restrictive set of requirements. GRUZ-O2 adopts a blunt approach to lifestyle subdivision, and does not accommodate the possibility of lifestyle subdivision which does not compromise the productivity of the land. | Amend GRUZ-O2 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to subdivision and minimum dwellings, without compromising the amenity and productivity of rural land. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O6 | S222.003 | Jack Wass | Amend | The submitter is concerned that the PDP proposes to replace the ODP provisions on subdivision and maximum number of residential dwellings in the General Rural Zone with a far more restrictive set of | AmendGRUZ-O6 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to subdivision and minimum dwellings, without compromising the amenity and productivity of rural land. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | requirements. GRUZ-O6 adopts a blunt approach to lifestyle subdivision, and does not accommodate the possibility of lifestyle subdivision which does not compromise the productivity of the land. | |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P2 | S222.004 | Jack Wass | Amend | The submitter is concerned that the PDP proposes to replace the ODP provisions on subdivision and maximum number of residential dwellings in the General Rural Zone with a far more restrictive set of requirements. GRUZ-P2 adopts a blunt approach to lifestyle subdivision, and does not accommodate the possibility of lifestyle subdivision which does not compromise the productivity of the land. | Amend GRUZ-P2 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to subdivision and minimum dwellings, without compromising the amenity and productivity of rural land. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P4 | S222.005 | Jack Wass | Amend | The submitter is concerned that the PDP proposes to replace the ODP provisions on subdivision and maximum number of residential dwellings in the General Rural Zone with a far more restrictive set of requirements. GRUZ-P4 adopts a blunt approach to lifestyle subdivision, and does not accommodate the possibility of lifestyle subdivision which does not compromise the productivity of the land. | Amend GRUZ-P4 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to subdivision and minimum dwellings, without compromising the amenity and productivity of rural land. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S4 | S222.006 | Jack Wass | Amend | The submitter is concerned that the PDP proposes to replace the ODP provisions on subdivision and maximum number of residential dwellings in the General Rural Zone with a far more restrictive set of requirements. GRUZ-S4 adopts a blunt approach to lifestyle subdivision, and does not accommodate the possibility of lifestyle subdivision which does not compromise the productivity of the land. | Amend GRUZ-S4 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to subdivision and minimum dwellings, without compromising the amenity and productivity of rural land. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R2 | S222.007 | Jack Wass | Amend | The submitter is concerned that the PDP proposes to replace the ODP provisions on subdivision and maximum number of residential dwellings in the General Rural Zone with a far more restrictive set of requirements. SUB-R2 adopts a blunt approach to lifestyle subdivision, and does | Amend SUB-R2 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to subdivision and minimum dwellings, without compromising the amenity and productivity of rural land. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | not accommodate the possibility of lifestyle subdivision which does not compromise the productivity of the land. | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S222.008 | Jack Wass | Amend | The submitter is concerned that the PDP proposes to replace the ODP provisions on subdivision and maximum number of residential dwellings in the General Rural Zone with a far more restrictive set of requirements. SUB-R4 adopts a blunt approach to lifestyle subdivision, and does not accommodate the possibility of lifestyle subdivision which does not compromise the productivity of the land. | Amend SUB-R4 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to subdivision and minimum dwellings, without compromising the amenity and productivity of rural land. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S5 | S222.009 | Jack Wass | Amend | The standards for rural accessways in the PDP appear more restrictive than the ODP, with unclear rationale. | Amend TR-S5 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to accessways. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S10 | S222.010 | Jack Wass | Amend | The standards for rural accessways in the PDP appear more restrictive than the ODP, with unclear rationale. | Amend TR-S10 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to accessways. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S11 | S222.011 | Jack Wass | Amend | The standards for rural accessways in the PDP appear more restrictive than the ODP, with unclear rationale. | Amend TR-S11 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to accessways. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S12 | S222.012 | Jack Wass | Amend | The standards for rural accessways in the PDP appear more restrictive than the ODP, with unclear rationale. | Amend TR-S12 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to accessways. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S13 | S222.013 | Jack Wass | Amend | The standards for rural accessways in the PDP appear more restrictive than the ODP, with unclear rationale. | Amend TR-S13 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to accessways. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S14 | S222.014 | Jack Wass | Amend | The standards for rural accessways in the PDP appear more restrictive than the ODP, with unclear rationale. | Amend TR-S14 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to accessways. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S15 | S222.015 | Jack Wass | Amend | The standards for rural accessways in the PDP appear more restrictive than the ODP, with unclear rationale. | Amend TR-S15 to adopt a more flexible and discretionary approach to accessways. |
| Planning Maps | Specific Controls | S126.001 | James Derek Gordon Milne | Support in part | Submitter has listed former experience in the soil science realm, having written a report on land at 101a Shooting Butts Road. It is concluded that land between Hinakura Road and Shooting Butts Road and its extension to the South-East does not have sufficient potential for viticulture to warrant protection. | Amend the mapping of the Martinborough Soils Overlay, to remove the overlay from land between Hinakura Road and Shooting Butts Road and its extension to the South-East (centered on Cromarty Road) and land at 10 Nelsons Road. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|---|------------------|---|----------|--|---|
| Planning Maps | Specific Controls | S126.002 | James Derek Gordon Milne | Oppose | The soils on this site have been highly disturbed and built on over the years, and timber has been treated with copper / chrome / arsenate type preservatives at the site, and therefore should not be designated as suitable for viticulture. | Amend the Martinborough Soils Overlay, to remove extent over "the old sawmill site in Nelsons Road". |
| Tangata Whenua | Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi | S197.001 | James Houston | Oppose | Despite the fact that consultation hui were held (thank you) the information provided on how lands owned or administered by individuals, whānau, marae, land trusts etc, the process of opt-in and opt-out was very contentious and speculative. The involvement of the Māori Land Court (MLC) in relation to opting in of all lands under their jurisdiction was not made clear until the last consultation hui held on 10 December 2023. Representatives of MLC should have been involved with the series of consultation and more so, needed to seek permission direct with Māori o Wairarapa in regard to the Māori Purpose Zone opt -in or out, kaupapa. The combined Wairarapa Councils breached Te Tiriti i.e. Article 2 - not enabling tangata whenua to participate in decision making and solely relying on advice of MLC & Article 3 equitable opportunity to opt-in or out of Māori Purpose Zone opposed to determining just the opt-in advice from MLC. | To afford tangata whenua o Wairarapa time to consult wider with their whānau and beneficiaries that reside within and outside of Wairarapa. To enable this process to occur, extending the submission date for tangata whenua and to engage with both the Māori Land Court o Takitimu and Combined Wairarapa District Council representatives is requested. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R8 | S34.001 | James Richardson | Support | The submitter supports more flexibility for secondary dwellings up to 65m2 within the Rural (Special) Zone. Note: This land is now rezoned to General Rural Zone, which provides for minor dwellings up to 80m2 in size. | Amend GRUZ-R8 provisions to enable more flexibility for minor dwellings up to 65m2 on rural properties. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S34.002 | James Richardson | Support | In order to protect area north of Greytown, the submitter supports rezoning the area of Rural (Special) to General Rural Zone. | Retain area north of Greytown as General Rural Zone. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S192.001 | James Wallace, Leslie Wallace and Rosemary Laffey | Oppose | The submitters seek to rezone this property to enable rural residential and general residential development. The subject site is located between Ardlsy Lane and SH2, north of Masterton. Seeks that the eastern elevated | Amend zoning of land described as Lot 2 DP 505688 and Part Section 56 Opaki District o Rural Lifestyle Zone (eastern half) and General Residential Zone (western half). Please refer to map contained in original |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|---|------------------|-------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | portions of the site are zoned for rural lifestyle purposes, and the flatter area surrounding the homestead and adjoining SH2 for general residential development. The proposal will allow for a continuation of the existing development pattern off Ardsley Lane, will not detract from the current openness of the site, with adequate room for services. Notes the land is difficult to use for rural purposes despite LUC 3 classification. | submission. As secondary relief, seeks the Rural Lifestyle Zone apply to the whole site. |
| ENG - Energy | | S271.001 | Jamiee Burns | Oppose | Supports the submission made by the South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group (SWWAG). | Amend provisions as requested in the submission by SWWAG (Submission number 207). |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB - Table 1 | S13.001 | Janette and John Dennis | Oppose | None listed. | Amend provision to enable subdivision of property of less than 4ha within General Rural Zone (Masterton). |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S3 | S36.001 | Jan Jessep | Oppose | A property was purchased in the General Rural Zone with assurance the dwelling setbacks were 25m for privacy and also that covenants placed on the forested areas around us would remain in place to protect the nature and topography of the site. To reduce minimum setbacks encourages further subdivision and contravenes the original planning appendices and covenants placed on the subdivision in which we live as well as encourage further subdivision in the future. | Amend GRUZ-S3 to require side boundary setbacks of 25m. |
| Designations | SWDC - South Wairarapa District Council | S178.001 | Jason Paul Clements | Oppose | The submission notes various concerns including the consultation process, ownership and use, water table and run off issues, historical maintenance issues, wellbeing, property value, and potential impact on the historical use of the site. | Amend the designation area for SWDC-S-26 Martinborough WWTP to not include the Pain Farm complex. |
| ENG - Energy | | S279.001 | Jeannie Hancock | Oppose | Supports the submission made by the South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group (SWWAG). | Amend provisions as requested in the submission by SWWAG (Submission number 207). |
| Planning Maps | Hazards and Risks | S93.001 | Jennifer Jenkins | Oppose | The submitter sees no justification for Flood Alert Area on their property as detailed flood modelling has been undertaken for the whole site following swale construction. This modelling was accepted by SWDC. The | Delete Flood Alert Area on Planning Maps on properties within the Brookside Development, Featherston. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | submitter is concerned that incorrect information may adversely affect insurances and resale value. | |
| SCHED3 - Schedule of Notable Trees | Notable Trees | S39.001 | Jennifer McKenzie | Amend | Consider listing the trees at Lansdowne Nursery in SCHED3 - Notable Trees. The trees include species such as Redwood Cedar, Oak, European Lime, Linden, and Buckeye. | Insert trees on the Lansdowne Nursery Site into SCHED3 - Notable Trees. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S39.002 | Jennifer McKenzie | Not Stated | The Council should be considering future use of the Lansdowne Nursery site, in light of soil contamination in the north-west area. | No specific decision requested. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-P1 | S43.001 | Jeremy Partridge | Oppose | Readers of the Plan should be able to understand what numerical threshold is required to include a tree in the Plan for transparency reasons. Other councils include this information in their Plans. Masterton and Carterton TA's have a STEM threshold of 120 and South Wairarapa have a STEM threshold of 110. It does not make sense why SWDC has a lower threshold. Submitter notes that no professional justification has been provided for having two different thresholds. It is also important for trees with lower point scores to be added to the Plan. Well formed young trees should be protected to ensure recruitment to the Notable Tree list for the future to replace the older specimens that naturally die over time. | Amend Policy TREE-P1 to include the numerical STEM threshold/s within the Plan and to have one universal numerical STEM threshold for all three councils. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-P2 | S43.002 | Jeremy Partridge | Oppose in part | The Policy requires amendment to state that minor tree works may be allowed if the effects are adequately mitigated. The ability to trim or prune roots as a permitted activity within the RPA should be removed unless improved and tighter rules are put in place to prevent damaging root loss which could deleteriously affect a tree's health or stability. | Amend Policy TREE-P2 to state that minor tree works may be carried out if the effects are adequately mitigated. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-O1 | S43.003 | Jeremy Partridge | Oppose in part | Many trees have not been scheduled as Notable in the combined DP because the tree owner has objected to the tree being scheduled as Notable. Whilst the tree assessor's report mentions such trees and many others in SWDC plan change 16 there | Amend Policy TREE-O1 to state that Council will consider overriding the objection of a landowner to the scheduling of a tree on private land where that tree has outstanding amenity, cultural, historic or intrinsic value. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | is no discussion or analysis of why Council allows any tree owner to prevent the scheduling of a Notable Tree under any circumstance as a blanket policy. Very important trees should have the chance to be protected where the tree owner objects. Council should at least hear the argument as to why a landowner's objection should not be allowed, as that tree may have very important amenity, cultural, historic, or intrinsic value. | |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-R2 | S43.004 | Jeremy Partridge | Oppose in part | The permitted rules allow for the removal/severance of any amount of roots of any size located below 1m of ground level. This means that large structural roots very close to a tree can be removed as a permitted activity as long as the above requirements are followed. These roots are critical for a tree's ability to remain upright and severing these could cause a tree's collapse or sever decline. Furthermore, the term 'shallow' is also unclear and confusing, this should be replaced with 'no deeper than 1m below ground level.' | Amend Rule TREE-R2 to tighten the rules surrounding permitted activities within the root protection area of notable trees to prevent a tree's collapse, death serious decline. also Amend Rule TREE-R2 as follows: "a. earthworks for the purpose of installing underground network utilities, including customer connections, provided these are: i. no deeper shallower than 1m below ground level; ii. installed by hand-digging..." |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S43.005 | Jeremy Partridge | Oppose in part | The definition of a Qualified Arborist needs to be amended. Many Plans around New Zealand require a NZQA level 6 qualified arborist to consult, report and advise on Notable Trees. It would provide better nationally consistency and enable the best consultation and advice on Notable Trees if a level 6 arborist is required. The third part of the definition which states 'and/or equivalent experience, the knowledge and skills enabling that person to perform the required tasks' could allow for conflicts of interest. Only qualified arborists without ties to Councils should be able to carry out reports on notable trees and act on the tree's health free from | Amend definition for 'qualified arborist' as follows: - the minimum qualification should be Level 6 Qualified Arborist. - delete 'and/or equivalent experience, the knowledge and skills enabling that person to perform the required tasks' and make it so that only NZQA Level 6 qualified Arborists to consult and undertake reports on Notable Trees. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|---|------------------|------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | the influence from third parties. | |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-P5 | S43.006 | Jeremy Partridge | Oppose in part | The term 'terminal' is not used by professional arborists as trees can live for hundreds to thousands of years and go through many phases. The term terminal is generally used for people or an acute illness where death may be near, this term is inappropriate for trees. Considers the the intention of this term is likely to allow Council to consider applications to remove trees where death is imminent or the tree is unsafe and mitigation is not possible. I suggest either removing this term or replacing it with working such as 'is likely to die within six months'. | Amend Policy TREE-P5 to delete the term 'terminal decline' from this provision and any other rule or reference within Notable or Street Trees and replace with wording such as 'is likely to die within six months'. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | | S43.007 | Jeremy Partridge | Oppose | The term 'trimming' is not used in arboriculture apart from when applied to work such as trimming hedges. Trimming trees without reference can likely lead to increased rates of decay, stress, and fungal ingress to trees. Many recent District Plans have replaced the term 'trimming' with 'pruning' as it is the more modern and correct arboricultural term. The use of 'trim' may encourage notable tree owners to undertake poor quality tree work which damages the tree's health and structure. | Amend Notable Trees chapter to delete the term 'trimming' and replace it with 'prune/pruning' |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S43.008 | Jeremy Partridge | Support in part | Multi stemmed trees have a different calculation methodology which has significant implications for the size of the RPA if calculated incorrectly. | Amend definition for 'root protection area' to include conversion factors for multi stemmed trees in order to calculate diameter of a tree at 1.4m correctly. |
| Tangata Whenua | Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi | S196.001 | Jess Anniss | Oppose | Despite the fact that consultation hui were held (thank you) the information provided on how lands owned or administered by individuals, whānau, marae, land trusts etc, the process of opt-in and opt-out was very contentious and speculative. The involvement of the Māori Land Court (MLC) in relation to opting in of all lands under their jurisdiction was not made clear until the last consultation hui held on 10 December 2023. | Amend consultation period to afford tangata whenua o Wairarapa time to communicate with their whānau and beneficiaries that reside within and outside of Wairarapa. To enable this process to occur, extending the submission date for tangata whenua and to engage with both the Māori Land Court o Takitimu and Combined Wairarapa District Council representatives is requested. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | | Representatives of MLC should have been involved with the series of consultation and more so, needed to seek permission direct with Māori o Wairarapa in regard to the Māori Purpose Zone opt -in or out, kaupapa. The combined Wairarapa Councils breached Te Tiriti i.e. Article 2 - not enabling tangata whenua to participate in decision making and solely relying on advice of MLC & Article 3 equitable opportunity to opt-in or out of Māori Purpose Zone opposed to determining just the opt-in advice from MLC. | |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-O1 | S42.001 | Jet Boating New Zealand | Support | Supports the Objective; confirms that Wairarapa rivers and lakes provide natural character, amenity, and recreational values. | Retain Objective ASW-O1 as notified. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-P1 | S42.002 | Jet Boating New Zealand | Support | Supports the policy. Confirms that the existing recreational use of powered watercraft on Wairarapa rivers in all seasons and all sections from the mountain to the sea. The frequency and intensity of use, being of a recreational nature, has only minor or less than minor impact on the environment. | Retain Policy ASW-P1 as notified. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-P2 | S42.003 | Jet Boating New Zealand | Support | Supports the enabling of recreational jet boat activities on the surface of water because of the high values provided in the region and because existing recreational use has cumulative impacts on the environment that are minor or less than minor. Agrees that commercial use may cumulatively create adverse effects on the environment that require management. | Retain Policy ASW-P2 as notified. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-P4 | S42.004 | Jet Boating New Zealand | Support | Supports the proposed policy that activities on the surface of water have cumulative effects that should be avoided where possible or otherwise remedied or mitigated. Confirms that it is only commercial use that may cumulatively create adverse effects on the environment that require management. | Retain Policy ASW-P4 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-P5 | S42.005 | Jet Boating New Zealand | Support | Supports the minimisation of potential conflicts of use created by motorised commercial recreation. Agrees that recreational use of motorised watercraft does not require a policy to minimise potential conflicts because of the low frequency and intensity. | Retain Policy ASW-P5 as notified. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-R1 | S42.006 | Jet Boating New Zealand | Support | Supports the permitted status for recreational use of powered watercraft in all zones because all zones offer high recreational value and the existing use has not, nor is likely to in the future, reach an intensity or frequency that may cause potential cumulative effects that require management. | Retain Rule ASW-R1 as notified. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-R3 | S42.007 | Jet Boating New Zealand | Support | Supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status for motorised commercial recreation in all zones because of the potential cumulative effect. | Retain Rule ASW-R3 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P8 | S42.008 | Jet Boating New Zealand | Support | Supports the proposed policy. Noise from powered watercraft has a limited duration and frequency and for this reason is best excluded from noise rules and standards in the chapter, provided the use is reasonable. | Retain Policy NOISE-P8 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-R8 | S42.009 | Jet Boating New Zealand | Support | Supports the rule relating to ASW. The noise from powered craft on the surface of water should not be subject to the rules and standards in the chapter because the craft are used in a transitional way, with quick passage past any location. Given that land boundaries are set back from the river, effects are of a low intensity. | Retain Rule NOISE-R8 as notified. |
| TEMP - Temporary Activities | TEMP-O1 | S42.010 | Jet Boating New Zealand | Support | Supports the provision of organised recreational jet boating events. | Retain Objective TEMP-O1 as proposed. |
| TEMP - Temporary Activities | TEMP-P1 | S42.011 | Jet Boating New Zealand | Support | Supports the policy of enabling temporary activities. | Retain Policy TEMP-P1 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | | S287.001 | Jill Greathead and William Sloan | Oppose | Supports the submission made by the South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group (SWWAG). | Amend provisions as requested in the submission by SWWAG (Submission number 207). |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|---|------------------|-------------------------------|------------|--|---|
| Designations | SWDC - South Wairarapa District Council | S166.001 | Joanne Bosch | Oppose | Concerned about effects on their property, which neighbours the site. Notes lack of consultation with neighbours and potentially affected parties regarding the re-designation of the site. Considers the soil type is not suitable for the proposed use. Notes history of poor management of wastewater treatments. Seeks full consultation with all affected parties regarding wastewater treatment plans. | Delete Designation SWDC-S-26 Martinborough wastewater land based disposal - Pains Farm |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-O3 | S-3.002 | Joanne Smith | Support | sdfg | fdgs |
| Whole Plan | | S14.001 | Jordan Pratt and Kyla Coulson | Not Stated | | Discuss a specific storm water pipe management with Masterton District Council |
| SUB - Subdivision | | S262.001 | Joseph Frank Percy | Oppose | We oppose being forced to sell 40 hectares with a house from a viable farming operation to finance our retirement requirements. | Amend rural subdivision rules to protect the viability of existing farms, and provide flexibility in rules and regulations that may come into force in the future (inferred). |
| ENG - Energy | | S283.001 | Josje Neerincx | Oppose | Supports the submission made by the South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group (SWWAG). | Amend provisions as requested in the submission by SWWAG (Submission number 207). |
| ENG - Energy | | S270.001 | Jo Woodcock | Oppose | Supports the submission made by the South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group (SWWAG). | Amend provisions as requested in the submission by SWWAG (Submission number 207). |
| ENG - Energy | | S275.001 | Judith and Rod Jay | Oppose | Supports the submission made by the South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group (SWWAG). | Amend provisions as requested in the submission by SWWAG (Submission number 207). |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S199.001 | Kahutiaterangi Fahey | Oppose | Considers the opt-in/opt-out process for the Māori Purpose Zone was contentious, speculative, and unclear as to the involvement of the Māori Land Court (MLC) in relation to opting in of all lands under their jurisdiction. Considers that representatives of MLC should have been involved in consultation and needed to seek permission with Māori o Wairarapa. Considers that the Councils breached Te Tiriti (i.e. Article 2 - not enabling tangata whenua to participate in | Amend submissions deadline to afford tangata whenua o Wairarapa time to consult wider with their whānau and beneficiaries that reside within and outside of Wairarapa, engage with both the Māori Land Court o Takitimu, and the Combined Wairarapa District Council representatives. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|--|------------------|----------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | decision making and solely relying on advice of MLC & Article 3 equitable opportunity to opt-in or out of Māori Purpose Zone opposed to determining just the opt-in advice from MLC). | |
| HH - Historic Heritage | New provision request | S199.002 | Kahutiaterangi Fahey | Amend | The rohe of Ngai Tumapuhia-a-Rangi, is located on the eastern shores of the district of Wairarapa and extends inland to the Maungaraki Range and south to the Awhea River. The traditional rohe is defined by the following boundary markers"Mai i Whareama ki Taueru, whiti atu ki te Taumata o te Hangatu, ahu atu ki te Karaka o Waimatua ki Wainuioru, ahu atu ki te Karaka ki Te Awhea rere atu ki te ngutu awa o Te Awhea, rere atu ma te takutai ki Whareama" Within those traditional markers there are numerous wāhi tapu or sites of significance, that need to be included on maps that will be part of the Proposed Plan | Insert wāhi tapu and sites of significance to Māori in the Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan maps. |
| Planning Maps | Hazards and Risks | S83.001 | Karen Vincent | Oppose | The submission suggests that the information relied on for liquefaction and fault mapping may be inaccurate and requires further consideration and testing before implementing into the Proposed District Plan and relevant rules given effect to. | Delete liquefaction and earthquake fault risk overlays until they have been validated or disproven. |
| SCHED4 - Schedule of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | S105.001 | Kate Reedy | Oppose | Concerns regarding the ability to subdivide a site with Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori located on it, either it is not allowed or costs too much. The mapping of SASM has taken a 'blanket' approach, which is inaccurate and should be amended. | Amend mapping of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori to reduce the area surrounding these sites. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P5 | S105.002 | Kate Reedy | Oppose | Oppose landowners bearing the cost of consultation with tangata whenua and council to protect SASM. | Delete SASM-P5. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of | SASM-P9 | S105.003 | Kate Reedy | Oppose | Concerns regarding promoting areas which need to be left in their natural state. Monitoring and regulation of the coast is | Delete SASM-P9. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Significance to Māori | | | | | already taking place, to preserve local seafood stocks and the fauna and flora. Access should be given to those with customary rights, but this should not be promoted. | |
| HH - Historic Heritage | | S105.004 | Kate Reedy | Oppose | Submitter raises concerns that the Historic Heritage rule will be used in the future for tangata whenua to reclaim land. Seeks confirmation from Council and associated groups that this will not be the case. | No decision requested. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P6 | S181.001 | Kath and David Tomlinson | Support in part | The submission states that in some areas subdivision has already occurred and remaining land under 8 hectares is not able to be subdivided. The submitter states that it would be sensible to allow further subdivision for such pockets of land in keeping with current 1-2 hectare lifestyle blocks surrounding them. | Amend SUB-P6 to allow subdivision in areas where there has already been existing subdivision and where further subdivision fits within the character of the area. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S181.002 | Kath and David Tomlinson | Amend | Concerns regarding land 'stuck' in the middle of 4ha and 8ha that will no longer be able to subdivide. These lots should be able to subdivide to create extra houses without detrimental effect. | Amend SUB-R4 to lots less than 8 hectares. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S4 | S181.003 | Kath and David Tomlinson | Not Stated | The Operative District Plan provides for 2 residential dwellings on properties over 4ha, which is changed to 40ha in the Proposed District Plan. The approach in the Operative District Plan is better suited to reduce rural creep from lifestyle blocks. | Amend GRUZ-S4 to be consistent with the Operative District Plan provisions. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S181.004 | Kath and David Tomlinson | Amend | Plan provisions should include all three districts, not just South Wairarapa and Carterton. This is a 'combined' plan and should not have separate rules for different districts within the Wairarapa. | Amend SUB-R4 to refer to all three districts, not just South Wairarapa and Carterton. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S181.005 | Kath and David Tomlinson | Amend | 1ha lots will allow lifestyle property owners to have enough space on their land without the loss of productive land. | Amend SUB-R4 to allow balance lots of 1ha in areas where there is already subdivision and further subdivision will be consistent with the existing character. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S181.006 | Kath and David Tomlinson | Oppose | There are currently pockets of rural subdivisions throughout the Wairarapa. Allow in-fill subdivision in these areas, where | Amend SUB-R4 to allow for in-fill rural subdivision in areas that have already been subdivided and the character of the area will |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | Council can benefit from reserves contributions and infrastructure charges. Council does not have obligation to provide water, stormwater, septic, as the landowner is responsible. | be retained through a Discretionary activity status. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P1 | S184.001 | Kawakawa 1D2 Ahu Whenua Trust | Support in part | <p>In the case of Māori land, including Ahu Whenua Trusts, rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga is exercised by the owners of that land. Submitter notes that as trustees of Kawakawa 1D2 they exercise rangatiratanga over the land and the abutting foreshore.</p> <p>While the submitter acknowledges the overall governance role that the iwi entities exercise in the Wairarapa, in their role as owners of Māori land, they consider it their duty (duty of the land owner themselves) to protect the mauri of their tūpuna through a meaningful relationship with the SWDC.</p> | Amend SASM-P1 to recognise that in the case of Māori land, including Ahu Whenua Trusts, rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga is exercised by the owners of that land. |
| Tangata Whenua | Introduction | S184.002 | Kawakawa 1D2 Ahu Whenua Trust | Amend | The is currently no reference in the section on tangata whenua, that Kahungunu ki Wairarapa is one of the four iwi entities. This is currently not included and needs to be rectified. | Amend the tangata whenua chapter, to include description that Kahungunu ki Wairarapa as one of the four iwi entities. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | | S184.003 | Kawakawa 1D2 Ahu Whenua Trust | Support in part | Submitter obtained a copy of the schedule and accompanying map, and notes the schedule includes archaeological sites but does not include other sites of Māori significance, including wāhi tapu. This raises the question of whether the archaeological data within South Wairarapa is on its own, sufficient value for site recognition, protection and management under the RMA. The current information is inadequate for now, but will enable a starting point to identifying sites, and wāhi tapu and contribute to the development of a sites of significance management plan for the future. | Amend - Taking into account SASM-P1, submitter asks that the Council's take steps to ensure that the site information; (a) includes non-archaeological sites, including wāhi tapu; and (b) meets the required standard for site recognition, protection and management under the RMA (1991). |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of | SASM-P5 | S184.004 | Kawakawa 1D2 Ahu Whenua Trust | Support in part | Section 42(1) of the RMA provides that in order to avoid serious offence to tikanga Maori or to avoid the disclosure of the location of wāhi tapu; a local body may make | Amend SASM-P5 to include an additional clause which reads: (f) the importance of avoiding serious offence to tikanga |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|---|---|
| Significance to Māori | | | | | an order prohibiting publication of any information supplied to it, or obtained by it, in the course of any proceedings, whether or not the information may be material to any proposal, application, or requirement. | Maori through the disclosure of the location of wāhi tapu; by prohibiting publication of any information supplied to it, or obtained by it, in the course of any proceedings, whether or not the information may be material to any proposal, application, or requirement, as provided under s.42(1) of the RMA. |
| SCHED4 - Schedule of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | | S184.005 | Kawakawa 1D2 Ahu Whenua Trust | Amend | The proposed plan will have rules for Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori, it will therefore be important to ensure anyone planning on doing work in those areas is aware of the rules and aware that they are working on wāhi tapu land. The Council's should therefore develop a process in which the information is available to those engaged in the work without making the information publicly available. The use of a 'Silent File' may be a good approach to this, where land titles which Māori know to contain wāhi tapu are marked in local authorities plans to show some of the property was recorded on the silent file as having wāhi tapu - the precise location would not be recorded. If any work was proposed on that land, then the local authority would need to check with the holders of the silent file to ensure that wāhi tapu were not threatened before approval given. | Amend SASM to develop a process by which sites of significance for Māori and wāhi tapu can be identified for the purpose of the RMA, without the need for public notification. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | | S184.006 | Kawakawa 1D2 Ahu Whenua Trust | Oppose in part | The RMA specifically provides for Māori interests and values in Part II. This means that all persons exercising their duties and functions under the Act must take these into consideration. .This implies a specific requirement by both consent applicants and consent authorities to take account of Maori interests and values. It is questionable as to whether this can be undertaken without some | Amend - The Council's review the adequacy of its consultation process with Māori. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | form of consultation with any Māori land owner who may be affected. | |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | | S184.007 | Kawakawa 1D2 Ahu Whenua Trust | Amend | This submission point proposes a strategy to (a) improve relationships between local government and Māori land owners; and (b) promote wider community understanding of tikanga Māori in relation to the protection of sites and areas of significance to Māori including wāhi tapu | Amend - The submitter recommends that the plan promotes wider community understanding of tikanga Māori in relation to the protection of sites and areas of significance to Māori including wāhi tapu; along the following lines; (a) Develop a database which identifies; (i) all Māori land in the region; (ii) all Crown land and public reserves, in which sites of Māori significance have been currently identified; (iii) land in private ownership in which sites of Māori significance have been currently identified. (b) Develop a process by which sites of significance for Māori and wāhi tapu can be identified for the purpose of the RMA, without the need for public notification. (c) Develop a communication and engagement strategy which targets a specific class of land owner e.g. Māori land owners, or an agreed location, e.g. Ngawi Township, to trial and develop a process which enables all land owners to work collaboratively with mana whenua and the Council to identify the sites, including wāhi tapu, on the understanding that those sites will not be publicly notified; (d) Target an area in which Council cultural advisers together with local Māori land owners can engage with private land owners, in a way which avoids racial tension, and promotes shared understanding. (e) Identify local kaitiaki or kaumatua who have the respect of the wider community to explain the significance of tikanga Māori to the community in relation to wāhi tapu. (f) Establish a database which records the status of each site area and accurately identifies sites of significance to Māori and wāhi tapu. (f) Set a goal to increase the number of |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | identified sites including wāhi tapu, by the next 10 year review. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P8 | S24.001 | Keith Thorsen | Support | Submitter supports the policy. States that the Wairarapa Region must take all necessary steps to build resilience on the water supply and this policy is an important step in building that resilience. | Retain GRZ-P8 as notified. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S266.001 | Kirsten Browne | Oppose in part | Considers mapped overlays are the only mechanism in our District Plan for seeing our reality. That is: one space can embody multiple values, cross referencing several District Plan categories. Considers the Whakaoriori Masterton maps are underdeveloped and is living with outdated environmental development goals simply because the town has not updated its chief development mechanism. | Amend the Plan and planning maps to achieve more aspirational environmental development goals for Masterton. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S266.002 | Kirsten Browne | Oppose in part | Begin aligning the provisions that relate to the Masterton town centre with the Masterton Wellbeing Strategy, using terms beyond retail, business, and motor vehicle movement to recognise other values (e.g., trees, rivers, natural character) | Amend the Plan and planning maps to align with the Masterton Wellbeing Strategy to improve environmental and public outcomes for the town. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | | S266.003 | Kirsten Browne | Amend | Notes support for Tony Garstang's submission (submitter number 260) | Amend the Plan as per the relief sought by Tony Garstang (submitter number 260). |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S79.001 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports definition as proposed. | Retain definition 'Functional need' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S79.002 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support in part | This definition, which has the same meaning as the RMA definition, is supported, noting rail structures are included. Notes that the numbering is not consistent with the RMA definition and requires amendment. | Amend definition for 'infrastructure' so the numbering aligns with the RMA definition. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S79.003 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports reference to Network Utility Operator which includes KiwiRail. | Retain definition 'Network Utility' as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| Interpretation | Definitions | S79.004 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports the use of the RMA definition of Network Utility Operator, which includes a person who constructs and operates a railway line. | Retain definition 'Network Utility Operator' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S79.005 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support in part | Seeks amendment to this definition to ensure it captures all activities, night and day, which are sensitive to noise. Disturbance from rail operations can occur at any time and rail operator seeks to ensure new and altered nearby noise sensitive activities are adequately protected. Also seeks amendment to list activities as opposed to facilities for consistency and clarity. | Amend definition Noise sensitive activity as follows: Means any lawfully established : a. Any habitable room in a residential activity unit (including visitor accommodation), boarding houses, papakāinga , and retirement accommodation); b. Any educational activity (teaching areas and sleeping rooms only) ; c. Any healthcare activity, including hospitals facility (rooms used for overnight patient medical care only) ; d. Any congregations within any places of worship ; and e. Activity at a marae. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S79.006 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports the definition as proposed. | Retain definition 'operational need' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S79.007 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Amend | Seeks the inclusion of a new definition of Rail Corridor Noise Control Overlay. This submission point aligns with other submission points on the Noise Chapter and Planning Maps seeking the inclusion of a new policy, rule, standard and mapped overlay for noise controls within proximity to the rail corridor. | Insert new definition as follows: Rail Corridor Noise Control Overlay: means the area potentially affected by noise between a railway corridor boundary and a distance of 100m. Rail Corridor Noise Control Overlay shown on the planning maps identifies areas that have the potential to experience high noise levels from rail traffic. New buildings and alterations to habitable rooms in |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>buildings used for noise sensitive land uses are required to demonstrate that adverse noise effects have been appropriately managed by demonstrating compliance with the standards specified in Appendix A.</p> <p>[For reference, Appendix A contains a new proposed rule NOISE-R15: Noise sensitive activities within the Rail Corridor Noise Control Overlay, and a new proposed standards NOISE-S4: Noise insulation standards for noise sensitive activities within the Rail Corridor Noise Control Overlay - the full wording of these are captured in subsequent submission points]</p> |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S79.008 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Amend | Seeks the inclusion of a new definition of Rail Vibration Alert Area Overlay for clarity. This submission aligns with other submission points on the Noise Chapter and Planning Maps seeking the inclusion of new introductory text and a mapped overlay. | Insert new definition as follows: Rail Vibration Alert Area Overlay: means the area potentially affected by vibration between a railway corridor boundary and a distance of 60m. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S79.009 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Amend | Seeks that the term 'Reverse sensitivity' is defined in the plan for clear interpretation. The term is shown in italics in the Plan as if it should be defined and there was a definition provided in the draft Plan. Seeks that a definition is included as provided. | Insert new definition as follows: Reverse sensitivity: means the potential for the development, upgrading, operation and maintenance of an existing lawfully established activity to be compromised, constrained or curtailed by the more recent establishment or alteration of another activity which may be sensitive to the actual, potential or perceived |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | environmental effects generated by an existing activity. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S79.010 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports the definition for Sensitive Activities as proposed. | Retain definition for 'Sensitive activities' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S79.011 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports the inclusion of a definition for 'Transport Network' that includes the rail network. | Retain definition for 'Transport network' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S79.012 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | The specific ability to improve or increase the safety or efficiency of existing infrastructure as defined as upgrading, is supported. | Retain definition for 'Upgrade' as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | INF-O1 | S79.013 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports INF-O1 as it recognises the benefits of infrastructure and the need to protect infrastructure from incompatible land use, subdivision and development. | Retain Objective INF-O1 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | Introduction | S79.014 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support in part | Considers it is not appropriate to exclude rail infrastructure from the Network Utility Chapter, as it would mean that important objectives and policies regarding the benefits of the rail network from reverse sensitivity would not apply to this rail. This would also create confusion in plan interpretation and implementation as it would be a different approach to district plans throughout New Zealand. | Amend Network Utilities Introduction as follows: ... Transport related network utilities including the road and rail network are not also addressed in this chapter. They are covered by the Transport Chapter... |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O1 | S79.015 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Objective NU-O1 as proposed. | Retain Objective NU-O1 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O2 | S79.016 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Objective NU-O2 as proposed. | Retain Objective NU-O2 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O3 | S79.017 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Objective NU-O3 as proposed. | Retain Objective NU-O3 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P1 | S79.018 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Policy NU-P1 as proposed. | Retain Policy NU-P1 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P3 | S79.019 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Policy NU-P3 as proposed. | Retain Policy NU-P3 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------|--|--|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P4 | S79.020 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Policy NU-P4 as proposed. | Retain Policy NU-P4 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P5 | S79.021 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Policy NU-P5 as proposed. | Retain Policy NU-P5 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | New provision request | S79.023 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Amend | Seeks the inclusion of a new policy for the protection of network utilities from the adverse effects of land use, subdivision, development and urban growth. The amendment sought is necessary to achieve NU-O3. | Insert new policy as follows: Managing adverse effects including reverse sensitivity on network utilitiesManage the establishment or alteration of activities near existing lawfully established network utilities, including by: a. managing new activities through setbacks and design controls where it is necessary to achieve appropriate protection of a network utility;b. managing new activities that are sensitive to noise adjoining network utilities including state highways and the railway corridor; andc. managing land disturbance, subdivision, and activities in the vicinity of a network utility to maintain the safe and efficient operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the network utility. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R1 | S79.024 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports the permitted activity status of the operation, maintenance, repair, and removal of network utilities subject to standards. | Retain Rule NU-R1 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R2 | S79.025 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports the permitted activity status of new underground network utilities and upgrading of existing underground network utilities. | Retain Rule NU-R2 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R3 | S79.026 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports the permitted activity status of upgrading existing above ground network utilities subject to standards. | Retain Rule NU-R3 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------------|---|---|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R5 | S79.027 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports provision for substations and minor utility structures which are required to be erected within the rail corridor around the country. | Retain Rule NU-R5 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R6 | S79.028 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports the provision for substations and minor utility structures which are required to be erected within the rail corridor around the country. | Retain Rule NU-R6 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R10 | S79.029 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports the provision for substations and minor utility structures which are required to be erected within the rail corridor around the country. | Retain Rule NU-R10 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R15 | S79.030 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports the permitted activity status of aboveground network utilities subject to standards. Supports the matters of discretion which includes the functional and operational needs of network utilities, the location, and the benefits of network utilities. | Retain Rule NU-R15 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | Introduction | S79.031 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Oppose in part | KiwiRail opposes paragraph 6 of the 'Transport' introduction as it fails to mention the rail corridor in relation to noise related reverse sensitivity effects. Therefore, KiwiRail seeks amendment to include reference to the rail network. | Amend introduction as follows: ... The Transport Chapter contains provisions that deal with on-site transport facilities and access, the operation, maintenance and repair of the transport network, and the effects of high traffic generating activities. Provisions addressing noise related reverse sensitivity effects on the State Highway, rail network and the Hood Aerodrome are in the Noise Chapter. |
| TR - Transport | TR-O1 | S79.032 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports the objective for a safe, efficient and effective transport network. | Retain Objective TR-O1 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-O2 | S79.033 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Objective TR-O2 as proposed. | Retain Objective TR-O2 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-O3 | S79.034 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Objective TR-O3 as proposed. | Retain TR-O3 - Effects of activities on the transport network as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P5 | S79.035 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Policy TR-P5 as proposed. | Retain TR-P5 - Transport network connections as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| TR - Transport | TR-P6 | S79.036 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Policy TR-P6 as proposed. | Retain TR-P6 - Managing effects of the transport network as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P8 | S79.037 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support in part | Supports policy which seeks to protect sightlines at level crossings. It is unclear what infrastructure the policy intends to capture and KiwiRail seeks amendment for clarity of the intent of the policy and what it specifically seeks to achieve. | Amend TR-P8 - Rail corridor safety as follows: Provide safe visibility and appropriate infrastructure at road/ rail level crossings. Ensure the safe and efficient operation of the rail network by: a. protecting sight lines at rail level crossings by managing adjacent land use and development; b. controlling new or increased use of vehicle access to sites adjacent to level crossing; and c. avoiding new at-grade level crossings. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R2 | S79.038 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Rule TR-R2 as proposed. | Retain Rule TR-R2 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R3 | S79.039 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Rule TR-R3 as proposed. | Retain Rule TR-R3 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R4 | S79.040 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Oppose | KiwiRail generally supports this rule however, seeks amendment for consistency with our model rule and standard which has been adopted in district plans throughout the country. | Delete and Replace rule with the following: TR-R4 Sight lines at railway level crossingsAll zonesActivity status: PermittedWhere:Compliance is achieved with TR-SXActivity status where compliance is not achieved:Restricted DiscretionaryMatters of discretion are: 1. the potential for adverse effects on the safety and efficiency of the rail network. 2. applications under this rule must provide, in addition to the standard information requirements, |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | | evidence of engagement with KiwiRail. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-O1 | S79.041 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Objective NH-O1 as proposed. | Retain Objective NH-O1 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P8 | S79.042 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Policy NH-P8 as proposed. | Retain Policy NH-P8 as proposed. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P9 | S79.043 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Policy NH-P9 as proposed. | Retain Policy NH-P9 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R8 | S79.044 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Rule NH-R8 as proposed. | Retain Rule NH-R8 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P3 | S79.045 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | There are three heritage items within the rail corridor including the Greytown Railway Station, Carterton Railway Station, and Solway Railway Station. KiwiRail supports enabling maintenance and repair activities, and seismic and building safety alterations to heritage items. | Retain Policy HH-P3 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P5 | S79.046 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | There are three heritage items within the rail corridor including the Greytown Railway Station, Carterton Railway Station and Solway Railway Station. KiwiRail supports enabling maintenance and repair activities, and seismic and building safety alterations to heritage items. | Retain Policy HH-P5 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P4 | S79.047 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports policy that provides for additions and alterations to, and partial demolition of heritage items if values are protected. | Retain Policy HH-P4 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R1 | S79.048 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports the Permitted Activity status of maintenance and repair of a heritage item. | Retain Rule HH-R1 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R3 | S79.049 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports the Permitted Activity status of additions and alterations to, and partial demolition of heritage items subject to standards. | Retain Rule HH-R3 as proposed. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P3 | S79.050 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports proposed policy which seeks to enable earthworks within 25m of significant | Retain Policy NATC-P3 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | waterbodies if the works are infrastructure maintenance works. | |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P5 | S79.051 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports proposed policy which allows structures within proximity to significant waterbodies where there is a functional or operational need for locating within this setback. | Retain Policy NATC-P5 as notified. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P6 | S79.052 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports the modification of vegetation where it involves pest plant species. | Retain Policy NATC-P6 as notified. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-R1 | S79.053 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports the proposed Permitted Activity status of earthworks within 25m of a significant waterbody for infrastructure maintenance purposes. | Retain Rule NATC-R1 as proposed. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-R2 | S79.054 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports the Permitted Activity status for modification of vegetation where it involves pest plant species. | Retain Rule NATC-R2 as proposed. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O2 | S79.055 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports the proposed objective to require sites to connect to the public reticulated stormwater system where there is capacity or demonstrate there is an alternative means of on-site servicing. | Retain Objective SUB-O2 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O3 | S79.056 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support in part | Supports the proposed objective to integrate subdivision and development with infrastructure to ensure it doesn't undermine the effective and efficient provision of infrastructure. Seeks amendment to specify rail as well as roads within this objective. | Amend Objective SUB-O3 as follows: Subdivision and development are provided for where they integrate with the existing and planned development of land, roads, and infrastructure, and avoid fragmentation or development that undermines the effective and efficient provision of infrastructure, rail and roads. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P7 | S79.057 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports the avoidance of subdivision which could compromise the efficient and effective operation of the transport network and reverse sensitive effects on infrastructure. | Retain Policy SUB-P7 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R1 | S79.058 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Rule SUB-R1 as proposed. | Retain Rule SUB-R1 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R2 | S79.059 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Rule SUB-R2 as proposed. | Retain Rule SUB-R2 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R3 | S79.060 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Rule SUB-R3 as proposed. | Retain Rule SUB-R3 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S79.061 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Rule SUB-R4 as proposed. | Retain Rule SUB-R4 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R5 | S79.062 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Rule SUB-R5 as notified. | Retain Rule SUB-R5 as notified. |
| SCHED7 - Schedule of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features | Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes | S79.063 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Amend | Part of the Tararua/ Rimutaka Forest Parks ONFL 1 overlay extends over the established, operational Wairarapa Line. Having reviewed SCHED7 values which define this overlay, KiwiRail does not consider it appropriate to include the operational rail corridor within this overlay which is characterised by high natural vegetation and landscape. | Amend overlay to remove designated rail corridor in yellow circled area below: [see original submission for map] |
| LIGHT - Light | LIGHT-O3 | S79.064 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Objective LIGHT-O3 as proposed. | Retain Objective LIGHT-O3 as notified. |
| LIGHT - Light | LIGHT-P4 | S79.065 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Policy LIGHT-P4 as proposed. | Retain Policy LIGHT-P4 as notified. |
| LIGHT - Light | LIGHT-R1 | S79.066 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Rule LIGHT-R1 as proposed. | Retain Rule LIGHT-R1 as notified. |
| LIGHT - Light | LIGHT-S1 | S79.067 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support in part | Generally supports this standard for light spill and lighting design. Seeks amendment to this standard to include rail as well as roads. | Amend standard as follows: ... Exception: The provisions do not apply to specific types of activities or lighting which have a functional need or operational need, such as navigational aids, rail signals and lights and vehicle lights. ... Matters of discretion: ... 2. The effects of light direction on the safe and efficient operation of the road |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | | or rail network. |
| NOISE - Noise | Introduction | S79.068 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Amend | Seeks the inclusion of a new Rail Vibration Alert Area overlay to identify areas susceptible to rail vibration, within 60m of the rail corridor boundary. KiwiRail seeks the inclusion of a description of the mapped overlay and its purpose within the introduction section of the Noise Chapter. | Amend introduction as follows: ... Noise sensitive activities will be defined and managed to mitigate potential effects on human health occurring from operational noise from established transport routes. A Rail Vibration Alert Overlay has been applied which identified the vibration-sensitive area within 60 metres each side of the railway designation boundary as properties within this area may experience rail vibration effects. No specific district plan provisions apply in relation to vibration controls as a result of this Rail Vibration Alert Area. The Rail Vibration Alert Overlay is to advise property owners of the potential vibration effects but leaves the site owner to determine an appropriate response. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-O2 | S79.069 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Objective NOISE-O2 as proposed. | Retain Objective NOISE-O2 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P1 | S79.070 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Policy NOISE-P1 as proposed. | Retain Policy NOISE-P1 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | New provision request | S79.071 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Amend | The Proposed Plan contains policy NOISE-P4 which seeks to ensure noise sensitivity activities are appropriately located and separated from state highways and/or adverse effects on human health are managed by requiring noise insulation. Seeks the inclusion of a new policy requiring noise insulation for new/ altered noise sensitive activities located near the rail network. | Insert new Policy NOISE-P9 as follows: NOISE-P9 Noise insulation within the Rail Corridor Noise Control Overlay.Ensure noise sensitive activities are appropriately located and separated from the rail corridor and/or that any adverse noise, amenity, and adverse human health effects are avoided, |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | | remedied, or mitigated by requiring acoustic insulation measures within the Rail Corridor Noise Control Overlay. |
| NOISE - Noise | | S79.072 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports the exclusion of rail activities as specified in clause c. | Retain NOISE Rules exemptions as proposed. |
| NOISE - Noise | New provision request | S79.073 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Amend | Seeks the inclusion of noise provisions requiring acoustic insulation and appropriate mechanical ventilation to be installed in new (or altered) noise sensitive activities within 100m of the railway corridor. Appropriate mitigation, installed to ensure that the health and wellbeing of those living and working near to the rail network are not adversely affected, is crucial to ensure that undue restrictions are not placed on the operation of the rail network. | Insert new rule NOISE-R15 as follows: 'Noise sensitive activities within the Rail Corridor Noise Control OverlayAll zonesActivity Status: PermittedWhere: Any new building or alterations to an existing building containing a noise sensitive activity which complies with the noise standards in NOISE-S4. All zonesActivity Status where activity conditions are not met: Restricted DiscretionaryMatters of discretion are:1. Adverse effects on health and amenity of people indoors within the Railway Corridor Noise Overlay.2. Alternative options for building design or location that would achieve compliance with the standards in Table-S4.3. Adverse effects on the continuing operation of the railway corridor as a result of non-compliance with the standards in Table-S44. The reverse sensitivity effects on the rail network, including the extent to which the activity will unduly constrain the ongoing operation, maintenance, and upgrade of the rail network.5. Any |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | | natural or built features of the site or surrounding area that will mitigate noise effects.6. The outcome of any consultation with KiwiRail.' |
| NOISE - Noise | New provision request | S79.074 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Amend | Seeks the inclusion of provisions requiring acoustic insulation and appropriate mechanical ventilation to be installed in new (or altered) noise sensitive activities within 100m of the railway corridor. Appropriate mitigation, installed to ensure that the health and wellbeing of those living and working near to the rail network are not adversely affected, is crucial to ensure that undue restrictions are not placed on the operation of the rail network. | Insert new Standard NOISE-S4 as follows: 'NOISE-S4: Noise insulation standards for noise sensitive activities within the Rail Corridor Noise Control Overlay Indoor railway noise: 1. Any new building, or alteration to an existing building, that contains a noise sensitive activity where the building or alteration is: a. designed, constructed and maintained to achieve indoor design noise levels resulting from the railway not exceeding the maximum values in Table-S4; or b. at least 50 metres from the railway network, and is designed so that a noise barrier entirely blocks line-of-sight from all parts of doors and windows to all points 3.8 metres above railway tracks; or c. is single-storey framed residential building with habitable rooms designed, constructed and maintained in accordance with the construction schedule NOISE-APP1. Table-S4 Building type Occupancy/ activity Maximum railway noise level LAeq(1h) Residential Sleeping spaces 35dB All other habitable rooms 40dB Education Lecture rooms/ theatres, music |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------|---|
| | | | | | | <p>studios, assembly halls 35dB Teaching areas, conference rooms, drama studios, sleeping areas 40 dB Library 45dB Health Clinics Overnight medical care, wards 40dB Consulting rooms, theatres, nurses' stations 45dB Cultural Place of worship, marae 35dB Mechanical ventilation². If the opening windows must be closed to achieve the design noise levels in Table- S4, the building must be designed, constructed and maintained with a mechanical ventilation system that: a. for habitable rooms located within the Rail Corridor Noise Control Overlay containing a residential activity, achieves the following requirements: i. Provides mechanical ventilation that can operate continuously to satisfy clause G4 of the New Zealand Building Code and that provides at least 1 air changes per house, but no less than 7.5L/s per occupant; ii. Provides cooling and heating that is controllable by the occupant and can maintain the inside temperature between 18°C and 25°C when assessed using a 2.5% design weather condition for the applicable location. An acceptable design weather set would include IRHACE Yearbook 2009 NIWA weather data; and iii. HVAC system installed in compliance with (a)</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------|--|
| | | | | | | <p>and (b) above must not generate more than 35dB LAeg(30s) when measured 1 metre away from any grille or diffuser. The noise level must be measured after the system has cooled the rooms to the temperatures in (ii), or after a period of 30 minutes from the commencement of cooling (whichever is the lesser).b. Alternatively, in lieu of section (2)a. above, a design verified by a suitably qualified and experienced HVAC expert stating the design proposed will provide ventilation and internal space temperature controls to meet or exceed the outcomes described in parts (2)a,c. A commissioning report must be submitted to the Council prior to occupation of the building demonstrating compliance with all of the mechanical ventilation system performance requirements in (2). Design report3. A report is submitted to the council demonstrating compliance with clauses (1) to (2) above (as relevant) prior to the construction or alteration of any building containing an activity sensitive to noise. Compliance with 1(a) and (c) must be confirmed by a Registered Acoustician and when doing so railway noise must be assumed to be 70 LAeg(1h) at a distance of 12 metres from the track, and must be deemed to reduce at a rate of 3dB per</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>doubling of distance up to 40 metres and 6dB per doubling of distance beyond 40 metres. Matters of discretion are:1. Adverse effects on health and amenity of people indoors within the 'Railway Corridor Noise Overlay.2. Alternative options for building design or location that would achieve compliance with the standards in Table-S4.3. Adverse effects on the continuing operation of the railway corridor as a result of non-compliance with the standards in Table-S4.4. The reverse sensitive effects on the railway network, including the extent to which the activity will unduly constrain the ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrade of the rail network.5. Any natural or built features of the sites or surrounding area that will mitigate noise effects.6. The outcome of any consultation with KiwiRail.'</p> |
| NOISE - Noise | New provision request | S79.075 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Amend | <p>Seeks the inclusion of noise provisions requiring acoustic insulation and appropriate mechanical ventilation to be installed in new (or altered) noise sensitive activities within 100m of the railway corridor. Appropriate mitigation, installed to ensure that the health and wellbeing of those living and working near to the rail network are not adversely affected, is crucial to ensure that undue restrictions are not placed on the operation of the rail network.</p> | <p>Insert new appendix "NOISE-APP1 Construction schedule for indoor noise control" as follows: 'NOISE-APP1 Construction schedule for indoor noise control Elements: Minimum construction for noise control in addition to the requirements of the New Zealand Building Code External Walls: Wall cavity infill of fibrous insulation, batts or similar (minimum</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------|---|
| | | | | | | <p>density of 9 kg/m³) Cladding and internal wall lining complying with either Options A, B or C below:</p> <p>Option A - Light cladding: timber weatherboard or sheet materials with surface mass between 8 kg/m² and 30 kg/m² of wall cladding. Internal lining of minimum 17 kg/m² plasterboard, such as two layers of 10 mm thick high-density plasterboard, on resilient/ isolating mountings.</p> <p>Option B - Medium cladding: surface mass between 30 kg/m² and 80 kg/m² of wall cladding. Internal lining of minimum 17 kg/m² plasterboard, such as two layers of 10 mm thick high-density plasterboard.</p> <p>Option C - Heavy cladding: surface mass between 80 kg/m² and 220 kg/m² of wall cladding.</p> <p>No requirements additional to New Zealand Building Code.</p> <p>Roof/ Ceiling: Ceiling cavity infill of fibrous insulation, batts, or similar (minimum density of 7 kg/m³) Ceiling penetrations, such as for recessed lighting or ventilation shall not allow additional noise break-in.</p> <p>Roof type and internal ceiling complying with either Options A, B, or C below:</p> <p>Option A - Skillion roof with light cladding: surface mass up to 20 kg/m² of roof cladding. Internal lining of minimum 25 kg/m² plasterboard, such as two layers of 13mm thick high-density</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------|--|
| | | | | | | <p>plasterboard Option B - Pitched roof with light cladding: surface mass up to 20kg/m² of roof cladding Internal lining of minimum 17 kg/m² plasterboard, such as two layers of 10mm thick high-density plasterboard Option C - Roof with heavy cladding: surface mass between 20 kg/m² and 60 kg/m² of roof cladding No requirements additional to New Zealand Building Code Glazed areas: Aluminium frames with full compression seals on opening panes Glazed areas shall be less than 35% of each room floor area Either, double glazing with:- laminated pane of glass at least 6mm thick; and- a cavity between the two panes of glass at least 12mm deep; and - a second pane of glass at least 4mm thick or, any other glazing with a minimum performance of Rw 33dB Exterior doors: Exterior door with line-of-sight, to any part of the state highway road surface or to any point 3.8 metres above railway tracks Solid core exterior door, minimum surface mass 24 kg/m² with edge and threshold compression seals; or other doorset with minimum performance of Rw 30dB Exterior door shielded by the building so there is no line-of-sight to any parts of the state highway road surface or any points 3.8 metres above railway tracks Exterior door with edge</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | | and threshold compression seals.' |
| Planning Maps | General District-Wide Matters | S79.076 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Amend | <p>Noise from the rail corridor can give rise to adverse health effects on sensitive land uses located within 100m of the corridor boundary. The research and guidelines relating to these effects are widely accepted internationally and applied in New Zealand</p> <p>Seeks the inclusion of a new Rail Corridor Noise Control Overlay to identify areas susceptible to rail noise, within 100m of the rail corridor boundary.</p> | Insert a Rail Corridor Noise Control Overlay to the planning maps as provided in the submitted GIS shapefile. [See original submission] |
| Planning Maps | General District-Wide Matters | S79.077 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Amend | <p>Seeks the inclusion of a new Rail Vibration Alert Area Overlay to identify areas susceptible to rail vibration, within 60m of the rail corridor boundary. KiwiRail has provided a GIS shapefile of the overlay and seeks this to be included on the planning maps.</p> | Insert Rail Vibration Alert Area Overlay to the planning maps as provided in the submitted GIS shapefile. [See original submission] |
| SIGN - Signs | SIGN-O1 | S79.078 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Objective SIGN-O1 as proposed. | Retain Objective SIGN-O1 as notified. |
| SIGN - Signs | SIGN-P1 | S79.079 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Policy SIGN-P1 as proposed. | Retain Policy SIGN-P1 as notified. |
| SIGN - Signs | SIGN-P6 | S79.080 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Policy SIGN-P6 as proposed. | Retain Policy SIGN-P6 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-S3 | S79.081 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Amend | <p>The GRZ Chapter does not contain a specific rail corridor building setback standard. Instead, the rail corridor boundary is assessed as a side or rear yard site boundary and a 3m and 1.5m building setback applies. KiwiRail seeks a new clause within GRZ-S3 to require a 5m setback for buildings and structures from the rail corridor. Matters of discretion are also sought in the case that the setback cannot be achieved and resource consent is required.</p> | <p>Amend as follows:... Rail corridor setbacks:6. No part of any building or structure may be located within a 5m setback from a boundary shared with a rail corridor.</p> <p>... Matters of discretion:... 9. The safe and efficient operation of the rail network;10. Compatibility with the surrounding environment; and 11. The reason for the reduced setback.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------|--|--|
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-S4 | S79.082 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Amend | The GRZ Chapter does not contain a specific rail corridor building setback standard. Instead, the rail corridor boundary is assessed as a side or rear yard site boundary and a 3m and 1.5m building setback applies. KiwiRail seeks a new clause within GRZ-S4 to require a 5m setback for buildings and structures from the rail corridor. Matters of discretion are also sought in the case that the setback cannot be achieved and resource consent is required. | Amend as follows: ... Rail corridor setbacks:3. No part of any building or structure may be located within a 5m setback from a boundary shared with a rail corridor. ... Matters of discretion:... 7. The safe and efficient operation of the rail network;8. Compatibility with the surrounding environment; and 9. The reason for the reduced setback. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S3 | S79.083 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Standard GRUZ-S3 as proposed. | Retain Standard GRUZ-S3 as notified. |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-S3 | S79.084 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Amend | The MUZ Chapter does not contain a specific rail corridor building setback standard and there is no yard setback that applies to the corridor. KiwiRail seeks a new clause within MUZ-S3 to require a 5m setback for buildings and structures from the rail corridor. Matters of discretion are also sought in the case that the setback cannot be achieved and resource consent is required. | Amend as follows: ... d. 5m of a boundary shared with a rail corridor. ... Matters of discretion: ... 9. The safe and efficient operation of the railway network;10. Compatibility with the surrounding environment; and11. The reason for the reduced setback. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-S3 | S79.085 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Amend | The TCZ Chapter does not contain a specific rail corridor building setback standard and there is no yard setback that applies to the corridor. KiwiRail seeks a new clause within TCZ-S3 to require a 5m setback for buildings and structures from the rail corridor. Matters of discretion are also sought in the case that the setback cannot be achieved and resource consent is required. | Amend as follows: 1. Buildings or structures must not be located within: ... c. 5m of a boundary shared with a rail corridor. ... Matters of discretion: ... 9. The safe and efficient operation of the rail network ;10. Compatibility with |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | | the surrounding environment; and 11. The reason for the reduced setback. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-S3 | S79.086 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Amend | The GIZ Chapter does not contain a specific rail corridor building setback standard and there is no yard setback that applies to the corridor. KiwiRail seeks a new clause within GIZ-S3 to require a 5m setback for buildings and structures from the rail corridor. Matters of discretion are also sought in the case that the setback cannot be achieved and resource consent is required. | Amend as follows: 1. Buildings or structures must not be located within;... d. 5. of a boundary shared with a rail corridor. ... Matters of discretion: ... 5. The safe and efficient operation of the rail network;6. Compatibility with the surrounding environment; and 7. The reason for the reduced setback. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-S3 | S79.087 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Amend | The NOSZ Chapter does not contain a specific rail corridor building setback standard and there is no yard setback that applies to the corridor. KiwiRail seeks a new clause within NOSZ-S3 to require a 5m setback for buildings and structures from the rail corridor. Matters of discretion are also sought in the case that the setback cannot be achieved and resource consent is required. | Amend as follows: 2. Buildings or structures must not be located within:... d. 5m of a boundary shared with a rail corridor. ... Matters of discretion: ...8. The safe and efficient operation of the rail network;9. Compatibility with the surrounding environment; and 10. The reason for the reduced setback. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | | S79.088 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | The FUZ Chapter does not contain a specific rail corridor building setback standard and there is no yard setback that applies to the corridor. KiwiRail seeks a new clause within SARZ-S3 to require a 5m setback for buildings and structures from the rail corridor. Matters of discretion are also sought in the case that the setback cannot be achieved and resource consent is required. | Amend as follows: ... Rail corridor setbacks:3. No part of any building or structure may be located within a 5m setback from a boundary shared with a rail corridor. Matters of discretion: ... 8. The safe and efficient operation of the rail network;9. Compatibility with the surrounding environment; and 10. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|---------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | The reason for the reduced setback. |
| Designations | KRH - KiwiRail Holdings Limited | S79.089 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports KRH-C-O1 which details the rail designations in the Carterton District. Supports the text in the Designations Chapter and the mapped extent as shown on the planning maps. | Retain KRH-C-O1 as notified. |
| Designations | KRH - KiwiRail Holdings Limited | S79.090 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports KRH-M-O1 which details the rail designations in the Masterton District. KiwiRail supports the text in the Designations Chapter and the mapped extent as shown on the planning maps. | Retain KRH-M-O1 as notified. |
| Designations | KRH - KiwiRail Holdings Limited | S79.091 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports KRH-S-O1 which details the rail designations in the South Wairarapa District. Supports the text in the Designations Chapter and the mapped extent as shown on the planning maps. | Retain KRH-S-O1 as notified. |
| SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ-S3 | S79.092 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support in part | The SARZ chapter does not contain a specific rail corridor building setback standard and there is no yard setback that applies to the corridor. KiwiRail seeks a new clause within SARZ-S3 to require a 5m setback for buildings and structures from the rail corridor. Matters of discretion are also sought in the case that the setback cannot be achieved and resource consent is required. | Amend Standard SARZ-S3 as follows: '1. Buildings or structures must not be located within;... d. 5m of a boundary shared with a rail corridor. ... Matters of discretion ... 8.The safe and efficient operation of the rail network; 9. Compatibility with the surrounding environment; and 10 The reason for the reduced setback.' |
| OSZ - Open Space Zone | OSZ-S3 | S79.093 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support in part | The OSZ chapter does not contain a specific rail corridor building setback standard and there is no yard setback that applies to the corridor. KiwiRail seeks a new clause within OSZ-S3 to require a 5m setback for buildings and structures from the rail corridor. Matters of discretion are also sought in the case that the setback cannot be achieved and resource consent is required. | Amend Standard OSZ-S3 as follows: 1. Buildings or structures must not be located within; a. 5m of any boundary adjoining another zone; b. 5m of any surface waterbody; and c. 5m of any significant waterbody; andd. 5m of a boundary shared with a |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | | <p>rail corridor.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Matters of discretion:</p> <p>...</p> <p>7. For the surface waterbody setbacks, the effects on the values of the surface waterbody;-8. The safe and efficient operation of the rail network;9. Compatibility with the surrounding environment; and 10. The reason for the reduced setback.</p> |
| TR - Transport | TR-P3 | S79.094 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Support | Supports Policy TR-P3 as proposed. | Retain Policy TR-P3 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R4 | S79.096 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | Oppose | KiwiRail generally supports this rule however, seeks amendment for consistency with our model rule and standard which has been adopted in district plans throughout the country | <p>Insert new standard:TR-SX: Sight lines at railway level crossingsRestart sight triangles at level crossings: On sites adjacent to all rail level crossings, no building, structure, planting or visual obstruction shall be located within the shaded areas shown in Figure 1. These are defined by a sight triangle taken 5 metres from the outside rail and distance A along the railway track. Distance A depends on the type of control (Table 1).Figure 1: Restart sight triangles for all level crossings [see original submission for diagram]Table 1: Required restart sight distances for Figure 1 Required approach visibility along tracks A (m)Signs only:</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------|---|
| | | | | | | <p>677mAlarms only: 677mAlarms and barriers: 80m.Advice Note: The restart sight line triangles ensure that a road vehicle driver stopped at a level crossing can see far enough along the railway to be able to start off, cross and clear the level crossing safely before the arrival of any previously unseen train. Of particular concern are developments that include shelter belts, tree planting, or a series of building extensions. These conditions apply irrespective of whether any visual obstructions already exist.</p> <p>Approach sight triangles at level crossings with Give Way signs: On sites adjacent to rail level crossings controlled by Give Way Signs, no building, structure, planting or other visual obstruction shall be located within the shaded areas shown in Figure 2.</p> <p>Figure 2: Approach sight triangles for level crossings with "Give Way" signs [see original submission for diagram]</p> <p>Advice Note: The approach sight triangles ensure that clear visibility is achieved around rail level crossings with Give Way signs so that a driver approaching a rail level can either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See a train and stop before the crossing; or • Continue at the approach speed and cross the level crossing safely. <p>Of particular concern are developments that include shelter</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|------------------------------|------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | belts, tree planting, or a series of building extensions. These conditions apply irrespective of whether any visual obstructions already exist. No approach sight triangles apply for level crossings fitted with alarms and/or barrier arms. However, care should be taken to avoid developments that have the potential to obscure visibility of these alarm masts. This is particularly important where there is a curve in the road on the approach to the level crossing, or where the property boundary is close to the edge of the road surface and there is the potential for vegetation growth. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-O1 | S201.001 | Ko Hinetau Te Whaiti-Trueman | Support | Supports SASM O1 and the process to implement sites | Retain SASM-O1 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | | S201.002 | Ko Hinetau Te Whaiti-Trueman | Not Stated | Supports the Maori Purpose Zone generally, but considers there needs to be more flexibility due to difficulty to engage with all Maori land owners in the Wairarapa. Requests the ability to opt in or out outside of DP reviews. | Amend the Maori Purpose Zone to enable landowners to opt in and out of the zone outside of District Plan reviews |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-O2 | S201.003 | Ko Hinetau Te Whaiti-Trueman | Support | Supports SASM O2 and the process to implement sites | Retain SASM-O2 as notified |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of | SASM-O3 | S201.004 | Ko Hinetau Te Whaiti-Trueman | Support | Supports SASM-O3 and the process to implement sites | Retain SASM-O3 as notified |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Significance to Māori | | | | | | |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-O1 | S201.005 | Ko Hinetau Te Whaiti-Trueman | Support | Include MPZ-O1 in the Plan | Retain MPZ-O1 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-O2 | S201.006 | Ko Hinetau Te Whaiti-Trueman | Support | Include MPZ-O2 in the Plan | Retain MPZ-O2 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-O3 | S201.007 | Ko Hinetau Te Whaiti-Trueman | Support | Include MPZ-O3 in the Plan | Retain MPZ-O3 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-O4 | S201.008 | Ko Hinetau Te Whaiti-Trueman | Support | Include MPZ-O4 in the Plan | Retain MPZ-O4 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | | S280.001 | Lawrence Stephenson | Oppose | Supports the submission made by the South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group (SWWAG). | Amend provisions as requested in the submission by SWWAG (Submission number 207). |
| Designations | MEDU - Minister of Education | S5.001 | Liza Phipps | Amend | 446 Dalefield Road was purchased from the Ministry of Education. | Amend designation MEDU-C-01 to remove 446 Dalefield Road (legally described as Section 2 Survey Office Plan 519587) from the designation. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S51.001 | Lucy Sanderson-Gammon | Support in part | <p>Reducing the remaining land required would provide more flexibility for those with land less than 4ha.</p> <p>If the remainder required after subdividing just one section is 1.5ha, it seems illogical to require 2.5ha after subdividing two sections. Having 2ha (or 1.5ha) remaining after two sections would not adversely affect the character of the Rural zone but would make a big difference to those wishing to subdivide two sections (and also help to free up more land for housing).</p> | Amend SUB-R4 (1) (e) as follows: "e. Either: i. one additional allotment is created and the balance area remaining from the record of title subject to subdivision is no less than 1.5ha; or ii. two additional allotments are created and the balance area remaining from the record of title subject to subdivision is no less than 2.5ha 2ha ;" |
| Planning Maps | Specific Controls | S125.001 | Lynly Selby-Neal and Angus Laird | Oppose | The site does not have unique soil and climate characteristics suitable for high value crops including viticulture, orchards and | Amend the planning maps to remove 101a Shooting Butts Road from the Martinborough |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | olives. A soil scientist carried out a site visit and produced a report that recommends the area not be specifically protected for viticulture (full report attached to submission). This is supported by the AGFIRST report 'Assessment of rural production and rural subdivision in the Wairarapa' dated July 2023 which states olives and orchards preferring free-draining soil, and the "Interim Soil Map of the Wairarapa Valley" 1974 which identifies the site as "imperfectly drained soils". | Soils Overlay. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P7 | S125.002 | Lynly Selby-Neal and Angus Laird | Oppose | Considers the application of a "buffer" is inconsistent, not appropriate, not necessary, and is in part outside SWDC jurisdiction as the buffer zone is not defined within the Martinborough Soils Overlay or Plan maps, there is no evidence alternative options were considered / or if a buffer is suitable to meet the outcomes sought. There is no buffer in areas neighbouring existing viticulture. Notes the SWDC stated "is it unlikely that there is any information to provide you" in response to a request for evidence of relevant complaints received from residents in the upper Shooting Butts Road area regarding viticulture and activities. Notes there are recently issued subdivision consents for the neighbouring properties require each title issued to include Consent Notices regarding Reverse Sensitivity to rural activities. Future housing or new builds are required to have double or triple glazing and good insulation, mitigating noise. Other reverse sensitivities toward viticulture e.g. spray drift or dust are not within District Council's jurisdictions, being a regional council function. | Amend GRUZ-P7 to remove reference to "buffer areas". |
| Planning Maps | Specific Controls | S125.003 | Lynly Selby-Neal and Angus Laird | Oppose in part | The S32 report lists the two workshops held with the Wairarapa Wine Growers Association regarding the Martinborough Soils Overlay. The report notes that the extent of area should be based on current land use (where | Amend planning maps to reduce the extent of area subject to Martinborough Soils Overlay to match the extent of current viticulture use and land suitable for viticulture in response to |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | existing viticulture is) and land that is suitable for viticulture and the spatial extent of the overlay may require further input from a suitably qualified individual. Considers that the investigation the submitter has carried out informs their submission assists to better define what land that is suitable for viticulture, and provides further input from a suitably qualified soil scientist to better define the spatial extent of the overlay. | additional evidence provided. |
| Planning Maps | Specific Controls | S125.004 | Lynly Selby-Neal and Angus Laird | Oppose in part | The rule GRUZ-R8 further restricts residential activities within the Martinborough Soils Overlay. Considers the property at 101a Shooting Butts Road is not suitable for high value crops including viticulture, orchards and olives, but they are subsequently subject to a further removal of property rights by the application of these rules. | None requested (Amend planning maps to remove 101a Shooting Butts Road from the Martinborough Soils Overlay (inferred)). |
| Planning Maps | Specific Controls | S125.005 | Lynly Selby-Neal and Angus Laird | Oppose in part | The rule GRUZ-R4 further restricts seasonal worker accommodation within the Martinborough Soils Overlay. Considers the property at 101a Shooting Butts Road is not suitable for high value crops including viticulture, orchards and olives, but they are subsequently subject to a further removal of property rights by the application of these rules. | None requested (Amend planning maps to remove 101a Shooting Butts Road from the Martinborough Soils Overlay (inferred)). |
| SIGN - Signs | Introduction | S99.001 | Manu Te Whata | Amend | Since the Akura Road Alignment 1993, these roads have been turned into a bypass route especially for heavy trucks, which has created problems with traffic noise and exhaust pollution close to local whare, including unrestricted speed and out of control burnouts on Kibblewhite Rd and Akura Rd corner. | Install speed signs installed or reduced on Akura, Kibblewhite, and Paieru Roads, and STOP sign on corner of Ngaumutawa, Akura, and Lincoln Roads. |
| NOISE - Noise | New provision request | S99.002 | Manu Te Whata | Not Stated | Since the Akura Road Alignment 1993, these roads have been turned into a bypass route especially for heavy trucks, which has created problems with traffic noise and exhaust pollution close to local whare, including unrestricted speed and out of control burnouts on Kibblewhite Rd and Akura Rd corner. | Insert noise testing and noise control plan for Akura, Kibblewhite and Paierau Rds. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Strategic Direction | New provision request | S212.001 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter states that an objective is required to address impact of climate change on Maori land. | Insert new objective as follows: CCR-05. Owners of Māori land are empowered to become resilient so they can build adaptive capacity using mātauranga Māori, accurate data and information to support informed decision-making where climate adaptation and retreat processes are implemented. |
| Strategic Direction | HC-O1 | S212.002 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter supports this objective. | Retain as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | HC-O2 | S212.003 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter supports this objective. | Retain as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | NE-O1 | S212.004 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | The submitter generally supports the Natural Environment objectives however notes the intention is not clear and requires amending. The current drafting seems to place an obligation on the natural environment to justify its worth, rather than highlighting the district's responsibility to acknowledge and preserve its inherent natural values. | Amend as follows: Recognise, protect and sustain the natural environment's ability to positively contribute to the Wairarapa's sense of place and identity. |
| Strategic Direction | NE-O3 | S212.005 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | The submitter states for consistency with other areas of the Plan, that sites of significance to Maori should be used for this objective. | Amend as follows: (2). areas with natural, ecological, and landscape values, and sites of significance to tangata whenua Māori are protected. |
| Strategic Direction | NE-O5 | S212.006 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | The submitter supports and acknowledges Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa as tangata whenua in the Wairarapa district. The submitter administers whenua Māori on behalf of Māori freehold landowners, who have had their whakapapa connection to their ancestral lands confirmed by a Māori Land Court order upon succession. The current definition of tangata | Amend as follows: Land and water are managed using an integrated approach, in collaboration with tangata whenua owners of Māori land , the community and other government entities. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>whenua in the RMA 1991 does not expressly provide for Māori freehold landowners.</p> <p>s74 of the RMA requires territorial authorities to prepare and change their plans in accordance with Part 2 matters - including recognising and providing for "the relationship for Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga" as a matter of national importance. In order for the council to perform their functions and duties under the Act, the PDP should therefore recognise and provide for all Māori rights and interests within this objective.</p> <p>Owners of Māori land, as defined in paragraph 9, should be included in this objective.</p> | |
| Strategic Direction | NE-O6 | S212.007 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The objective should be amended to reference 'ecosystem services', in addition to biological diversity, as an important function of a healthy ecosystem.</p> <p>As a strategic objective it is highly relevant to consider that healthy ecosystems, in addition to providing habitat for indigenous biodiversity, can also provide important services for people and communities such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - food and water - flood and disease control - nutrient cycling - spiritual, recreational, and cultural benefits | Amend as follows: The biological diversity and ecosystem services of indigenous species and habitats within the Wairarapa are maintained and enhanced, and restored where degraded. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O1 | S212.008 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Rural Environment' objectives in this chapter.</p> <p>The NPS-HPL only requires the mapping of highly productive land that is within the general rural or rural productive zones and that are also predominantly LUC 1, 2, and 3. The PDP incorrectly identified blocks within</p> | Delete the Highly Productive Land overlay from all land in the Maori Purpose Zone. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | the MPZ as 'Highly Productive Land'. Given that there are no associated rules within the MPZ for highly productive land, this overlay should be removed. | |
| Strategic Direction | TW-O3 | S212.009 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Tangata Whenua' objectives in this chapter.</p> <p>The PDP does not currently provide a definition for 'Māori land' within the definitions chapter. However, the introduction to the Māori Purpose Zone chapter states the purpose of the zone is to recognise and provide for the "relationship of Māori with Māori land as defined by the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993". If the use of Māori land within TW-O3 adopts Te Ture Whenua Māori Act's definition, this only refers to Māori freehold and customary land, which is land not owned by iwi and hapū (tangata whenua). The submitter considers that a definition for Māori land, which is inclusive of land owned by Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa and any additional holding companies, should be included within the definitions chapter of the PDP.</p> <p>s74 of the RMA requires territorial authorities to prepare and change their plans in accordance with Part 2 matters - including recognising and providing for "the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga" as a matter of national importance. In order for the council to perform their functions and duties under the Act, the Proposed Plan should therefore recognise and provide for all Māori rights and interests within this objective.</p> <p>The submitter also considers that the objective should additionally provide for the</p> | Amend as follows: Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Owners of Māori land can protect, develop, and use Māori land to undertake customary activity, and to support their cultural, environmental, social and economic aspirations. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | cultural and environmental aspirations of Māori. | |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S212.010 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Tangata Whenua' objectives in this chapter.</p> <p>The PDP does not currently provide a definition for 'Māori land' within the definitions chapter. However, the introduction to the Māori Purpose Zone chapter states the purpose of the zone is to recognise and provide for the "relationship of Māori with Māori land as defined by the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993". If the use of Māori land within TW-O3 adopts Te Ture Whenua Māori Act's definition, this only refers to Māori freehold and customary land, which is land not owned by iwi and hapū (tangata whenua). The submitter considers that a definition for Māori land, which is inclusive of land owned by Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa and any additional holding companies, should be included within the definitions chapter of the PDP.</p> <p>s74 of the RMA requires territorial authorities to prepare and change their plans in accordance with Part 2 matters - including recognising and providing for "the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga" as a matter of national importance. In order for the council to perform their functions and duties under the Act, the Proposed Plan should therefore recognise and provide for all Māori rights and interests within this objective.</p> <p>The submitter also considers that the objective should additionally provide for the cultural and environmental aspirations of Māori.</p> | <p>Insert new definition for Maori land:Māori land means a. Land owned by Rangitāne o Wairarapa, Rangitāne TūMai Rā Trust, Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa or one of their holding companies/Limited Partnerships;b. Land gazetted or determined by order of the Māori Land Court as Māori reservation under s338 Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993;c. Māori customary and Māori freehold land as defined in s4 and s129 of Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993;d. Any land where: I. A status declaration under the Māori Affairs Amendment Act 1967 was made converting Māori freehold land to general title, and where there have been no changes of ownership since the conversion other than to an owner's bloodline successor(s); or II. One or more owners are able to satisfy Rangitāne o Wairarapa or Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa that they whakapapa to the land; or III. The land is vested in a Trust constituted pursuant to Part 12 of Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 or a Māori incorporation constituted pursuant to Part 13 of the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|--|---|
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O1 | S212.011 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter supports the objective. | Retain UFD-O1 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | INF-O1 | S212.012 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter supports this objective. | Retain as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-O1 | S212.013 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter supports this objective. | Retain ENG-O1 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P3 | S212.014 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Energy' policies in this chapter.</p> <p>Considers that ENG-P3 should be amended to include the MPZ. Land zoned within the MPZ often has similar characteristics to land zoned as General Rural Zone (GRUZ) under the PDP. Therefore, the same resource consent activity status for small scale or community scale renewable energy proposals in the GRUZ should also apply to proposals within the MPZ.</p> <p>The ENG standards as written for the GRUZ should also apply to the MPZ.</p> | Amend as follows: Encourage community-scale renewable electricity generation in the General Rural Zone and Māori Purpose Zone where effects are appropriately managed, by having regard to: |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R3 | S212.015 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter considers that the ability for Māori freehold landowners to install small scale renewable electricity (wind) generation activities on their land will be impeded by ENG-R3. Although land blocks zoned as MPZ are in general smaller in size compared with land within GRUZ, there are no physical differences between them. The different activity status for resource consent purposes is inconsistent and not equitable. Māori land zones as MPZ is likely to be further from a reticulated power supply, and the ability to utilise a wind turbine would increase resilience and development opportunities.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the installation of a wind turbine should be assessed as a 'controlled' activity on land within the MPZ (as it is for the GRUZ). In addition, the 'Matter of Control: 4. Measures to avoid and minimise</p> | Amend to provide for the installation of a maximum of one wind turbine as a 'controlled' activity in the MPZ, where compliance is achieved with the relevant standards set out under R3(2)(b). |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | any potential loss of highly productive land' is not a valid consideration for MPZ land. | |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R4 | S212.016 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The ability for Māori freehold landowners to install community scale renewable electricity generation (solar) activities on their land will be impeded by ENG-R4. Although land blocks zoned as MPZ are in general smaller in size compared with land within GRUZ, there are no physical differences between them. The different activity status for resource consent purposes is inconsistent and not equitable. Māori land zoned as MPZ is likely to be further from a reticulated power supply, and the ability to utilise solar panels would increase resilience and development opportunities.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the installation of community scale renewable electricity generation (solar) activities on land within the MPZ should have the same resource consent activity class as is provided within the GRUZ.</p> | Amend ENG-R4(1) so it provides for the operation, maintenance, repair, and upgrade of community-scale renewable electricity generation (solar) as a 'controlled' activity within the MPZ where compliance is achieved with the relevant standards set out under R4(1)(b). If compliance with the relevant standards set out under R4(1)(b) is not achieved, or the site is within a moderate hazard zone, then rule ENG-R4(2) applies for the activity to be assessed as a 'restricted discretionary' activity. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R5 | S212.017 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The ability for Māori freehold landowners to install small scale renewable electricity generation (wind) activities on their land will be impeded by ENG-R5. Although land blocks zoned as MPZ are in general smaller in size compared with land within GRUZ, there are no physical differences between them. The different activity status for resource consent purposes is inconsistent and not equitable. Māori land zoned as MPZ is likely to be further from a reticulated power supply, and the ability to utilise wind turbines would increase resilience and development opportunities.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the installation of community scale renewable electricity generation (wind) activities on land within the MPZ should have the same resource consent activity class as is provided within the GRUZ.</p> | Amend ENG-R5(1) to provide for the operation, maintenance, repair, and upgrade of community-scale renewable electricity generation (wind) as a 'controlled' activity within the MPZ where compliance is achieved with the relevant standards set out under R5(1)(b). If compliance with the relevant standards set out under R5(1)(b) is not achieved, then ENG-R(2) applies for the activity to be assessed as a 'restricted discretionary' activity. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|--|--|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O2 | S212.018 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | The submitter does not support the inclusion of 'operational need' within NU-O2, as a gateway test for allowing adverse effects on the environment from a Network Utility, particularly on Māori land. The submitter is concerned that the use of such a test will likely result in the degradation of areas with significant environmental values, including on Sites of Significance to Māori, for purely economic reasons. The submitter acknowledges that there may be instances where activities will need to be located in these areas however, a 'functional need' test, though also not perfect, will be available for these cases. | Amend as follows: a. the functional need and operational need of network utilities; and |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P5 | S212.019 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | The submitter does not support the inclusion of the term 'operational need' within NU-P5 as a gateway test for allowing adverse effects on the environment from a Network Utility, particularly on Māori land. The submitter is concerned that the use of such a test will likely result in the degradation of areas with significant environmental values, including Sites of Significance to Māori, for purely economic reasons. The submitter acknowledges that there may be instances where activities will need to be located in these areas, however, a 'functional need' test, though also not perfect, will be available in these cases. | Amend as follows: Ensure that network utilities avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects on the environment, while recognising the functional need and operational need of the network utility, and having regard to: a. the extent to which adverse effects have been addressed through site, route, or method selection and/or the extent to which the network utility is constrained by functional need or operational need ; |
| TR - Transport | TR-O1 | S212.020 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' objectives in this chapter. | Retain TR-O1 as notified. |
| CL - Contaminated Land | CL-O1 | S212.021 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Contaminated land' objectives in this chapter. | Retain CL-O1 as notified. |
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | HAZ-O1 | S212.022 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Hazardous substances' objectives in this chapter. | Retain HAZ-O1 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|--|--|
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-O1 | S212.023 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Natural Hazard' objectives in this chapter. | Retain NH-O1 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P1 | S212.024 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter notes that the natural hazard risk to people and property from 'Wildfire' is not identified and that no statement about the assessed level of risk is made.</p> <p>'Wildfire' is a natural hazard that is likely to be exacerbated by climate change and is identified in the publicly notified GWRC RPS PC 1. The submitter considers that there should be an explanation or discussion of the level of risks from 'wildfire' to the Wairarapa. This needs to be addressed in the introduction to the chapter before the objectives.</p> <p>Furthermore, Wildfire is a natural hazard risk that should be assessed using the framework that is within this chapter to categorise natural hazards.</p> | Insert a provision to identify 'wildfire' as a natural hazard risk in the Natural Hazard chapter. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P2 | S212.025 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter does not support the use of an 'operational need' test for locating hazard sensitive activities or potentially hazard sensitive activities within areas of high natural hazard risk, particularly on Māori land. The submitter is concerned that the use of such a test will result in the approval of development or land uses that would put people and property at risk for purely economic reasons. The submitter acknowledges that there may be instances where activities will need to be located in these areas, however, a 'functional need' test, though also not perfect, will be available for these cases.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the removal of 'operational need' is important to provide a consistent framework for assessing natural hazard risks for new development.</p> | <p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Avoid locating hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities within high hazard areas unless the activity has an operational need or functional need to locate within the high hazard area.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|---|
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P8 | S212.026 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter does not support the use of an 'operational need' test under clause 1 of policy NH-P8. The submitter is concerned that the use of such a test will promote the maintenance or location of infrastructure in areas with ongoing or increased risks from natural hazards (and exacerbated by climate change) that will not support people or communities to enhance their resilience from the risks of natural hazard events. The submitter acknowledges that there may be instances where existing infrastructure activities will need to be located in these areas however, a 'functional need' test, though also not perfect, will be available for these cases.</p> | <p>Amend as follows: Allow for the upgrade of existing infrastructure, and only allow new infrastructure to be established in hazard areas where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. it has an operational need or functional need for the location; |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P11 | S212.027 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter considers that landowners want to be empowered with information on natural hazard risk to make their own decisions in managing effects upon their communities and whenua from natural hazards, climate change and sea level rise.</p> <p>The submitter would support the use of a precautionary approach that encourages the use of mātauranga Māori when assessing natural hazard risk and mitigation measures to avoid negative impacts on the surrounding lands. They consider that decision-makers should apply a precautionary, but adaptive, approach when encountering uncertainty. This would ensure that each development proposal is dynamically assessed and responsive to changing situations.</p> <p>The submitter also considers that if decision-makers are to adopt a precautionary approach, that this recommendation does not unintentionally undermine the use of mātauranga Māori to inform decisions, as research in this area has historically been underfunded.</p> | <p>Amend as follows: Ensure a precautionary approach that includes the application of mātauranga Māori, is taken in relation to planning for and adapting to the effects of natural hazards caused by climate change and sea level rise on both the natural environment and existing and future development.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|--|
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P12 | S212.028 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter considers that this policy creates uncertainty where a 'Flood Alert Area' is partially identified over land and the magnitude of the Flood Alert hazard ranges from 'low-moderate-high'.</p> <p>To better manage this uncertainty and provide clarity for landowners, the overlay display of the Flood Alert Area should be amended. It is also considered that the policy should be re-written to refer to the suggested changes.</p> | <p>Amend to reassign 'Flood alert' as a layer within 'Flood Hazard'.</p> <p>Amend the level of hazard risk for the Flood Alert Area from 'low / moderate / high' to one level of hazard risk (and one colour) for all locations identified within the Flood Alert Area. Amend to assign a commonly understood measure of height for 'flood alert areas' which will assist landowners when future development is considered either within the map layer or in the Natural Hazards chapter.</p> |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P13 | S212.029 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter considers that NH-P13 does not currently recognise the limitation that Māori freehold landowners encounter in developing their whenua. Due to the nature of Māori freehold land ownership and the barriers to accessing capital for risk mitigation, owners could face an inability to develop within tolerable areas of high risk. Therefore, if a property is located within a 'Flood Alert Area' but has no history of a natural hazard (flood) occurrence, development should still be possible of evidence is provided.</p> <p>The submitter also considers that further information needs to be provided on how the 'Flood Alert Area' modelling determined the susceptibility of properties and buildings to an identified flood event.</p> | <p>Amend as follows: Discourage new buildings in flood alert areas unless:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. there is no increase in flood flow or level on adjoining sites; 2. risk to people's safety will be low; 3. the activity incorporates mitigation measures so that the risk of damage to buildings and structures is not significantly increased; and 4. people can safely evacuate the property during a natural hazard event; and 5. there is no history of natural hazard (flood) occurrence. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R1 | S212.030 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter considers that there should be an accompanying rule as part of the PDP NH-R1 that provides for landowners to undertake works for flood mitigation or stream/river management on their own property as a permitted activity.</p> <p>Rural land can include streams or rivers which</p> | <p>Amend NH-R1 to allow landowners to undertake works for flood mitigation or stream/river management on their own property as a permitted activity.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>is not managed may exacerbate that areas flood risk. These streams or rivers may not be prioritised for flood mitigation or river management works by Council. Therefore, provided that landowners meet minimum standards, works for the purpose of flood mitigation, streams or river management should be a permitted activity.</p> <p>This rule could have permitted standards in terms of the works being in accordance with standards set by Council for managing any adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity, and water quality.</p> | |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P9 | S212.031 | Māori Trustee | Oppose | <p>The submitter considers that this rule should be a 'restricted discretionary' rather than a discretionary activity. This would put the proposed NH-R9 on the same basis as the proposed NH-R7. If both of these proposed rules are 'restricted discretionary', this would reflect the severity of the (moderate or low) hazard which can be mitigated through risk assessment and physical measures as a basis for an acceptable development (using the criteria listed under NH-P3 and NH-R7). Retaining NH-R9 as 'discretionary' is considered inconsistent when this might be the only reason that resource consent is required.</p> | Amend activity status of NH-R9 from Discretionary to Restricted Discretionary. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-O1 | S212.032 | Māori Trustee | Support | <p>The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' objectives in this chapter.</p> | Retain HH-O1 as notified. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-O2 | S212.033 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports and acknowledges Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa as tangata whenua in the Wairarapa District. The submitter administers whenua Māori on behalf of Māori freehold landowners, who have has their whakapapa connection to their ancestral lands confirmed by a Māori Land Court order upon succession. However, the current definition of tangata whenua in the RMA 1991 does not</p> | Amend as follows: Tangata whenua Owners of Māori land can exercise kaitiakitanga in relation to sites and areas of significance to them in the Wairarapa. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>expressly provide for Māori freehold landowners.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the current drafting of SASM-O2 only provides for tangata whenua. This appears to be inconsistent with the National Planning Standards 2019, which directs that sites and areas of significance to Māori in a plan are identified where there is agreement by Māori to include them. Therefore, objectives in relation to SASM sites should recognise and provide for the rights and interests of all Māori to have their sites and areas identified within the PDP, not just tangata whenua.</p> <p>The submitter therefore considers owners of Māori land, as defined in paragraph 9, should be included within this objective.</p> | |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P1 | S212.034 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports and acknowledges Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa as tangata whenua in the Wairarapa District. The submitter administers whenua Māori on behalf of Māori freehold landowners, who have had their whakapapa connection to their ancestral lands confirmed by a Māori Land Court order upon succession. However, the current definition of tangata whenua in the RMA 1991 does not expressly provide for Māori freehold landowners. The submitter notes that the current drafting of SASM-P1 only provides for tangata whenua. This appears to be inconsistent with the National Planning Standards 2019, which directs that sites and areas of significance to Māori in a plan are identified where there is agreement by Māori to include them. Therefore, all Māori, including Māori freehold landowners, with rights and interests in the region should have the ability to identify SASM sites. This can be achieved by including 'owners of Māori land',</p> | <p>Amend as follows: Work with Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa owners of Māori land in accordance with tikanga Māori to identify and schedule sites and areas of significance to Māori, and their cultural and spiritual values, including by:</p> <p>(a) for sites in Schedule 4, seeking to establish an extent through engagement and collaboration with tangata whenua owners of Māori land.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>as defined in paragraph 9.</p> <p>Furthermore, the submitter supports Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa identifying sites and areas of significance. However, considers it is not clear how involved they have been in identifying SASM sites, including the extent of some of the mapping. The Proposed Plan should therefore clearly state their involvement in the identification process.</p> <p>Additionally, the submitter considers SASM-P7(e) should be removed from SASM-P7 and inserted into SASM-P1. This is because it better aligns with the policy and ensures that the extend of SASM mapping is not being identified late in the process or placing an expectation on Māori to redefine the boundaries of the SASM sites.</p> | |
| <p>SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori</p> | <p>SASM-P2</p> | <p>S212.035</p> | <p>Māori Trustee</p> | <p>Support in part</p> | <p>The submitter supports and acknowledges Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa as tangata whenua in the Wairarapa District. The submitter administers whenua Māori on behalf of Māori freehold landowners, who have had their whakapapa connection to their ancestral lands confirmed by a Māori Land Court order upon succession. However, the current definition of tangata whenua in the RMA 1991 does not expressly provide for Māori freehold landowners.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the current drafting of SASM-P2 only provides for tangata whenua. This appears to be inconsistent with the National Planning Standards 2019, which directs that sites and areas of significance are to all Māori. Therefore, Māori freehold landowners should be able to protect and maintain sites and areas of significance to them in addition to Rangitāne o Wairarapa</p> | <p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>(b). requiring activities on, or in proximity to sites and areas of significance to Māori to maintain the site or area's cultural, spiritual, and historical values, interests, or associations of importance to tangata whenua owners of Māori land; and</p> <p>(c). enabling maintenance, repair and restoration of sites and areas of significance to Māori where the cultural, spiritual, and historical values, interests, associations of importance to tangata whenua owners of Māori land of the site or area are protected.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa. This can be achieved by including 'owners of Māori land', as defined in paragraph 9. | |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P3 | S212.036 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports and acknowledges Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa as tangata whenua in the Wairarapa District. The submitter administers whenua Māori on behalf of Māori freehold landowners, who have had their whakapapa connection to their ancestral lands confirmed by a Māori Land Court order upon succession. However, the current definition of tangata whenua in the RMA 1991 does not expressly provide for Māori freehold landowners.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the current drafting of SASM-P3 only provides for tangata whenua. This appears to be inconsistent with the National Planning Standards 2019, which directs that sites and areas of significance are to all Māori. Therefore, SASM-P3 should give protection and regard to the cultural, spiritual, and historical values of all Māori, with rights and interests in the region, within or near their SASM sites. This can be achieved by including 'owners of Māori land', as defined in paragraph 9.</p> | Amend as follows: (iv). the cultural, spiritual, and historical values, interests, associations of importance to tangata whenua owners of Māori land of the site or area. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P4 | S212.037 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports and acknowledges Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa as tangata whenua in the Wairarapa District. The submitter administers whenua Māori on behalf of Māori freehold landowners, who have had their whakapapa connection to their ancestral lands confirmed by a Māori Land Court order upon succession. However, the current definition of tangata whenua in the RMA 1991 does not expressly provide for Māori freehold landowners.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the current drafting</p> | Amend as follows: Allow the following activities to occur on, or in proximity to sites and areas of significance to Māori, while ensuring their design, scale, and intensity will not compromise cultural, spiritual, and historical values, interests, or associations of importance to tangata whenua owners of Māori land : |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | of SASM-P4 only provides for tangata whenua. This appears to be inconsistent with the National Planning Standards 2019, which directs that sites and areas of significance are to all Māori. Therefore, SASM-P4 should not compromise the cultural, spiritual and historical values of all Māori, with rights and interests in the region, within or near their SASM sites. This can be achieved by including 'owners of Māori land', as defined in paragraph 9. | |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P5 | S212.038 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports and acknowledges Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa as tangata whenua in the Wairarapa District. The submitter administers whenua Māori on behalf of Māori freehold landowners, who have had their whakapapa connection to their ancestral lands confirmed by a Māori Land Court order upon succession. However, the current definition of tangata whenua in the RMA 1991 does not expressly provide for Māori freehold landowners.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the current drafting of SASM-P5 only provides for tangata whenua. This appears to be inconsistent with the National Planning Standards 2019, which directs that sites and areas of significance are to all Māori. Therefore, SASM-P5 should recognise and provide for the rights and interests of all Māori to have their sites and areas of significance protected and maintained within the Proposed Plan, not just tangata whenua. This can be achieved by including 'owners of Māori land', as defined in paragraph 9.</p> | <p>Amend as follows: Only allow any other use and development on, or in proximity to sites and areas of significance to Māori where it can be demonstrated that the cultural, spiritual, and historical values, interests, or associations of importance to tangata whenua owners of Māori land of the site or area are protected and maintained, having regard to:</p> <p>(a). whether there are alternative methods, locations, or designs that would avoid or reduce the impact on the values, interests, or associations of importance to tangata whenua owners of Māori land associated with the site or area of significance;</p> <p>(b). outcomes articulated by tangata whenua owners of Māori land through an assessment of environmental effects, cultural impact assessment, or iwi planning documents;</p> <p>(c). the protection and maintenance or potential enhancement of the values, interests, or associations of importance</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>to tangata whenua owners of Māori land of the site or area of significance and the relationship of by tangata whenua owners of Māori land with their taonga, commensurate with the scale and nature of the proposal;</p> <p>(d). how values of significance to by tangata whenua owners of Māori land, including tikanga, kaitiakitanga, and mātauranga Māori may be incorporated; and</p> <p>(e). for subdivision, ensure sufficient land is provided around the site or area of significance to Māori to protect values, interests, or associations of importance to by tangata whenua owners of Māori land and the remainder of the site is of a size which continues to provide it with a suitable setting to the values, interests, or associations of importance to by tangata whenua owners of Māori land of the site or area.</p> |
| <p>SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori</p> | <p>SASM-P7</p> | <p>S212.039</p> | <p>Māori Trustee</p> | <p>Support in part</p> | <p>The submitter supports and acknowledges Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa as tangata whenua in the Wairarapa District. The submitter administers whenua Māori on behalf of Māori freehold landowners, who have had their whakapapa connection to their ancestral lands confirmed by a Māori Land Court order upon succession. However, the current definition of tangata whenua in the RMA 1991 does not</p> | <p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Support and resource landowners to manage, maintain, preserve, and protect sites and areas of significance to Māori, including by:</p> <p>(b). encouraging landowners to engage with local tangata whenua owners of Māori land and/or marae and</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>expressly provide for Māori freehold landowners.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the current drafting of SASM-P7 only provides for tangata whenua. This appears to be inconsistent with the National Planning Standards 2019, which directs that sites and areas of significance are to all Māori. Therefore, SASM-P7 should recognise and provide for all Māori rights and interests, including the ability to engage with owners of Māori land regarding the management, maintenance and preservation of sites and areas of significance to Māori. This can be achieved by including 'owners of Māori land', as defined in paragraph 9.</p> <p>Furthermore, the submitter reiterates the point made in SASM-P1 that SASM-P7(e) should be removed and inserted into SASM-P1. This is because it better aligns with the intended outcome of SASM-P1 and ensures the extent of SASM mapping is not only being identified this late in the process or placing an expectation on Māori to redefine the boundaries of the SASM sites.</p> <p>The submitter also considers that SASM-P7 should expressly provide for the resourcing of landowners to manage, maintain and preserve sites and areas of significance to Māori. This will further incentivise landowners to actively engage with Māori for the protection of SASM sites.</p> | <p>develop positive working relationships in respect of the ongoing management and/or protection of sites or areas of significance to Māori;</p> <p>(c). promoting the use of mātauranga Māori, tikanga, and kaitiakitanga to manage, maintain, preserve, and protect sites and areas of significance to Māori through engagement and collaboration with tangata whenua owners of Māori land; (e). for sites in Schedule 4, seeking to establish an extent through engagement and collaboration with tangata whenua.</p> |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P8 | S212.040 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports and acknowledges Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa as tangata whenua in the Wairarapa District. The submitter administers whenua Māori on behalf of Māori freehold landowners, who have had their whakapapa connection to their ancestral lands confirmed by a Māori Land Court order upon</p> | <p>Amend as follows: Encourage engagement with tangata whenua owners of Māori land where activities have the potential to adversely affect sites or areas of significance to Māori.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>succession. However, the current definition of tangata whenua in the RMA 1991 does not expressly provide for Māori freehold landowners.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the current drafting of SASM-P8 only provides for tangata whenua. This appears to be inconsistent with the National Planning Standards 2019, which directs that sites and areas of significance are to all Māori. Therefore, SASM-P8 should recognise and provide for all Māori rights and interests, including the ability to engage with owners of Māori land regarding where activities could have a potential adverse effect on sites and areas of significance to Māori. This can be achieved by including 'owners of Māori land', as defined in paragraph 9.</p> | |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P9 | S212.041 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports and acknowledges Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa as tangata whenua in the Wairarapa District. The submitter administers whenua Māori on behalf of Māori freehold landowners, who have had their whakapapa connection to their ancestral lands confirmed by a Māori Land Court order upon succession. However, the current definition of tangata whenua in the RMA 1991 does not expressly provide for Māori freehold landowners.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the current drafting of SASM-P9 only provides for tangata whenua. This appears to be inconsistent the National Planning Standards 2019, which directs that sites and areas of significance are to all Māori. Therefore, SASM-P9 should recognise and provide for all Māori rights and interests, including the promotion or development of access to sites and areas of significance to Māori. This can be achieved by</p> | <p>Amend as follows: Promote the provision or development of access for tangata whenua owners of Māori land to sites and areas of significance to Māori, including through: (b). informal arrangements or understandings between landowners and local tangata whenua owners of Māori land, iwi, hapū, or marae.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|-----------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | including 'owners of Māori land', as defined in paragraph 9. | |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R1 | S212.042 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Sites of Significance to Māori' rules in this chapter. | Retain SASM-R1 as notified. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-O1 | S212.043 | Māori Trustee | Oppose | <p>The submitter acknowledges that given the timeframe of gazetting of the NPS-IB 2023 and the development and notification of this Proposed Plan, that the Proposed Plan does not currently give effect to the NPS-IB 2023. However, the submitter considers that this process can provide the Council with the opportunity and scope to align this Proposed plan with the NPS-IB 2023.</p> <p>The submitter therefore considers that ECO-O1 should be amended, or a new objective inserted in this chapter, to align with the intent of the NPS-IB 2023 and the objectives and policies of the GWRC RPS PC1 in relation to indigenous biodiversity.</p> | Amend as follows: The biological diversity of Indigenous biodiversity species and habitats within the Wairarapa is protected , maintained, and enhanced, or restored where degraded so that there is at least no overall loss. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | New provision request | S212.044 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter understands that the NPS-IB 2023 requires Council's to give effect to the document within 5 years of its commencement date. However, as this process would require a subsequent plan change, it could provide an opportunity for the Council to align the Proposed Plan with the NPS-IB 2023.</p> <p>In this regard, an additional objective should be included within this chapter to recognise and provide for the relationship that Māori have with their indigenous biodiversity. This would also be consistent with s6(e) of the RMA.</p> | Insert objective as follows: ECO-O3: Recognise and provide for the relationship of owners of Māori land and their traditions and culture with indigenous vegetation and fauna. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous | ECO-P1 | S212.045 | Māori Trustee | Oppose | The wording of ECO-P1 should be amended, or a new policy inserted, to empower Māori, in partnership with Council, to make decisions in relation to the management and protection for | Amend as follows: Coordinate with other agencies, and organisations, and partner with owners |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|----------|---|---|
| Biodiversity | | | | | their indigenous biodiversity. This would better align with the direction of the NPS-IB 2023. | of Māori land , in identifying risks, requirements, opportunities, and effective methods for protecting and enhancing Wairarapa's indigenous biodiversity and restoring the Wairarapa's indigenous biodiversity where it has been degraded. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P3 | S212.046 | Māori Trustee | Oppose | <p>The submitter understands that the Council intends to undertake further work in the future to give effect to the NPS-IB 2023. However, the submitter considers that this process can provide the Council with the opportunity and scope to align this Proposed plan with the NPS-IB 2023 where appropriate.</p> <p>The submitter therefore believes it to be particularly prudent that the Proposed Plan reflects the requirement in the NPS-IB 2023 for Councils to engage and partner with Māori in the identification of areas of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna.</p> | Amend as follows: Identify, in partnership with owners of Māori land , those areas that are habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna in the Wairarapa. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P4 | S212.047 | Māori Trustee | Oppose | <p>The submitter considers that maintaining ecosystem services should also be protected within ECO-P4.</p> <p>The submitter also does not support the use of an 'operational need' test as a determining factor for locating land use activities or development within areas of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The submitter is concerned that the use of such a test will likely result in the degradation of significant indigenous vegetation or habitats and their values, for purely economic reasons. The submitter acknowledges that there may be instances where activities will need to be</p> | Amend as follows: Protect those areas that are habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna or areas providing ecosystem functions and services in the Wairarapa from inappropriate subdivision, land use, and development by: (a) only providing for activities that demonstrate an operational need or functional need to be located in this area; |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | located in these areas, however, a 'functional need' test, though not perfect, will be available for these cases. The submitter considers that it is important to remove the 'operational need' test from all policies of the Proposed Plan to ensure a consistent and equitable framework to assess land use and development. | |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P5 | S212.048 | Māori Trustee | Oppose | The submitter considers ECO-P5 should be amended to provide an additional subclause that aligns with the NPS-IB 2023 considerations of the use and development of Māori land. | Amend as follows inserting new line: (g). enable new occupation, use, and development of Māoriland to support the social, cultural, and economic wellbeing of owners of Māori land. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P6 | S212.049 | Māori Trustee | Oppose | The submitter considers that the wording of the ECO-P6 should be amended to align with the NPS-IB 2023 through providing specific exceptions for Māori land. | Amend to insert subclause as follows: (d). The criteria (a) to (c) for managing adverse effects onSNAs do not apply to Māori land. Councils are to work in partnership with owners of Māori land to apply an alternative, flexible approach (that enables development and use) to support the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of owners of Māori land while maintaining and protecting indigenous biodiversity. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P8 | S212.050 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | The submitter considers that the 'values' and 'significance' referred to in ECO-P8 are currently undefined and ambiguous. To ensure that the significance and values of vegetation and habitats are appropriately managed, further context needs to be | Insert a guidance note or schedule to identify and list the values and significance of each vegetation and habitat site. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | provided. This could be achieved through providing a guidance note or identifying and listing their values and significance against each site in a schedule of this Proposed Plan. | |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-R1 | S212.051 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | The submitter considers that ECO-R1 should be amended to include references to the exemptions provided for under the NPS-IB 2023. | Insert references to the exemption provided for under the NPS-IB 2023. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-O1 | S212.052 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Natural Character' objective in this chapter. | Retain NATC-O1 as notified. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P5 | S212.053 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Natural Character' policies in this chapter. However, she notes the following matter in NATC-P5 should be addressed.</p> <p>The submitter does not support the use of an 'operational need' test to allow for buildings and structures within 5m or 10m of surface waterbodies or 25m of a significant waterbody. The submitter is concerned that the use of such a test will likely result in the degradation of waterbodies and their values, for purely economic reasons. The submitter acknowledges that there may be instances where buildings and structures will need to be located within 5m or 10m of surface waterbodies or 25m of a significant waterbody however, a 'functional need' test, though also not perfect, will be available for these cases.</p> | Amend as follows: P5(a). there is a functional need of operational need for their location within the setback; |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-R1 | S212.054 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Natural Character' rules in this chapter. | Retain NATC-R1 as notified. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-O1 | S212.055 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Natural Features and Landscapes' objectives in this chapter. | Retain NFL-O1 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|--|---|
| PA - Public Access | PA-O1 | S212.056 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Public Access' objective in this chapter. | Retain PA-O1 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O1 | S212.057 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Subdivision' objectives in this chapter. | Retain SUB-O1 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R14 | S212.058 | Māori Trustee | Oppose | The submitter considers that the subdivision of land containing a SASM site is a defined issue and should be afforded the same activity status as a subdivision of land within an 'Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape' (restricted discretionary). The impact of a proposed subdivision proposal can be adequately assessed through criteria set under a restricted discretionary activity rule. | Amend SUB-R14 activity status from Discretionary to Restricted Discretionary. |
| FC - Financial Contributions | FC-O1 | S212.059 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Financial Contribution' objectives in this chapter. | Retain FC-O1 as notified. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-O1 | S212.060 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Activities on the Surface of Water' objective in this chapter. | Retain ASW-O1 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O4 | S212.061 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports and acknowledges Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūni ki Wairarapa as tangata whenua in the Wairarapa District. The submitter administers whenua Māori on behalf of Māori freehold landowners, who have had their whakapapa connection to their ancestral lands confirmed by a Māori Land Court order upon succession. However, the current definition of tangata whenua in the RMA 1991 does not expressly provide for Māori freehold landowners.</p> <p>s74 of the RMA requires territorial authorities to prepare and change their plans in accordance with Part 2 matters - including recognising and providing for "the relationship</p> | Amend as follows: Tangata whenua The values of Owners of Māori land values , mātauranga, and tikanga are recognised and provided for in resource management processes for the coastal environment. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga" as a matter of national importance. In order for the Council to perform their functions and duties under the Act, the Proposed Plan should therefore recognise and provide for all Māori rights and interests within this objective. | |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P3 | S212.062 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports and acknowledges Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa as tangata whenua in the Wairarapa District. The submitter administers whenua Māori on behalf of Māori freehold landowners, who have had their whakapapa connection to their ancestral lands confirmed by a Māori Land Court order upon succession. However, the current definition of tangata whenua in the RMA 1991 does not expressly provide for Māori freehold landowners. Therefore, CE-P3 should recognise and provide for all Māori rights and interests by including 'owners of Māori land', as defined in paragraph 9.</p> <p>Furthermore, the submitter does not support the use of an 'operational need' test for subdivision, use or development activities within areas identified as Very High and High Natural Character. The submitter is concerned that the use of such a test will likely result in the degradation of areas with significant environmental values, including in Sites of Significance to Māori, for purely economic reasons. The submitter acknowledges that there may be instances where activities will need to be located in Very High and High Natural Character areas however, a 'functional need' test, though also not perfect, will be available for these cases.</p> | Amend as follows: (b)(i). having an operational need or functional need to be located in this area; (b)(vi). enabling the continuation, or enhancing, of tangata whenua owners of Māori land cultural and spiritual values and customary activities. |
| CE - Coastal | CE-P4 | S212.063 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | The submitter supports and acknowledges Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa as tangata whenua in the | Amend as follows: (a). there is a functional need or operational need for the activity to be located in the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Environment | | | | | <p>Wairarapa District. The submitter administers whenua Māori on behalf of Māori freehold landowners, who have had their whakapapa connection to their ancestral lands confirmed by a Māori Land Court order upon succession. However, the current definition of tangata whenua in the RMA 1991 does not expressly provide for Māori freehold landowners. Therefore, CE-P4 should recognise and provide for all Māori rights and interests by including 'owners of Māori land', as defined in paragraph 9.</p> <p>Furthermore, the submitter does not support the use of an 'operational need' test for activities and subdivision within the Coastal Environment. The submitter is concerned that the use of such a test will likely result in the degradation of areas with significant environmental values, including on Sites of Significance to Māori, for purely economic reasons. The submitter acknowledges that there may be instances where activities will need to be located in the Coastal Environment however, a 'functional need' test, though also not perfect, will be available for these cases.</p> | <p>coastal environment; and (b)(ix). taking into account the outcomes of any consultation with and/or cultural advice provided by tangata whenua owners of Māori land, including the extent to which the activity may compromise tangata whenua's owners of Māori land relationship with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhitapu, and other taonga, and/or tangata whenua's owners of Māori land responsibilities as kaitiaki and mana whenua in the coastal environment;</p> |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P8 | S212.064 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter considers that decision-makers should apply a precautionary, but adaptive, approach when encountering the uncertainty of coastal hazards for new subdivisions, use and development. This would ensure that any subdivision, use or development proposal is dynamically assessed and responsive to changing environments. The submitter also considers that where a precautionary approach is adopted, decision makers do not unintentionally undermine the use of mātauranga Māori held at place to inform their decision on any new subdivision, use or development. This is particularly important as mātauranga Māori, especially within coastal</p> | <p>Amend as follows: P8(a). only providing for activities that have an operational need or functional need within the Foreshore Protection Area;</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>communities, is held by very few and those who hold it may not want their mātauranga made public within a plan process.</p> <p>Furthermore, the submitter does not support the use of an 'operational need' test for activities within the Foreshore Protection Area. The submitter is concerned that the use of such a test will likely result in the degradation of areas with significant environmental values, including on Sites of Significance to Māori, for purely economic reasons. The submitter acknowledges that there may be instances where activities will need to be located in the Foreshore Protection Area however, a 'functional need' test, though also not perfect, will be available for these cases.</p> | |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-R1 | S212.065 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Coastal Environment' rules in this chapter. | Retain CE-R1 as notified. |
| LIGHT - Light | LIGHT-O1 | S212.066 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Light' objectives in this chapter. | Retain LIGHT-O1 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O1 | S212.067 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' objectives in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-O1 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-O1 | S212.068 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports and acknowledges Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa as tangata whenua in the Wairarapa District. The submitter administers whenua Māori on behalf of Māori freehold landowners, who have had their whakapapa connection to their ancestral lands confirmed by a Māori Land Court order upon succession. However, the current definition of tangata whenua in the RMA 1991 does not expressly provide for Māori freehold landowners.</p> <p>s74 of the RMA requires territorial authorities to prepare and change their plans in</p> | <p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>The Māori Purpose Zone enables a range of social, cultural, and economic development opportunities that support the occupation, use, development, and ongoing relationship of tangata whenua owners of Māori land with ancestral land.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>accordance with Part 2 matters - including recognising and providing for "the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga" as a matter of national importance. In order for the council to perform their functions and duties under the Act, the Proposed Plan should therefore recognise and provide for all Māori rights and interests within this objective.</p> <p>The submitter is supportive of the MPZ, however, considers that owners of Māori land, as defined in paragraph 9, should be referenced instead of tangata whenua within the objective.</p> | |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-O2 | S212.069 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter considers that the intention of objective MPZ-O2 is not clear and should be amended.</p> <p>The NPS-HPL only requires the mapping of highly productive land that is within the general rural or rural productive zones and that are also predominately LUC 1, 2, and 3. The submitter notes that the Proposed Plan incorrectly identifies blocks within the MPZ as 'Highly Productive Land'. Given that there are no associated rules within the MPZ for highly productive land, this overlay should be removed.</p> | Delete highly productive land from MPZ. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-O3 | S212.070 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports and acknowledges Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa as tangata whenua in the Wairarapa District. The submitter administers whenua Māori on behalf of Māori freehold landowners, who have had their whakapapa connection to their ancestral lands confirmed by a Māori Land Court order upon succession. However, the current definition of tangata whenua in the RMA 1991 does not expressly provide for Māori freehold landowners.</p> | Amend as follows: Tangata whenua Owners of Māori land are able to exercise their role as kaitiaki in the Māori Purpose Zone to protect, maintain, and promote their spiritual, cultural, social, economic, and environmental interests and associations. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>s74 of the RMA requires territorial authorities to prepare and change their plan in accordance with Part 2 matters - including recognising and providing for "the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga" as a matter of national importance. In order for the council to perform their functions and duties under the Act, the Proposed Plan should therefore recognise and provide for all Māori rights and interests within this objective.</p> <p>The submitter is supportive of the MPZ, however, considers owners of Māori land, as defined in paragraph 9, should be enabled to exercise kaitiakitanga in relation to their whenua.</p> | |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-O4 | S212.071 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | The submitter considers it is not necessary to reference 'ancestral land' within this objective as the term is not defined and the concept already exists implicitly within the MPZ. | Amend as follows: A range of activities and development of ancestral land are enabled in the Māori Purpose Zone, whilst ensuring actual or potential adverse effects of activities and development are avoided, remedied, or mitigated. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-P2 | S212.072 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | The submitter supports and acknowledges Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa as tangata whenua in the Wairarapa District. The submitter administers whenua Māori on behalf of Māori freehold landowners, who have had their whakapapa connection to their ancestral lands confirmed by a Māori Land Court order upon succession. However, the current definition of tangata whenua in the RMA 1991 does not expressly provide for Māori freehold landowners. | Amend as follows: a. the purpose of the activity enables tangata whenua owners of Māori land to achieve MPZ-O1, MPZ-O2, MPZ-O3, and MPZ-O4; b. the activity will enable enables tangata whenua owners of Māori land to provide for their cultural, environmental, and economic needs; |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|--|------------------|---------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | The submitter therefore considers that the Proposed Plan should recognise and provide for all Māori rights and interests within this policy, by referencing owners of Māori land as defined in paragraph 9. | |
| Designations | GWRC - Greater Wellington Regional Council | S212.074 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Designations' as scheduled in this chapter. | Retain designations as notified. |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S212.075 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter supports the inclusion of Hs179. | Retain Hs179 as notified. |
| SCHED4 - Schedule of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | S212.076 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the following 9 listed SASM sites in Schedule 4 of the PDP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TWs26 - TWs30 - TWs60 - TWs60 - TWs65 - TWs99 - TWm33 - TWm35 - TWm40 <p>The submitter notes that the current drafting of Schedule 4 only provides for tangata whenua. This appears to be inconsistent with the National Planning Standards 2019, which directs that sites and areas of significance to Māori in a plan are identified where there is agreement by Māori to include them. Therefore, Māori freehold landowners should have the ability to identify sites and areas of significance to Māori in addition to Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa.</p> <p>The submitter supports Rangitāne o</p> | Amend to clearly state the involvement of Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa in the identification process of sites and areas of significance to Māori. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa identifying the sites and areas of significance. However, it is not clear how involved they have been in identifying the SASM sites, including the extent of some of the mapping. The PDP should therefore clearly state their involvement in the identification process. | |
| SCHED5 - Schedule of Significant Natural Areas | Significant Natural Areas | S212.077 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter supports the inclusion of SNs08. | Retain as notified. |
| SCHED8 - Schedule of Significant Amenity Landscapes | Special Amenity Landscapes | S212.078 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter supports the inclusion of SAL1. | Retain as notified. |
| SCHED10 - Schedule of Very High and High Natural Character Areas | Very High and High Natural Character | S212.079 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter supports the inclusion of HNC10. | Retain as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O2 | S212.080 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Rural Environment' objectives in this chapter.</p> <p>The NPS-HPL only requires the mapping of highly productive land that is within the general rural or rural productive zones and that are also predominantly LUC 1, 2, and 3. The PDP incorrectly identified blocks within the MPZ as 'Highly Productive Land'. Given that there are no associated rules within the MPZ for highly productive land, this overlay should be removed.</p> | Delete the Highly Productive Land overlay from all land in the Maori Purpose Zone. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Strategic Direction | RE-O3 | S212.081 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Rural Environment' objectives in this chapter.</p> <p>The NPS-HPL only requires the mapping of highly productive land that is within the general rural or rural productive zones and that are also predominantly LUC 1, 2, and 3. The PDP incorrectly identified blocks within the MPZ as 'Highly Productive Land'. Given that there are no associated rules within the MPZ for highly productive land, this overlay should be removed.</p> | Delete the Highly Productive Land overlay from all land in the Maori Purpose Zone. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O4 | S212.082 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Rural Environment' objectives in this chapter.</p> <p>The NPS-HPL only requires the mapping of highly productive land that is within the general rural or rural productive zones and that are also predominantly LUC 1, 2, and 3. The PDP incorrectly identified blocks within the MPZ as 'Highly Productive Land'. Given that there are no associated rules within the MPZ for highly productive land, this overlay should be removed.</p> | Delete the Highly Productive Land overlay from all land in the Maori Purpose Zone. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O5 | S212.083 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | <p>The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Rural Environment' objectives in this chapter.</p> <p>The NPS-HPL only requires the mapping of highly productive land that is within the general rural or rural productive zones and that are also predominantly LUC 1, 2, and 3. The PDP incorrectly identified blocks within the MPZ as 'Highly Productive Land'. Given that there are no associated rules within the MPZ for highly productive land, this overlay should be removed.</p> | Delete the Highly Productive Land overlay from all land in the Maori Purpose Zone. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O2 | S212.084 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter supports the objective. | Retain UFD-O2 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O3 | S212.085 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter supports the objective. | Retain UFD-O3 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O4 | S212.086 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter supports the objective. | Retain UFD-O4 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O5 | S212.087 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter supports the objective. | Retain UFD-O5 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O6 | S212.088 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter supports the objective. | Retain UFD-O6 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-O2 | S212.089 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter supports the objective. | Retain ENG-O2 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-O3 | S212.090 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter supports the objective. | Retain ENG-O3 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P1 | S212.091 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Energy' policies in this chapter. | Retain ENG-P1 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P2 | S212.092 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Energy' policies in this chapter. | Retain ENG-P2 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P4 | S212.093 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Energy' policies in this chapter. | Retain ENG-P4 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P5 | S212.094 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Energy' policies in this chapter. | Retain ENG-P5 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P6 | S212.095 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Energy' policies in this chapter. | Retain ENG-P6 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O1 | S212.096 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | The submitter is comfortable with the 'Network Utility' objectives in this chapter. | Retain NU-O1 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O3 | S212.097 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | The submitter is comfortable with the 'Network Utility' objectives in this chapter. | Retain NU-O3 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O4 | S212.098 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | The submitter is comfortable with the 'Network Utility' objectives in this chapter. | Retain NU-O4 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P1 | S212.099 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' policies in this chapter. | Retain NU-P1 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P2 | S212.100 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' policies in this chapter. | Retain NU-P2 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P3 | S212.101 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' policies in this chapter. | Retain NU-P3 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P4 | S212.102 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' policies in this chapter. | Retain NU-P4 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P6 | S212.103 | Māori Trustee | Support in part | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' policies in this chapter. | Retain NU-P6 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R1 | S212.104 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' rules in this chapter. | Retain NU-R1 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R2 | S212.105 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' rules in this chapter. | Retain NU-R2 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R3 | S212.106 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' rules in this chapter. | Retain NU-R3 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R4 | S212.107 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' rules in this chapter. | Retain NU-R4 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R5 | S212.108 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' rules in this chapter. | Retain NU-R5 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R6 | S212.109 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' rules in this chapter. | Retain NU-R6 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R7 | S212.110 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' rules in this chapter. | Retain NU-R7 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R8 | S212.111 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' rules in this chapter. | Retain NU-R8 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R9 | S212.112 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' rules in this chapter. | Retain NU-R9 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R10 | S212.113 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' rules in this chapter. | Retain NU-R10 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R11 | S212.114 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' rules in this chapter. | Retain NU-R11 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R12 | S212.115 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' rules in this chapter. | Retain NU-R12 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R13 | S212.116 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' rules in this chapter. | Retain NU-R13 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R14 | S212.117 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' rules in this chapter. | Retain NU-R14 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R15 | S212.118 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' rules in this chapter. | Retain NU-R15 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R16 | S212.119 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' rules in this chapter. | Retain NU-R16 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R17 | S212.120 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' rules in this chapter. | Retain NU-R17 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R18 | S212.121 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' rules in this chapter. | Retain NU-18 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R19 | S212.122 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' rules in this chapter. | Retain NU-R19 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R20 | S212.123 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Network utility' rules in this chapter. | Retain NU-R20 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-O2 | S212.124 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' objectives in this chapter. | Retain TR-O2 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-O3 | S212.125 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' objectives in this chapter. | Retain TR-O3 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P1 | S212.126 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' policies in this chapter. | Retain TR-P1 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P2 | S212.127 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' policies in this chapter. | Retain TR-P2 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P3 | S212.128 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' policies in this chapter. | Retain TR-P3 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P4 | S212.129 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' policies in this chapter. | Retain TR-P4 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| TR - Transport | TR-P5 | S212.130 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' policies in this chapter. | Retain TR-P5 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P6 | S212.131 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' policies in this chapter. | Retain TR-P6 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P7 | S212.132 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' policies in this chapter. | Retain TR-P7 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P8 | S212.133 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' policies in this chapter. | Retain TR-P8 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P9 | S212.134 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' policies in this chapter. | Retain TR-P9 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P10 | S212.135 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' policies in this chapter. | Retain TR-P10 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P11 | S212.136 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' policies in this chapter. | Retain TR-P11 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R1 | S212.137 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' rules in this chapter. | Retain TR-R1 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R2 | S212.138 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' rules in this chapter. | Retain TR-R2 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R3 | S212.139 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' rules in this chapter. | Retain TR-R3 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R4 | S212.140 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' rules in this chapter. | Retain TR-R4 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R5 | S212.141 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' rules in this chapter. | Retain TR-R5 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R6 | S212.142 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' rules in this chapter. | Retain TR-R6 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R6 | S212.143 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Transport' rules in this chapter. | Retain TR-R7 as notified. |
| CL - Contaminated Land | CL-P1 | S212.144 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Contaminated land' policies in this chapter. | Retain CL-P1 as notified. |
| CL - Contaminated Land | CL-P2 | S212.145 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Contaminated land' policies in this chapter. | Retain CL-P2 as notified. |
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | HAZ-O2 | S212.146 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Hazardous substances' objectives in this chapter. | Retain HAZ-O2 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | HAZ-P1 | S212.147 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Hazardous substances' policies in this chapter. | Retain HAZ-P1 as notified. |
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | HAZ-P2 | S212.148 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Hazardous substances' policies in this chapter. | Retain HAZ-P2 as notified. |
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | HAZ-R1 | S212.149 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Hazardous substances' rules in this chapter. | Retain HAZ-R1 as notified. |
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | HAZ-R2 | S212.150 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Hazardous substances' rules in this chapter. | Retain HAZ-R2 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-O2 | S212.151 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Natural Hazard' objectives in this chapter. | Retain NH-O2 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-O2 | S212.152 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' objectives in this chapter. | Retain HH-O2 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P1 | S212.153 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' policies in this chapter. | Retain HH-P1 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P2 | S212.154 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' policies in this chapter. | Retain HH-P2 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P3 | S212.155 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' policies in this chapter. | Retain HH-P3 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P4 | S212.156 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' policies in this chapter. | Retain HH-P4 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P5 | S212.157 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' policies in this chapter. | Retain HH-P5 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P6 | S212.158 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' policies in this chapter. | Retain HH-P6 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P7 | S212.159 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' policies in this chapter. | Retain HH-P7 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P8 | S212.160 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' policies in this chapter. | Retain HH-P8 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P9 | S212.161 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' policies in this chapter. | Retain HH-P9 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P10 | S212.162 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' policies in this chapter. | Retain HH-P10 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P11 | S212.163 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' policies in this chapter. | Retain HH-P11 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-P12 | S212.164 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' policies in this chapter. | Retain HH-P12 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R1 | S212.165 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' rules in this chapter. | Retain HH-R1 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R2 | S212.166 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' rules in this chapter. | Retain HH-R2 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R3 | S212.167 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' rules in this chapter. | Retain HH-R3 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R4 | S212.168 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' rules in this chapter. | Retain HH-R4 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R5 | S212.169 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' rules in this chapter. | Retain HH-R5 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R6 | S212.170 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' rules in this chapter. | Retain HH-R6 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R7 | S212.171 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' rules in this chapter. | Retain HH-R7 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R8 | S212.172 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' rules in this chapter. | Retain HH-R8 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R9 | S212.173 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' rules in this chapter. | Retain HH-R9 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R10 | S212.174 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' rules in this chapter. | Retain HH-R10 as notified. |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R11 | S212.175 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Historic Heritage' rules in this chapter. | Retain HH-R11 as notified. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-O1 | S212.176 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori' objectives in this chapter. | Retain SASM-O1 as notified. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-O3 | S212.177 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori' objectives in this chapter. | Retain SASM-O3 as notified. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R2 | S212.178 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Sites of Significance to Māori' rules in this chapter. | Retain SASM-R2 as notified. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R3 | S212.179 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Sites of Significance to Māori' rules in this chapter. | Retain SASM-R3 as notified. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R4 | S212.180 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Sites of Significance to Māori' rules in this chapter. | Retain SASM-R4 as notified. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R5 | S212.181 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Sites of Significance to Māori' rules in this chapter. | Retain SASM-R5 as notified. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of | SASM-R6 | S212.182 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Sites of Significance to Māori' rules in this chapter. | Retain SASM-R6 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|----------|---|-------------------------------|
| Significance to Māori | | | | | | |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R7 | S212.183 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Sites of Significance to Māori' rules in this chapter. | Retain SASM-R7 as notified. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R8 | S212.184 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Sites of Significance to Māori' rules in this chapter. | Retain SASM-R8 as notified. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-R2 | S212.185 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Natural Character' rules in this chapter. | Retain NATC-R2 as notified. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-O2 | S212.186 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Natural Features and Landscapes' objectives in this chapter. | Retain NFL-O2 as notified. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P1 | S212.187 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Natural Features and Landscapes' policies in this chapter. | Retain NFL-P1 as notified. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P2 | S212.188 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Natural Features and Landscapes' policies in this chapter. | Retain NFL-P2 as notified. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P3 | S212.189 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Natural Features and Landscapes' policies in this chapter. | Retain NFL-P3 as notified. |
| NFL - Natural Features | NFL-P4 | S212.190 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Natural Features and Landscapes' policies in this chapter. | Retain NFL-P4 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| and Landscapes | | | | | | |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P5 | S212.191 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Natural Features and Landscapes' policies in this chapter. | Retain NFL-P5 as notified. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P6 | S212.192 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Natural Features and Landscapes' policies in this chapter. | Retain NFL-P6 as notified. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P7 | S212.193 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Natural Features and Landscapes' policies in this chapter. | Retain NFL-P7 as notified. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-R1 | S212.194 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Natural Features and Landscapes' rules in this chapter. | Retain NFL-R1 as notified. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-R2 | S212.195 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Natural Features and Landscapes' policies in this chapter. | Retain NFL-R2 as notified. |
| PA - Public Access | PA-P1 | S212.196 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Public Access' policies in this chapter. | Retain PA-P1 as notified. |
| PA - Public Access | PA-P2 | S212.197 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Public Access' policies in this chapter. | Retain PA-P2 as notified. |
| PA - Public Access | PA-P3 | S212.198 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Public Access' policies in this chapter. | Retain PA-P3 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O2 | S212.199 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Subdivision' objectives in this chapter. | Retain SUB-O2 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O3 | S212.200 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Subdivision' objectives in this chapter. | Retain SUB-O3 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P1 | S212.201 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Subdivision' policies in this chapter. | Retain SUB-P1 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P2 | S212.202 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Subdivision' policies in this chapter. | Retain SUB-P2 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P3 | S212.203 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Subdivision' policies in this chapter. | Retain SUB-P3 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P4 | S212.204 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Subdivision' policies in this chapter. | Retain SUB-P4 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P5 | S212.205 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Subdivision' policies in this chapter. | Retain SUB-P5 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P6 | S212.206 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Subdivision' policies in this chapter. | Retain SUB-P6 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P7 | S212.207 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Subdivision' policies in this chapter. | Retain SUB-P7 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P8 | S212.208 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Subdivision' policies in this chapter. | Retain SUB-P8 as notified. |
| FC - Financial Contributions | FC-O2 | S212.209 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Financial Contribution' objectives in this chapter. | Retain FC-O2 as notified. |
| FC - Financial Contributions | FC-P1 | S212.210 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Financial Contribution' policies in this chapter. | Retain FC-P1 as notified. |
| FC - Financial Contributions | FC-P2 | S212.211 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Financial Contribution' policies in this chapter. | Retain FC-P2 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| FC - Financial Contributions | FC-P3 | S212.212 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Financial Contribution' policies in this chapter. | Retain FC-P3 as notified. |
| FC - Financial Contributions | FC-P4 | S212.213 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Financial Contribution' policies in this chapter. | Retain FC-P4 as notified. |
| FC - Financial Contributions | FC-P5 | S212.214 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Financial Contribution' policies in this chapter. | Retain FC-P5 as notified. |
| FC - Financial Contributions | FC-P6 | S212.215 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Financial Contribution' policies in this chapter. | Retain FC-P6 as notified. |
| FC - Financial Contributions | FC-R1 | S212.216 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Financial Contribution' rule in this chapter. | Retain FC-R1 as notified. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-P1 | S212.217 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Activities on the Surface of Water' policies in this chapter. | Retain ASW-P1 as notified. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-P2 | S212.218 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Activities on the Surface of Water' policies in this chapter. | Retain ASW-P2 as notified. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-P3 | S212.219 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Activities on the Surface of Water' policies in this chapter. | Retain ASW-P3 as notified. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-P4 | S212.220 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Activities on the Surface of Water' policies in this chapter. | Retain ASW-P4 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-P5 | S212.221 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Activities on the Surface of Water' policies in this chapter. | Retain ASW-P5 as notified. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-R1 | S212.222 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Activities on the Surface of Water' rules in this chapter. | Retain ASW-R1 as notified. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-R2 | S212.223 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Activities on the Surface of Water' rules in this chapter. | Retain ASW-R2 as notified. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-R3 | S212.224 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Activities on the Surface of Water' rules in this chapter. | Retain ASW-R3 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O1 | S212.225 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Coastal Environment' objectives in this chapter. | Retain CE-O1 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O2 | S212.226 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Coastal Environment' objectives in this chapter. | Retain CE-O2 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O3 | S212.227 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Coastal Environment' objectives in this chapter. | Retain CE-O3 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O5 | S212.228 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Coastal Environment' objectives in this chapter. | Retain CE-O5 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-R2 | S212.229 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Coastal Environment' rules in this chapter. | Retain CE-R2 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-R3 | S212.230 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Coastal Environment' rules in this chapter. | Retain CE-R3 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-R4 | S212.231 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Coastal Environment' rules in this chapter. | Retain CE-R4 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-R5 | S212.232 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Coastal Environment' rules in this chapter. | Retain CE-R5 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-R6 | S212.233 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Coastal Environment' rules in this chapter. | Retain CE-R6 as notified. |
| LIGHT - Light | LIGHT-O2 | S212.234 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Light' objectives in this chapter. | Retain LIGHT-O2 as notified. |
| LIGHT - Light | LIGHT-O3 | S212.235 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Light' objectives in this chapter. | Retain LIGHT-O3 as notified. |
| LIGHT - Light | LIGHT-P1 | S212.236 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Light' policies in this chapter. | Retain LIGHT-P1 as notified. |
| LIGHT - Light | LIGHT-P2 | S212.237 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Light' policies in this chapter. | Retain LIGHT-P2 as notified. |
| LIGHT - Light | LIGHT-P3 | S212.238 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Light' policies in this chapter. | Retain LIGHT-P3 as notified. |
| LIGHT - Light | LIGHT-P4 | S212.239 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Light' policies in this chapter. | Retain LIGHT-P4 as notified. |
| LIGHT - Light | LIGHT-R1 | S212.240 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Light' rule in this chapter. | Retain LIGHT-R1 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O2 | S212.241 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' objectives in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-O2 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O3 | S212.242 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' objectives in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-O3 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O4 | S212.243 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' objectives in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-O4 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O5 | S212.244 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' objectives in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-O5 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O6 | S212.245 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' objectives in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-O6 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O7 | S212.246 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' objectives in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-O7 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P1 | S212.247 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' policies in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-P1 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P2 | S212.248 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' policies in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-P2 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P3 | S212.249 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' policies in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-P3 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P4 | S212.250 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' policies in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-P4 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P5 | S212.251 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' policies in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-P5 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P6 | S212.252 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' policies in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-P6 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P7 | S212.253 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' policies in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-P7 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P8 | S212.254 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' policies in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-P8 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P9 | S212.255 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' policies in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-P9 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P10 | S212.256 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' policies in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-P10 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R1 | S212.257 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-R1 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|----------|---|-------------------------------|
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R2 | S212.258 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-R2 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R3 | S212.259 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-R3 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R4 | S212.260 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-R4 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R5 | S212.261 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-R5 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R6 | S212.262 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-R6 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R7 | S212.263 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-R7 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R8 | S212.264 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-R8 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R9 | S212.265 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-R9 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R10 | S212.266 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-R10 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R11 | S212.267 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-R11 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R12 | S212.268 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-R12 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R13 | S212.269 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-R13 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R14 | S212.270 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-R14 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R15 | S212.271 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-R15 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|----------|--|-------------------------------|
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R16 | S212.272 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-R16 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R17 | S212.273 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-R17 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R18 | S212.274 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-R18 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R19 | S212.275 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'General Rural Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain GRUZ-R19 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-P1 | S212.276 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' policies in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-P1 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-P3 | S212.277 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' policies in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-P3 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-P4 | S212.278 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' policies in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-P4 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-P5 | S212.279 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' policies in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-P5 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R1 | S212.280 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R1 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R2 | S212.281 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R2 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R3 | S212.282 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R3 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori | MPZ-R4 | S212.283 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R4 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|----------|---|-------------------------------|
| Purpose Zone | | | | | | |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R5 | S212.284 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R5 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R6 | S212.285 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R6 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R7 | S212.286 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R7 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R8 | S212.287 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R8 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R9 | S212.288 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R9 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R10 | S212.289 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R10 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R11 | S212.290 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R11 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R12 | S212.291 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R12 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R13 | S212.292 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R13 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R14 | S212.293 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R14 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|----------|---|---|
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R15 | S212.294 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R15 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R16 | S212.295 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R16 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R17 | S212.296 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R17 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R18 | S212.297 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R18 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R19 | S212.298 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R19 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R20 | S212.299 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R20 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R21 | S212.300 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R21 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R22 | S212.301 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R22 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R23 | S212.302 | Māori Trustee | Support | The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Māori Purpose Zone' rules in this chapter. | Retain MPZ-R23 as notified. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S103.001 | Marama Tuuta | Amend | Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa and Ngāti Rangitane are two distinct Iwi that both have manawhenua over the Wairarapa. However, throughout this document only the Ngāti Rangitane vocabulary is evidenced. | Amend the District Plan to refer to Mana Whenua alongside Tangata Whenua (e.g. Tangata Whenua/Mana Whenua). |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | The vocabulary of Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa should also be used in the plan, to represent members of that iwi. | |
| ENG - Energy | | S273.001 | Maria Berry | Oppose | Supports the submission made by the South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group (SWWAG). | Amend provisions as requested in the submission by SWWAG (Submission number 207). |
| Planning Maps | Hazards and Risks | S230.001 | Maria Miller | Oppose | The Resource Consent for Brookside Development, Featherston (SWDC RC190163) notes that "in the Council's analysis of the application that no significant risks from natural hazards have been identified (as per Tonkin and Taylor report). Furthermore, that "flooding is a low risk to the new residential allotments...". This does not align with Flood mapping across site and the submitter is concerned for value of the property. | Delete Flood Maps from District Plan, specifically that these overlays be removed from Lot 32 (112 Harrison Street East, Featherston). |
| Planning Maps | Hazards and Risks | S46.001 | Mark Jerling | Oppose in part | The submitter considers that the new mapping data (specifically fault and liquefaction hazards) has substantial errors, and on this basis, thinks it would be wrong to use these maps to inform the hazard categories. | Delete proposed liquefaction and fault hazard maps and use the existing maps from the Operative District Plan, which can be progressively updated with new data. |
| Planning Maps | Hazards and Risks | S46.002 | Mark Jerling | Oppose in part | Notes the liquefaction report writers used the data from 1635 boreholes to establish geological data. Considers the boreholes are irregularly distributed and are not robust. Considers the report writers defined the liquefaction risk on the basis of the locations of the river channels, but defined those channels too widely, e.g., much of Greytown area has been assigned a 'Moderate' risk on their mapping. As a result, property owners in Greytown have to engage a Geotechnical Engineer if they choose to build, which is costly. The submitter suggests instead that Council to maintain a database of testing already carried out, where engineers can add their data to a map. | Delete the proposed liquefaction hazard maps and instead use the existing maps from the Operative District Plan that can be progressively updated with new data. |
| Planning Maps | Hazards and Risks | S46.003 | Mark Jerling | Oppose in part | Considers that Council's fault hazard maps contains several errors. Concerned that | Delete the proposed fault hazard maps and retain those of the Operative District Plan, |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | "possible fault traces" in the GNS report become "High Hazard Fault Areas" in the Council's mapping. Notes the Ministry for the Environment guidance document has underlying principles e.g. only allowing low occupancy structures to be built on faults defined as "high risk". Considers that the long recurrence intervals (e.g. 2000 years for a "high risk" fault) means it is not warranted to define these fault lines as a "high risk" fault hazard. Notes other work has been done by Dr Ian Brown on the "possible trace of the Wairarapa Fault" and the 'Woodside fault" that came to different conclusions than the GNS Science report (i.e., fluvial in origin rather than faults). Also considers there are errors in the data for the Carterton fault and the Cashmere Oaks area north of Masterton. Therefore questions the robustness of these maps, and considers it is not warranted that these are classified as "high hazard" category in Council maps. Considers that more in depth study and on the ground testing is needed before these maps are adopted to avoid putting additional unnecessary costs on property owners. | which can be progressively updated with new data. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R4 | S46.004 | Mark Jerling | Oppose | The submitter seeks this change as the fault hazard maps have substantial errors. | Amend NH-R4(a):The building addition is located within the possible liquefaction-prone area or the possible fault hazard area; or... |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-S10 | S183.001 | Martinborough Community Board | Amend | Notes that Martinborough cannot support any new connections to the wastewater system, which will not be remedied for at least three years. Considers it essential that development be allowed to occur in Martinborough. Notes there are alternative systems for wastewater management permitted by some local authorities in residential and commercial zones, and seeks that these options be provided for in | Amend GRZ-S10 to allow for on-site sewage systems in residential Martinborough. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | residential Martinborough. Considers these alternatives include self contained septic systems and systems in which partially treated waste is stored, collected periodically, and discharged into a treatment system with extra capacity. | |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S53.001 | Martinborough Holdings Limited | Amend | The site (10 Nelsons Road, Lot 1 DP 434480) has a long history of non-rural activities; for 50yrs operated as timber treatment, and following partial remediation of contaminated land, has been primarily used for bulk wine storage. The requested zoning is better aligned with past, present, and future intended use of the site. | Amend 10 Nelsons Road (Lot 1 DP 434480) from General Rural Zone (GRUZ) to Mixed Use Zone (MUZ). |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S53.002 | Martinborough Holdings Limited | Amend | The site (10 Nelsons Road) is a contaminated site (historic timber treatment), thus restricting soil-based activities. The existing buildings on the site are well suited to commercial/light industrial activities. | Delete 10 Nelsons Road (Lot 1 DP 434480) from Martinborough Soils Overlay. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S251.001 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | The definition of "Hazard areas" refers to land identified on the planning maps as high, moderate, and low hazard areas. However, the basis for the hazard areas shown on the planning maps is currently unclear. To clarify this basis, a reference to the Natural Hazards Chapter Table NH-1 is required to confirm the category each of the natural hazard layers on the maps fall into. | Amend the definition of "Hazard areas" as follows: "Means land identified on the planning maps and categorised in Table NH-1: Hazard risk categories as: a. High hazard areas; b. Moderate hazard areas; or c. Low hazard areas." |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S251.002 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | Rule SUB-R4(1) relates to subdivision of land less than 4ha in the General Rural Zone. There is no minimum allotment size specified in the controlled activity rule. In practice the balance requirements of the rule may reasonably avoid the potential for very small allotments and the matters of control enable consideration of whether allotment size is sufficient for onsite servicing. Nevertheless, it would provide greater clarity and certainty if a minimum allotment size of 0.5ha were specified. A minimum lot size of 0.5ha is | Amend SUB-R4 as follows: "1. Activity status: Controlled Where: a. The allotment subject to subdivision is located within either the South Wairarapa or Carterton District; b. The allotment is not located on highly productive land or within the Martinborough Soils Overlay; c. The allotment subject to subdivision is less than 4ha in area as at 11 October 2023 ; d. No provision is used more than once |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>consistent with the minimum lot size in the Rural Lifestyle Zone.</p> <p>Rule SUB-R4(4) provides for a discretionary activity pathway for subdivision that is over highly productive land, but meets all of the other controlled activity conditions, subject to meeting an exemption under Clause 3.8 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. There is a second exemption under the NPS-HPL that could also be met through Clause 3.10 which is provided for in other similar rules (e.g. SUB-R2(10)). For consistency, reference should also be provided to Clause 3.10.</p> <p>Rule SUB-R4 as drafted does not include a specific rule where there is non-compliance with SUB-R4(1) (a), (d) and (e). This would result in an activity that meets all provisions of SUB-R4(1), except clause (a), (d) or (e) to be a default discretionary activity in accordance with Section 87B of the RMA. To provide clarity on the activity status, changes are sought to apply a specific rule where clause (a), (d) or (e) is not met. This should be provided through SUB-R4(5).</p> <p>It should be made explicit that a site cannot be reduced in size below 4ha via a boundary adjustment under controlled activity Rule SUB-R1(1) to allow further subdivision as a controlled activity under Rule SUB-R4(1). Rule SUB-R4 should be amended by making it clear that (c) means that the allotment is less than 4ha as at the date of notification of the plan.</p> | <p>and no retention of rights occurs;</p> <p>e. Either:</p> <p>i. one additional allotment is created and the balance area remaining from the record of title subject to subdivision is no less than 1.5ha; or</p> <p>ii. two additional allotments are created and the balance area remaining from the record of title subject to subdivision is no less than 2.5ha;</p> <p>f. The additional allotment is no less than 0.5ha.</p> <p>4. Activity status: Discretionary Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance is not achieved with SUB-R4(1)(b); and</p> <p>b. Evidence is provided that the subdivision will meet clause 3.8 or clause 3.10 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.</p> <p>5. Activity status: Non-complying Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance is not achieved with SUB-R4(1)(a), (c), (d) or (e); or</p> <p>b. Compliance is not achieved with SUB-R4(1)(b) and is not otherwise provided for by SUB-R4(4)"</p> |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R12 | S251.003 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | The Coastal Environment Overlay applies to a number of zones, including a few areas zoned Settlement Zone (e.g. Lake Ferry, Whatarangi, Ngawi, Riversdale, Castlepoint), General Rural Zone, Māori Purpose Zone and | Amend Rule SUB-R12 as follows: "SUB-R12 Subdivision within the Coastal Environment 1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>Open Space Zone.</p> <p>The minimum lot size for sites in the Settlement Zone is 400m² in the Masterton District and 1,000m² in the South Wairarapa District (Settlement Zone does not apply in Carterton District). In the Open Space and Māori Purpose Zone there is no minimum lot size. The minimum lot size for the Coastal Environment Overlay is 40ha (Rule SUB-R12, a restricted discretionary activity). This is consistent with the General Rural Zone, but all subdivision in the other zones subject to the Coastal Environment Overlay needs to have a minimum lot size of 40ha to meet the standards for a restricted discretionary activity. Whilst subdivision in the Coastal Environment should be assessed against the objectives and policies for the Coastal Environment, a minimum subdivision lot size consistent with the underlying zoning is considered appropriate.</p> | <p>a. A proposed building platform is identified for each proposed allotment that is capable of accommodating a building that complies with the permitted activity standards of the underlying zone;</p> <p>b. A building platform is not located in an area of Outstanding Natural Character, Very High and High Natural Character, or Foreshore Protection Area; and</p> <p>c. Any allotment created must have a minimum allotment size of 40ha Compliance is achieved with SUB-S1."</p> |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R5 | S251.004 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | <p>Rule SUB-R5 is for subdivision of a surplus residential unit. The term "surplus" is not defined but condition (e) of the rule requires that no vacant allotments are created following the subdivision. The clarity of this rule could be improved by amending the wording to make it more explicit what is meant by vacant allotment. It has also been identified that there may be circumstances in which the creation of a vacant allotment may be consistent with the policy direction e.g. after subdivision the remaining property is used as a run-off block. In order to provide for this form of subdivision, a restricted discretionary activity pathway is sought which would still enable a case-by-case assessment but provides for a less onerous consenting process.</p> | <p>Amend Rule SUB-R5 as follows: "1. Activity status: Controlled Where: e. No vacant allotments are created allotment vacant of a residential unit is created following the subdivision. ...4. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with SUB-R5(1)(e). Matters of discretion: 1. The matters set out in Policies SUB-P1, SUB-P2, SUB-P3, SUB-P4, SUB-P5, and SUB-P6. 2. The ability to achieve on-site servicing in compliance with Council's engineering standards. 3. Integration with the</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>Consequential amendments would also be needed to the non-complying activity rule.</p> | <p>character and amenity of the existing township. 4. The effect of non-compliance with any relevant Subdivision or Zone standard that is not met, and the matters of discretion of any standard that is not met. 5. Management of construction effects, including traffic movements, hours of operation, noise, earthworks, and erosion and sediment control. 6. Management of potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing land uses, including network utilities, or significant hazardous facilities. 7. Any effects to primary production and productive capacity, including any loss of highly productive land. 8. Infrastructure capacity to service the site, or where Council services are not available, the ability to provide for on-site servicing. 9. The matters referred to in sections 108 and 220 of the Act.45. Activity status: Non-complying Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with SUB-R5(1)(a), (b), (c), or (d), or (e)"</p> |
| TR - Transport | TR-P2 | S251.005 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | <p>Policy TR-P2 references "the Subdivision Design Guide". There is no specific subdivision design guide and this reference should be to "the relevant Design Guide" (which would be the Centres Design Guide, the Industrial Design Guide, or the Residential</p> | <p>Amend Policy TR-P2 Good design outcomes as follows: "The transport network is maintained or improved in a way that: a. promotes integrated planning and supports strategic directions;</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | Design Guide) and Council's Engineering Development Standard. | <p>b. roads and vehicle crossings meet minimum design standards to allow for safe, effective, and efficient traffic movement and can safely accommodate the intended number of users and the intended functioning of the road or crossing;</p> <p>c. is consistent with the relevant Design Guide in Appendices APP3, APP4, or APP5 and Council's Engineering Development Standard Subdivision Design Guide and promotes good urban design, including connectivity, decreasing travel distances, and linking to existing transport networks;</p> <p>d. considers and responds to safety and accessibility, including Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles."</p> |
| TR - Transport | TR-S6 | S251.006 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support | The Note below Table TR-5 Minimum sight distance requirements refers to sight distance being measured in accordance with Figure TR-1. This is an error and the correct reference should be to Figure TR-3 Sight distance measurement which immediately follows the note. | Amend Standard TR-S6 to correct the Note below Table TR-5 as follows: Notes: Sight distance measured in accordance with Figure TR-1 TR-3 . |
| TR - Transport | New provision request | S251.007 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | Appendix TR-APP2 Aerodrome Obstacle Limitation Surface Specifications describes the specifications for the Hood Aerodrome obstacle limitation surfaces. Some of these descriptions do not align with the existing and/or proposed runway configurations and should be updated. | Amend Appendix TR-APP2 Aerodrome Obstacle Limitation Surface Specifications as per the amendments in Attachment 1 of the Original Submission. |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage | Heritage Buildings and Items | S251.008 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | Amend listings in Schedule 1 to clarify what the heritage listing applies to. Particularly for sites with multiple buildings clarify which buildings are included in the listing. | Amend Schedule 1: Heritage buildings and Items as per Attachment 2 of the Original Submission. These amendments relate to: Langdale Homestead, Otahua Homestead, |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|------------------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| Buildings and Items | | | | | | Awamaru (villa), Brentwood (villa), Brancepeth, Old Kopuaranga School, Polyclough (villa), Woodchester Homestead, Edenbridge (villa), Former Seddon Technical School, Tironui Homestead, Carlingford (villa), Homeleigh Christian School, Eparaima (villa), Rotomahana (villa), Building (facade only), Building (facade only), Building (facade only), Carrick Homestead, Tyneside (villa), Llandaff Homestead, Tapia Homestead, Hartlands Cottage, Grassmere (Pitarrow) (villa), Te Whanga Homestead, Cartercade Building, Larnoch Homestead, Kahutara School, Fernside, Tauherenikau Racecourse (stands and memorial gates), Tablelands, Featherston Military Training Camp. |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S251.009 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support | Item Hm098 in Schedule 1 Heritage Buildings and Items are a group of "Memorial Oaks" that were planted in commemoration of soldiers who fought in World Wars I and II. | Delete Hm098 "Memorial Oaks" from Schedule 1 - Heritage Buildings and Items |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-R2 | S251.010 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | Rule CE-R2(2) includes requirements that must be met to be a restricted discretionary activity, such as maximum area of earthworks, maximum area for modification of indigenous vegetation, and maximum size and height of building or structure. | Amend Rule CE-R2 to insert CE-R2(3) as follows: " All zones 3. Activity status: Non-complying Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with CE-R2(2). " |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-R3 | S251.011 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | Rule CE-R3(2) includes requirements that must be met to be a restricted discretionary activity, such as maximum area of earthworks, maximum area for modification of indigenous vegetation, and maximum size and height of building or structure. There is no activity status for non-compliance with these requirements included in the rule. The intention was that the activity status would default to non-complying under Rule CE-R6. However, for consistency with the approach taken to rule structure in other chapters in the Proposed District Plan the activity status | Amend Rule CE-R3 to insert CE-R3(3) as follows: " All zones 3. Activity status: Non-complying Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with CE-R3(2) " |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | should be made explicit within the rule. | |
| NOISE - Noise | New provision request | S251.012 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support | The text box immediately above the rules in the Noise chapter sets out activities that are not subject to the rules and standards in the chapter. The wording of (i) should be amended to make it clear that helicopters used for an emergency and helicopters used as an air ambulance are both exempt. | Amend the note below the "Rules" heading as follows: "The following activities are not subject to the rules and standards in this chapter: ... (i) Helicopters used for an emergency and or as an air ambulance;" |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-S3 | S251.013 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | <p>Standard GRZ-S4(3) refers to not occupying more than 25% of the length of the setback along any one boundary. It is not clear in this context what is meant by "the length of the setback along any one boundary". The intention is that accessory buildings are able to occupy up to 25% of the yard area along each boundary as applied in Standard GRZ-S3. This should be made clearer by amending the wording of the standard and providing a diagram. In addition, the relationship between GRZ-S3 Minimum setbacks and GRZ-S4 Accessory building and minor residential unit setbacks could be clearer in terms of what setbacks apply to what structures and the exceptions. The two standards should be merged to make it clearer and avoid duplication and inconsistency. Standard GRZ-S3(6) allows for encroachment by a building of no more than 25% of the relevant setback distance. This is different to the standard for accessory buildings in GRZ-S4(3) which takes an area approach. This could be made clearer to plan readers by the provision of a diagram.</p> <p>The standards for building setbacks distinguish between accessory buildings and minor residential units. A sleepout that does not fall within the definition of a minor</p> | Delete Standard GRZ-S4 Accessory building and minor residential unit setbacks as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | residential unit would be covered by the provisions relating to accessory buildings. However, the different setback standard for accessory buildings and minor residential units recognises that accessory buildings and minor units will have less effect on space about buildings and bulk and dominance but does not recognise the effects that sleepouts are likely to have on privacy for the inhabitants and on neighbours. The setback provisions should therefore be amended so that the setback exceptions for accessory buildings only apply to non-habitable accessory buildings. | |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | PREC2-S1 | S251.014 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | Standard PREC2-S1(4), GRZ Precinct 2 Figure 1 and GRZ Precinct 2 Figure 2 refer to or map a road designation which no longer exists. The section of road has been constructed and the designation is not included in SWDC's rollover designation notice or shown in the Proposed District Plan designation schedule or maps. Standard PREC2-S1(4), GRZ Precinct 2 Figure 1 and GRZ Precinct 2 Figure 2 should therefore be amended to delete references to the road designation. | Delete Standard PREC2-S1(4) as follows: " The existing access into the Greytown Development Precinct from West Street (connection point of the 'spine' road onto West Street) shall have a minimum legal road width of 17 metres which is to be covered by a designation for "road" as outlined in in GRZ Precinct 2 Figure 2: Greytown Development Precinct Structure Plan (Designated Road Plan Cross Section AA). " |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P4 | S251.015 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | GRUZ-P4 and SUB-P6 are two 'inappropriate subdivision' policies relating to the General Rural Zone which were intended to be identical but are worded slightly differently. Policy SUB-P6 is the more directive policy and Policy GRUZ-P4 should be consistent with this. | Amend Policy GRUZ-P4, to align with the wording of Policy SUB-P6, as follows: "Avoid subdivision in the General Rural Zone that will result in sites that are of a size, scale, or location that is contrary to the anticipated purpose, character, and/or amenity values of the zone, by: a. limiting small lot subdivision within the General Rural Zone to only areas where the soil resource is fragmented, is not located on any highly productive land, and there is limited productive potential |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | and where it does not compromise the use of land for primary production activities; and b. recognising avoiding the cumulative effects associated with small lot subdivision on the productive use and potential within the General Rural Zone" |
| Planning Maps | Hazards and Risks | S251.016 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | The Proposed District Plan identifies "Fault Hazard Areas" as locations accurately mapped with a higher degree of certainty. In a separate GIS viewer outside of the Proposed District Plan, "Fault Awareness Areas" are identified where mapping is less certain and accurate. These Fault Awareness Areas are shown for information purposes only. "Active Fault Lines" are shown in the Proposed District Plan for information purposes only to aid interpretation of the Fault Hazard Areas and identify the location of fault lines with Fault Awareness Areas. This information-only purpose creates confusion with the Fault Hazard Areas which the rules relate to. For clarity, the Active Fault Lines should be deleted from the Proposed District Plan planning maps where it is not also covered by the Fault Hazard Area. | Amend the planning maps to remove the "Active Fault Lines" where they are not also covered by the "Fault Hazard Area". |
| Planning Maps | Historical and Cultural Values | S251.017 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | Two heritage items (Hs131 Settler's Cottage and Hs132 Cundy Cottage) are identified on the planning maps on the property at 2477 State Highway 2 (Lot 1 DP 90158). These items are both mapped incorrectly and do not match the description of their location in Schedule 1 -Heritage Buildings and Items. The maps should show the items in their correct locations as identified in Schedule 1 to the Proposed District Plan. It is also noted there is a spelling mistake in | Remove the Historic Heritage Site icon for Hs131 and Hs132 from 2477 State Highway 2, and place them as follows (also Refer to Original Submission): Hs131 Settler's Cottage at 2481 State Highway 2, Greytown (Lot 2 DP 90158) Hs132 Cundy Cottage at the corner of Bethune and Revans Street, Featherston (Lot 5 DP 17737). Correct the spelling of Bethune Street in Schedule 1:Cnr Bethane Bethune & Revans St, Featherston (Lot 5 DP 17737) |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|---|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | Schedule 1 and Hs132 Cundy Cottage is located at the corner of "Bethune" Street rather than "Bethane". | |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S251.018 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Oppose | Due to a mapping error an esplanade reserve adjacent to Waingawa River is shown as General Rural Zone rather than the intended Natural Open Space Zone. The site (Lot 4 DP 72333) is vested as local purpose (esplanade) reserve and Natural Open Space Zone is the more appropriate zoning for this site. | Rezone Lot 4 DP 72333 from General Rural Zone to Natural Open Space Zone. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S251.019 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Oppose | Due to a mapping error Beniorns Park, located off Vogel Crescent in Masterton is shown as General Rural Zone rather than the intended Open Space Zone. The site (Lot 1 DP 43304) is vested as a recreation reserve and Open Space Zone is the more appropriate zoning for this site | Rezone Lot 1 DP 43304 from General Rural Zone to Open Space Zone. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S251.020 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Oppose | An area of residential development in the north of Carterton has been inadvertently zoned General Rural Zone rather than General Residential Zone. The area is contiguous with General Residential Zoned properties. The intention was that this area be zoned General Residential Zone and a General Residential Zone is considered most appropriate given the existing use and location. | Rezone the properties identified in red (excluding roads) (refer to Original Submission) from General Rural Zone to General Residential Zone. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S251.021 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Oppose | Two privately owned properties adjacent to Considine Park in Martinborough have inadvertently been zoned Open Space Zone. These properties should be zoned General Rural Zone consistent with the zoning of the other adjoining properties and the rural zoning in the Operative District Plan. | Rezone Pt Lot 1 DP 6872 and Pt Lot 655 DP 249 from Open Space Zone to General Rural Zone as shown in red in the Original Submission. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S251.022 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Oppose | Properties to the north of Castlepoint are part of the Future Development Area overlay in the Operative District Plan. Areas that are subject to this overlay have been converted to Future Urban Zone under the Proposed District Plan. However, these areas in Castlepoint were | Rezone the properties identified in red in the Original Submission from Settlement Zone to Future Urban Zone. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | inadvertently zoned Settlement Zone when they should have been Future Urban Zone. | |
| NH - Natural Hazards | Introduction | S251.023 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | There is potential for confusion between categorised hazard areas and the fault hazard areas and flood alert areas which are not categorised as high, moderate, or low hazard areas. To clarify these terms and categorised/non-categorised hazards, amendments to the introductory text in the Natural Hazards chapter and associated terms is suggested. | Amend the paragraph in the introductory text in the Natural Hazards chapter below Table NH-1 as below: "..... Flood hazard areas are categorised as comprehensive flood hazard modelling and mapping has been undertaken for these areas. In other areas, more broad-scale flood hazard modelling and mapping has been undertaken which has not been categorised - flood mapping in these areas is called Flood Alert Area recognising the broad-scale nature of this modelling and mapping. For areas subject to risk of fault rupture, these areas are called Fault hazard risk areas as they are also not categorised due to the variable level of spatial definition of the active fault lines. Flood Alert Areas and Fault Risk Areas are not Hazard Areas in the District Plan...." |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S251.024 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | There is potential for confusion between categorised hazard areas and the fault hazard areas and flood alert areas which are not categorised as high, moderate, or low hazard areas. To clarify these terms and categorised/non-categorised hazards, amendments to the introductory text in the Natural Hazards chapter and associated terms is suggested. | Amend and replace all references in the Proposed District Plan from "Fault Hazard Areas" to "Fault Risk Areas". |
| Planning Maps | Hazards and Risks | S251.025 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | There is potential for confusion between categorised hazard areas and the fault hazard areas and flood alert areas which are not categorised as high, moderate, or low hazard areas. To clarify these terms and categorised/non-categorised hazards, amendments to the introductory text in the | Amend the legend in the planning maps to state the hazard risk category for 'Possible Liquefaction Prone Areas' as below: "Possible Liquefaction Prone Areas (Low Hazard Area)" |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | Natural Hazards chapter and associated terms is suggested. | |
| Planning Maps | Energy, Infrastructure and Transport | S251.026 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | Some of these descriptions do not align with the existing and/or proposed runway configurations and should be updated. | Amend planning maps as per the amendments in Attachment 1 to the Original Submission. |
| SCHED3 - Schedule of Notable Trees | | S251.027 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | As there is no building associated with this heritage item the more appropriate schedule for it to be included in is Schedule 3 - Schedule of Notable Trees. The inclusion of the avenue of trees in Schedule 3 would mean the provisions in the Notable Trees chapter would apply and these are more relevant to the protection of trees than the provisions in the Historic Heritage Chapter. | Insert into SCHED 3 - Schedule of Notable Trees as follows: Reference number: Tm25mlt Tree Record (Common name, botanical name): Scarlet Oak (Quercus coccinea) x 36 Location and Legal Description: Masterton Martinborough Road (Te Whiti Road) Te Whiti (Pt Lot 4 DP 4494 and road reserve) |
| Planning Maps | Historical and Cultural Values | S251.028 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | Item Hm098 in Schedule 1 Heritage Buildings and Items are a group of "Memorial Oaks" that were planted in commemoration of soldiers who fought in World Wars I and II. As there is no building associated with this heritage item the more appropriate schedule for it to be included in is Schedule 3 - Schedule of Notable Trees. The inclusion of the avenue of trees in Schedule 3 would mean the provisions in the Notable Trees chapter would apply and these are more relevant to the protection of trees than the provisions in the Historic Heritage Chapter. | Amend the planning maps to replace the heritage icon on Pt Lot 4 DP 4494 with a notable tree icon. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-R6 | S251.029 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | There is no activity status for non-compliance with these requirements included in the rule. The intention was that the activity status would default to non-complying under Rule CE-R6. However, for consistency with the approach taken to rule structure in other chapters in the Proposed District Plan the activity status should be made explicit within the rule. | Delete Rule CE-R6 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|----------|--|--|
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-S3 | S251.030 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support | <p>Standard GRZ-S4(3) refers to not occupying more than 25% of the length of the setback along any one boundary. It is not clear in this context what is meant by "the length of the setback along any one boundary". The intention is that accessory buildings are able to occupy up to 25% of the yard area along each boundary as applied in Standard GRZ-S3. This should be made clearer by amending the wording of the standard and providing a diagram. In addition, the relationship between GRZ-S3 Minimum setbacks and GRZ-S4 Accessory building and minor residential unit setbacks could be clearer in terms of what setbacks apply to what structures and the exceptions. The two standards should be merged to make it clearer and avoid duplication and inconsistency. Standard GRZ-S3(6) allows for encroachment by a building of no more than 25% of the relevant setback distance. This is different to the standard for accessory buildings in GRZ-S4(3) which takes an area approach. This could be made clearer to plan readers by the provision of a diagram. The standards for building setbacks distinguish between accessory buildings and minor residential units. A sleepout that does not fall within the definition of a minor residential unit would be covered by the provisions relating to accessory buildings. However, the different setback standard for accessory buildings and minor residential units recognises that accessory buildings and minor units will have less effect on space about buildings and bulk and dominance but does not recognise the effects that sleepouts are likely to have on privacy for the inhabitants and on neighbours. The setback</p> | <p>Amend GRZ-S3 Minimum setbacks as follows:Front boundary setbacks:1. Buildings or structures must not be located within 3m of the front boundary of a site.2. Garages and carports (either separate or integrated into the principal residential unit) must not be located within 5m of the front boundary of a site.1. Buildings or structures must not be located within a setback.2. Front boundary setbacks are:a. 3m from the front boundary of a siteb. 5m from the front boundary of a site for garages and carports (either separate or integrated into the principal residential unit) Note: For the purpose of the above rule,only one boundary will be subject to a front boundary for corner sites only one boundary will be considered a front boundary. The remaining boundaries will be treated as side and/or rear boundaries.3. Side and rear boundary setbacks are:a. For front sites, two boundaries (side or rear boundaries) shall be subject to 3m setbacks, and one boundary shall be subject to a 1.5m setback. Front sites: 3m from two side or rear boundaries and 1.5m from one side or rear boundaryb. For rear sites, two boundaries (side or rear boundaries) shall be subject to 3m setbacks, and two boundaries shall be subject to 1.5m setbacks. Rear sites: 3m from two side</p> |

621

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>provisions should therefore be amended so that the setback exceptions for accessory buildings only apply to non-habitable accessory buildings.</p> | <p>or rear boundaries and 1.5m from two side or rear boundaries. 0m for common wall boundaries Common wall boundaries: 0m. All sites: 1.5m from any side or rear boundary for non-habitable accessory buildings, and carports attached to a residential unit.</p> <p>Note: For the purpose of the above rule, a front site is a site with a legal road frontage of not less than 10m. A rear site is a site with a legal road frontage of less than 10m. A corner site means a site with two or more legal road frontages of not less than 10m each.</p> <p>4. Exceptions to side and rear boundary setbacks:</p> <p>a. Eaves, porches, balconies, and decks or other minor building features may occupy any part of a side or rear boundary required setback, other than the front yard setback, provided they do not encroach by more than 25% of the relevant setback distance and do not, except for eaves, exceed 2m in length.</p> <p>b. An accessory building, or a carport attached to a residential unit, can infringe on a 1.5m side or rear boundary setback provided it does not occupy more than 25% of the setback area along any one boundary.</p> <p>c. Unroofed swimming pools no higher than 1m above ground level.</p> <p>d. Rainwater tanks not exceeding a height above ground level of 1.8m.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------|--|
| | | | | | | <p>5. Waterbody setbacks are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 5m from any surface waterbody. b. 25m from a significant waterbody. <p>6. This standard GRZ-S3 does not apply to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Bridges and river crossings; b. Fences. <p>Matters of Discretion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The location, design, and appearance of the building or structure. 2. Effects on streetscape and the character of the area. 4. Effects on the amenity values of adjoining sites, including visual dominance, shading, sense of enclosure, or loss of outlook or privacy. 5. The ability to mitigate the adverse effect through the use of landscaping, topography, site orientation, screening, planting, and alternative design and/or location. 6. Effects on parking and access, safety, efficiency, and effects on on-street parking and neighbours. 7. Any benefits, including the extent to which the reduced setback will result in a more efficient, practical, and/or better use of the balance of the site. 8. Whether there are topographical or other site constraints that make compliance with the permitted standard impractical. 9. For the waterbody setbacks, the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|------------------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | effects on the values of the waterbody. 10. The relevant matters contained in the Residential Design Guide. Insert figures into Standard GRZ-S3 as per Attachment 3 in the Original Submission. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ Precinct 2 Figure 2 | S251.031 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | Standard PREC2-S1(4), GRZ Precinct 2 Figure 1 and GRZ Precinct 2 Figure 2 refer to or map a road designation which no longer exists. The section of road has been constructed and the designation is not included in SWDC's rollover designation notice or shown in the Proposed District Plan designation schedule or maps. Standard PREC2-S1(4), GRZ Precinct 2 Figure 1 and GRZ Precinct 2 Figure 2 should therefore be amended to delete references to the road designation. | Delete GRZ Precinct 2 Figure 2. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ Precinct 2 Figure 1 | S251.032 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Support in part | Standard PREC2-S1(4), GRZ Precinct 2 Figure 1 and GRZ Precinct 2 Figure 2 refer to or map a road designation which no longer exists. The section of road has been constructed and the designation is not included in SWDC's rollover designation notice or shown in the Proposed District Plan designation schedule or maps. Standard PREC2-S1(4), GRZ Precinct 2 Figure 1 and GRZ Precinct 2 Figure 2 should therefore be amended to delete references to the road designation. | Amend GRZ Precinct 2 Figure 1 to remove the Designated Road notation from Farley Avenue (Refer to Original Submission). |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S251.033 | Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils | Oppose | A zoning of Open Space Zone would be most appropriate for the local purpose (utility) reserve through the centre of the area. | Rezone Lots 27 and 28 DP 511924, and Lot 48 DP 416639, from General Rural Zone to Open Space Zone. |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S40.001 | Masterton Trust Lands Trust | Amend | Submitter asks Council to consider removing the heritage status of 185 Queen Street, Masterton. States that the cost of strengthening and rebuilding everything besides the façade is too expensive (upwards | Amend SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings and Items as follows: HM128 Bank of New South Wales Building 185 Queen Street, Masterton (Pt See 9 Town of |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|--------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | of \$6 Million NZD). The demolition of this site would allow for the strengthening of the adjoining property at 189 Queen Street, Masterton, the ex-National Bank Building which is also listed in SCHED1. | Masterton [Remove heritage status from 185 Queen Street, Masterton, Wellington 5810] |
| Appendix 4 - Residential Design Guide | Residential Design Guide | S175.001 | Matthew Wenden | Amend | Considers the format and structure of the residential design guide means provisions only relevant to small areas of the residential zoned areas come first, while more relevant sections are located at the back of the guide. The current format and subheadings duplicate points, which could result in inconsistencies in interpretation and review of design guide matters. | Amend Appendix 4 - Residential Design Guide to and put more relevant provisions at the front and reduce duplication. |
| Planning Maps | Precincts | S175.002 | Matthew Wenden | Amend | The submission notes the Featherston Master Plan should be implemented with the District Plan precincts. | Amend the planning maps to apply the Medium Density Residential Precinct to the applicable areas identified in the Featherston Master Plan. |
| Planning Maps | Hazards and Risks | S231.001 | Maureen Hyett and Jenny Wheeler | Oppose in part | The submitter has commissioned a geotechnical assessment to investigate the location of the fault on the site. | Amend the Active Fault Line and Fault Line Hazard Area overlays as they apply to the property at 80 Underhill Road, Featherston to reflect the findings of the geotechnical assessment that has been undertaken for the site (copy found in supporting docs for original submission). |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P7 | S231.002 | Maureen Hyett and Jenny Wheeler | Oppose in part | NH-P7 is unclear about what particular fault hazards the Fault Hazards Areas are dealing with. Typically, Fault Hazard Areas are intended to address fault rupture as opposed to ground shaking, liquefaction, laterally spread, slope instability or other fault induced natural hazards. The submitter assumes this is the intention for Policy NH-P7 and therefore seek for the policy to be amended to reflect that it is dealing with fault rupture. | Amend the wording of Policy NH-P7 as follows: For new buildings and structures that contain habitable rooms hazard sensitive activities or potentially hazard sensitive activities and are located within a fault hazard areas as shown on the District Planning maps: 1. Allow buildings and structures to locate within Fault Hazard Areas where it can be demonstrated that the fault |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | <p>hazard risk the risk from ground deformation from fault rupture can be avoided or mitigated to prevent loss of life and damage to buildings:</p> <p>2. Avoid buildings and structures locating within the Fault Hazard Area where the risk to life from ground deformation from fault rupture cannot be avoided or mitigated via distances from the fault, building engineering solutions, or other means</p> |
| <p>NH - Natural Hazards</p> | <p>NH-R4</p> | <p>S231.003</p> | <p>Maureen Hyett and Jenny Wheeler</p> | <p>Oppose in part</p> | <p>Rule NH-R4 Additions to buildings within all hazard areas requires all additions over 20m² to a hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activity in a natural hazard overall to obtain resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity. However, the matters of discretion have no relevance to fault hazard areas as these areas are not identified as either a low, moderate or high hazard area.</p> <p>This issue needs to be rectified, by identifying fault hazard areas as either high or moderate hazard areas.</p> | <p>Amend the wording of Rule NH-R4 as follows: NH-R4: Additions to buildings within all hazard areas All Zones 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The building addition is located within the possible liquefaction prone area; or b. The additions do not increase the gross floor area of a hazard sensitive activity or potential hazard sensitive activity within any fault hazard area or flood hazard area by more than 20m². c. Any building additions located in the identified overland flowpath or ponding area of the flood hazard overlay have a finished floor level above the 1% AEP flood level. All Zones 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where:</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>a. Compliance is no achieved with NH-R4(1). Matters of discretion: 1. For additions in the moderate hazard areas, the matters in Policy NH-P3 2. For additions in the low hazard areas, the matters in Policy NH-P4 3. For additions in the high hazard area, the matters in Policy NH-P2. 4. For additions in the fault hazard areas, the matters in Policy NH-P7</p> |
| <p>NH - Natural Hazards</p> | <p>NH-R6</p> | <p>S231.004</p> | <p>Maureen Hyett and Jenny Wheeler</p> | <p>Oppose in part</p> | <p>Rule NH-R6 applies to any building or structure on a site that is located or partially within a Fault Hazard Area. This means that if a Fault Hazard Area clips a small portion of a site, then any habitable building on the site requires resource consent, regardless of whether it is within the Fault Hazard Area or not. This is a different approach to other natural hazard provisions, where the rules only apply within the identified natural hazard overlay. There is no rational to why resource consent would be required on a site, when the works themselves are not within the natural hazard overlay. This rule needs to be amended so that it directly applies to new works within a natural hazard overlay.</p> <p>The matters of discretion under Rule NH-R6 require predominately the consideration of the impacts on the loss of life. Current planning practice should also require the consideration of the potential for building damage from fault rupture. This is to ensure the economic risks associated with developing in Fault Hazard Areas are addressed.</p> | <p>Amend: NH-R6 New Buildings and structure in Fault Hazard Area All Zones 1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Building or structure contains habitable room(s)The new building will contain a hazard sensitive or potentially hazard activity; and b. The subject site building is located fully or partially within the Fault Hazard Area. Matters of discretion 1. The proximity to any identified fault as demonstrated supporting geotechnical evidence; 2. Engineering measure incorporated into the building or structures to prevent loss of life or reduce the damage to a building from anticipated effects of aseismic event fault rupture; and 3. The</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|--|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | matters set out NH-P1, NH-P8 and NH-P11. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S231.005 | Maureen Hyett and Jenny Wheeler | Oppose in part | Seek any consequential changes to the objectives, policies and rules of the subdivision chapter to allow for the risk-based approach to the management of natural hazard risk associated with fault hazards. This is to ensure that the approach taken to the creation of new allotments via subdivision, align with the land use categories for hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities. | Amend plan and any other consequential amendments or alternative relief required to achieve the intended outcomes sought within this submission. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | | S231.006 | Maureen Hyett and Jenny Wheeler | Oppose in part | <p>The Proposed District Plan approach does not follow the Ministry for the Environment Guidelines as the mapping, policy and rule framework do not distinguish between any of the aforementioned factors. The policy and rule framework should be changed to align with the guidance. The submitter notes that this would make the fault hazards provisions more consistent with other recent reviews and proposals in the region.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the fault hazard overlay has not been classified as being either a low, moderate or high hazard area and therefore there is uncertainty regarding the activity status for land use activities (other than new structures and buildings and infrastructure within the fault hazard area) since the related policies and rules refer back to these categories.</p> | Insert a risk-based approach to the fault hazard areas as per the Ministry for the Environment Guidelines to ensure there is a regionally consistent approach to fault hazards. |
| National Direction Instruments | National policy statements and New Zealand Coastal | S220.001 | Meridian Energy Limited | Support in part | Supports the proposed text in principle but notes the need to update the table if the National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation or the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission are replaced before the hearing and determination of submissions on the PDP. | Retain but amend the references to the National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation and the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission if those National Policy Statements are updated or replaced before the hearing and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | Policy Statement | | | | | determination of submissions on the PWCDP. |
| ENG - Energy | Introduction | S220.002 | Meridian Energy Limited | Support in part | <p>Paragraph 3 references the 2011 NPS-REG. However, this NPS may be superseded before the hearings on submissions on the PDP are completed.</p> <p>A significant issue for infrastructure generally, and for renewable electricity generation activities in particular, is the impact of adverse reverse sensitivity effects. The text does not explicitly discuss reverse sensitivity and the importance of protecting lawfully established renewable electricity generation activities from reverse sensitivity.</p> <p>The last paragraph includes a statement that only the rules of the ENG-Chapter apply to REG activities. It could be made clearer that the objectives and policies of other district-wide chapters apply to applications for consent made under the rules of the ENG-Energy chapter but that the only rules applicable to renewable electricity generation activities are those in the ENG-Energy chapter (and that these prevail over the rules of other district-wide chapters).</p> <p>Supports the discretionary activity provision for large-scale renewable electricity generation activities proposed in Chapter ENG-Energy.</p> | <p>Amend Introduction test of the ENG - Energy Chapter as follows: 'Energy is critical to the functioning of the Wairarapa. Increasing demand for energy at a local regional and national level has an impact on the limited resources available to provide energy - while non-renewable resources such as gas and coal will eventually be depleted, renewable resources including hydro, solar, wind power, and biomass sources may also bring... ... The provisions in this chapter have been developed to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Generation 2011 (NPS-REG) [update this reference if the NPS-REG is replaced or revised before determining decisions on submissions on the PDP], which seeks to significantly increase electricity generated from renewable resources to achieve New Zealand's emissions reductions targets, emissions budgets, energy targets and associated emissions reductions commitments. enable the sustainable management of renewable electricity generation. Domestic small-scale... A substantial proportion of future energy supply will therefore, need to be generated from new and preferably renewable sources. ...Enabling the development, operation</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------|--|
| | | | | | | <p>and upgrading of renewable electricity generation activities at a scale is critical to Providing for renewable energy plays critical role in reducing reliance on non-renewable energy and will assist in decarbonisation. Parts of the Wairarapa contain excellent potential for wind generated energy. Usually, wind energy facilities are provided at a large scale, and can therefore potentially have environmental effects, particularly (including landscape and amenity effects); as wind energy facilities, by necessity, are in open usually require elevated and usually prominent locations where the wind resource occurs.</p> <p>...</p> <p>c. Flat land with a less than 5-degree slope. By their nature, there is tensions between other competing land uses, in particular primary production. The NPS-REG's objective of significantly increase electricity generated from renewable resources is to be achieved by enabling the effective and efficient development, operation, maintenance and upgrading of renewable generation assets while managing adverse effects on the environment.</p> <p>...However, some level of adverse effects may need to be accepted in accordance with the necessity for energy, and as</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>New Zealand moves towards a more sustainable energy future. This is consistent with the objective of the NPS-ET that the electricity transmission network is developed, maintained, and upgraded in an effective, efficient, and safe manner, while managing adverse effects on the environment.</p> <p>The provisions within this chapter apply on a district-wide basis... The objectives and policies in district-wide overlay chapters and the objectives, policies are relevant when considering applications under the rules of this ENG-Energy chapter. Also, the and rules of the subdivision chapter apply to renewable electricity generation where applicable.'</p> |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-O1 | S220.003 | Meridian Energy Limited | Support in part | The 2011 NPS-REG does not limit the benefits to only 'significant' benefits. | Amend ENG-O1 as follows: 'The significant local, regional, and national benefits of renewable electricity generation are recognised and provided for.' |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-O2 | S220.004 | Meridian Energy Limited | Support in part | The 2023 consultation draft proposed NPS-REG is on 'managing' (not 'minimising') the adverse effects of REG on the environment. Also, there is no objective in the proposed Plan that reflects the 2023 consultation draft proposed NPS-REG objective of 'enabling' REG. | Amend ENG-O2 as follows: 'Increased electricity generation from renewable energy resources is achieved by the effective and efficient development, operation maintenance and upgrading of renewable Renewable electricity generation activities (including protecting them from reverse sensitivity effects) while managing their |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | adverse effects on the environment. are designed and located to minimise adverse effects on communities and the environment while recognising their operational or locational constraints.' |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-O3 | S220.005 | Meridian Energy Limited | Support | Supports ENG-O3. | Retain ENG-O3. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P5 | S220.006 | Meridian Energy Limited | Oppose in part | There is no objective that provides the basis for ENG-P5. This omission would be addressed by making the amendments to ENG-O2 proposed by previously (which enables effective operation). The amended words of ENG-O2 provide a basis for policy about protecting lawfully established REG activities from reverse sensitivity. | Retain ENG-P5 and make the amendments requested previously to ENG-O2 to provide an appropriate basis for ENG-P5. |
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S220.007 | Meridian Energy Limited | Support | The policies do not reflect the emphasis currently being given by the government policy to renewable electricity generation and the important role it has in assisting to achieve New Zealand's emission reduction targets. The order of priority between the policies also seems inappropriate. | Insert an additional first policy (a replacement ENG-P1 as follows or similar) and amend the numbering of subsequent policies as follows: ENG-P1: Enable renewable electricity generation activitiesEnable the development, operation, maintenance and upgrading of renewable electricity generational activities (including large-scale, community-scale, and small-scale renewable electricity generation activities) while managing their adverse effect on the environment, recognising their functional and operational needs. ENG-P1 P2: Enable site investigations for renewable electricity generation Enable activities associated with investigating site suitability for |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | renewable electricity generation. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P2 | S220.008 | Meridian Energy Limited | Oppose | Delete ENG-P2 as small-scale renewable energy generation is provided for within proposed Policy ENG-P1 above. | Delete ENG-P2 ENG-P2: Enable small-scale renewable electricity generation Enable small-scale renewable electricity generation where it is of a form and scale that avoids, remedies, or mitigates its adverse effects. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P3 | S220.009 | Meridian Energy Limited | Support in part | Not stated. | Amend Policy ENG-P3 as follows: 'Encourage community small-scale renewable electricity generation in the General Rural Zone where effects are appropriately managed, by having regard to: a. benefits... ...' |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P4 | S220.010 | Meridian Energy Limited | Oppose in part | Not stated. | Amend ENG-P4 as follows: ENG-P4: Large-scale renewable electricity generation activities When considering applications for consent Provide for large-scale renewable electricity generation activities where effects are appropriately managed, by having recognise and provide for the benefits of providing additional large-scale renewable electricity generation and any operational needs or functional needs and have locational, technical, or operational constraints regard to: a. transport and infrastructure capacity |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------|---|
| | | | | | | <p>to accommodate the activity; b- earthworks and construction effects; c- the design and site layout of the activity and its ability to internalise effects; d. the management of actual and potential adverse effects from the activity, including: <i>(i)</i> traffic generation, visual, light, safety, and noise; (ii) earthworks and construction effects whether there is adequate separation from (iii) effects on sensitive activities and the need for separation distance to minimise ensure adverse reverse sensitivity effects including potential adverse reverse sensitivity effects, are minimised; (iv) cumulative effects from multiple renewable electricity generation activities; (v) potential for adverse effects on natural features and landscapes , waterbodies, indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage, and sites and areas of significance to Māori; (vi) potential adverse effects on the productive capacity of the land, including the ability to protect the productive capacity of highly productive land; and (a) consideration of long term management and responsibilities for the development; and (vii) any mitigation, compensation, offsetting or adaptive management measures proposed.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P5 | S220.011 | Meridian Energy Limited | Support in part | Not stated. | Amend ENG-P5 as follows: ENG-P5: Reverse sensitivity Manage subdivision and land use activities to avoid adverse effects on the efficient operation of established renewable electricity generation activities facilities . |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P6 | S220.012 | Meridian Energy Limited | Support in part | Not stated. | Amend ENG-P6 to italicise the defined terms (shown in bold): ENG-P6: Operation, maintenance, repair, removal and upgrade of renewable electricity generation activities Enable the operation, maintenance, repair and removal of existing renewable electricity generation activities and provide for the upgrade of renewable electricity generation where the effects are appropriately managed. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-S1 | S220.013 | Meridian Energy Limited | Support in part | Supports the proposed ENG-S1 standards except standard (5) the duration limit of 5 years. The effects on the environment of investigations equipment are generally minor and not compounded by duration. A 5-year duration limit is generally too short a period for gathering meteorological data to inform project decision making and project design. In general, a period of between five and ten years is necessary. | Amend ENG-S1 by increasing the duration permitted by standard (5) from five years to ten years. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R1 | S220.015 | Meridian Energy Limited | Support in part | The submitter supports the restricted discretionary activity status for investigation activities that do not comply with the standards of Rule ENG-R1. Concerns that discretionary matter number (3) is not a sufficiently specific consideration. Site suitability is not generally an appropriate consideration (in any event the purpose of the investigation is to determine whether the site is suitable for renewable electricity | Retain the restricted discretionary activity status for investigations facilities that do not comply with the standards specified in ENG-R1 but delete discretionary matters (3), (6) and (7). |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>generation).</p> <p>In discretionary matter number (6) it is not clear what 'health and safety' means. Also, 'health and safety' is not understood to be a matter of resource management concern for established investigations facilities.</p> <p>Investigations facilities are unlikely to result in any material loss of highly productive land. In any event, the operative Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region includes renewable electricity generation in the definition of regionally significant infrastructure. Part 3.8 of the NPS-Highly Productive Land provides for specified infrastructure (including infrastructure that is defined by a RPS as regionally significant infrastructure). There is no need to duplicate this consideration in the list of restricted matters.</p> | |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R2 | S220.016 | Meridian Energy Limited | Oppose | <p>The submitter considers there is no need to provide for the operation of renewable electricity generation activities because they will be either permitted activities or be authorised by consent and the terms of the permitted activity rule or the consent will enable ongoing operation.</p> <p>The submitter agrees that it is appropriate for ENG-R2 to provide for maintenance and repair. The submitter does not support the two-year limit for removing redundant equipment. The restricted discretionary activity status is unnecessarily stringent for repair and maintenance activities that do not involve the change in nature, intensity or scale of environmental effects but which are essential to the effective ongoing operation of the activities. A more appropriate activity status for repair and maintenance activities is permitted activity.</p> | <p>Delete ENG-R2 or amend the rule to provide a permitted activity status for the repair and maintenance of renewable generation activities.</p> <p>Delete the condition specifying a two-year time period within which redundant equipment is to be removed.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | For large-scale REG, repairs and maintenance would typically be addressed within conditions of consent. It is also notable that the rules for small-scale REG include provision for maintenance, repair and upgrade so it is not clear why ENG-R2 is necessary for those. | |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R6 | S220.017 | Meridian Energy Limited | Support in part | <p>The submitter supports the discretionary activity status for large-scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone.</p> <p>Support the proposed plan's approach whereby the activity status for renewable electricity generation activities is specified in the ENG-Energy chapter (and it not overridden by the rules in other district-wide chapters). The intention of the PDP is clear, in explicitly stating that the rules in other chapters apply only where this is specified in the ENG-Energy Chapter rules. This could, however, be made more explicit in the introductory text in other district-wide chapters.</p> <p>The discretionary activity status for upgrading is unnecessarily stringent, given that these activities will already have been established by consent. Upgrading of existing large-scale renewable electricity generation activities can be provided for as a permitted activity, subject to conditions, with a default of restricted discretionary activity for non-compliance with specified conditions. The discretionary matters should focus on the potential changes in environmental effects associated with the extent of upgrading proposed. This would be a more appropriate way of implementing the Plan objectives and to achieve the purpose of the Act in terms of the relevant considerations of s. 32 of the Act.</p> | <p>Retain the discretionary activity status for large-scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone. Delete reference to upgrading of large-scale renewable electricity generation activities from ENG-R6 and insert a new permitted activity rule providing for the upgrading of large-scale renewable electricity generation (with a restricted discretionary activity default for non-compliance with permitted activity conditions) as follows or similar:The upgrade of large-scale renewable electricity generation activities structures:(1) Activity status: Permitted Activity where the following standards are met:a. replacement or re-located structures are within 100m of the existing location;b. the height of any existing pole or support structure is not increased by more than 50%;c. the diameter (width) of any existing pole or support structure is not increased by more than 50%; and d. the area of any existing above-ground structure is not increased by more than 25%;e. The upgraded structures are not located within any identified site or area of significance to Māori, historic heritage site, significant natural area, outstanding natural feature or</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>landscape, outstanding, very high or high natural character area or special amenity landscape. (2) Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary Activity where the standards in (1) are not met. Discretion is restricted to:1. Local, regional, and national benefits.2. The effects on the environment associated with the form of upgrading proposed.3. The type, scale, form, and location of any structure.</p> <p>Retain the PDP approach whereby the activity status for renewable electricity generation activities is specified within the ENG-Energy Chapter and the ENG-Energy Chapter rules prevail over all other rules in other district-wide chapters. Insert into the introductory text of all district-wide chapters the following statement: 'The rules for renewable electricity generation activities are contained within the ENG-Energy Chapter and ENG-Energy chapter rules prevail over the rules in this chapter.'</p> |
| <p>Interpretation</p> | <p>Definitions</p> | <p>S220.018</p> | <p>Meridian Energy Limited</p> | <p>Oppose in part</p> | <p>The definition differs from the operative NPS-REG definition ('Small and community-scale distributed electricity generation means renewable electricity generation for the purpose of using electricity on a particular site, or supplying an immediate community or connecting into the distribution network').</p> <p>It also differs from the definition proposed in</p> | <p>Amend definition of 'community-scale renewable electricity generation' to be consistent with the language of the NPS-REG, including the wording of replacement NPS-REG if that is available at the time of hearing and determining submissions on the PDP.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>the 2023 consultation draft proposed NPS-REG ('community-scale REG means renewable electricity generation supplied to a community where: (a) the primary purpose is to provide benefits to that community; and (b) there is community collective ownership or management of the REG assets used to generate the electricity').</p> <p>The proposed plan needs to be consistent with the language of the NPS-REG if that is available at the time of hearing and determining submissions on the PDP.</p> | |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S220.019 | Meridian Energy Limited | Support | The submitter supports the definition of 'large-scale renewable electricity generation' but notes the potential need to refine the definition if the NPS-REG definition is amended in a future revision if available at the time of determining submissions on the proposed Plan. | Retain the definition of 'Large-scale renewable electricity generation' or amend it to be consistent with the definition in a revised NPS-REG if one has legal effect at the time of determining submissions on the proposed Plan. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S220.020 | Meridian Energy Limited | Support | The submitter supports the proposed definition of 'renewable electricity generation' but notes the potential need to refine the definition if the NPS-REG definition is amended in a future revision if available at the time of determining submissions on the proposed Plan. | Retain the definition of 'renewable electricity generation' or amend it to be consistent with the definition in a revised NPS-REG if one has legal effect at the time of determining submissions on the proposed Plan. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S220.021 | Meridian Energy Limited | Support in part | <p>'Renewable electricity generation activities has the same meaning as in the NPS-REG'. However, the 2023 consultation draft proposed NPS-REG definition is somewhat abbreviated: 'REG activity means an activity required for the development, operation, maintenance, or upgrade of REG assets'.</p> <p>The submitter supports the proposed definition and alignment with the NPS-REG but notes the potential need to refine it if the NPS-REG definition is amended in a future revision.</p> | Retain the definition of 'renewable electricity generation activities' or amend it to be consistent with the definition in a revised NPS-REG if one has legal effect at the time of determining the submissions on the proposed Plan. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Interpretation | Definitions | S220.022 | Meridian Energy Limited | Support in part | <p>The definition is similar to, but differs slightly from, the definition in the operative 2011 NPS-REG: 'Small and community-scale distributed electricity generation means renewable electricity generation for the purpose of using electricity on a particular site, or supplying an immediate community or connecting into the distribution network.'</p> <p>The equivalent definition in the 2023 consultation draft proposed NPS-REG is: 'small-scale REG means renewable electricity generation where the primary purpose is to provide electricity for an on-site commercial use, at an individual site or landholding level'.</p> <p>The definition should align with the NPS-REG, noting the potential need to refine it if the NPS-REG definition is amended in a future revision.</p> | Amend the of 'small-scale electricity generation activity' to be consistent with the definition in the NPS-REG (including the equivalent definition in a revised NPS-REG if one has legal effect at the time of determining submissions on the proposed Plan). |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P6 | S220.023 | Meridian Energy Limited | Oppose in part | <p>ECO-P6 does not adhere to the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity effects management hierarchy because it omits the 'where practicable' from the first (avoidance) step in the hierarchy and the wording departs from the NPS-IB wording for the other steps in the hierarchy. Importantly also, the proposed Plan policy framework does not acknowledge the exemption specified in Part 1.3 (3) of the NPS-IB applies to the development, operation, maintenance or upgrade of renewable electricity generation assets and activities or to electricity transmission network assets and activities. The policy should be amended to reflect the NPS-IB.</p> | <p>Amend ECO-P6 as follows: 'ECO-P6... ... a. avoiding the loss or degradation of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna where practicable in preference to remediation or mitigation; b. avoiding the loss of habitat that supports or provides a key life function or Threatened or At risk indigenous species where practicable; and c. requiring that any unavoidable more than minor adverse effects on area of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna are remedied or mitigated. d. nothing in Policy ECO-P6 applies to the</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>development, operation, maintenance or upgrade of renewable electricity generation activities or to electricity transmission network activities.</p> <p>...'</p> <p>Otherwise amend ECO-P6 to reflect the effects management hierarchy defined in the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, including to provide for biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation.</p> |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P8 | S220.025 | Meridian Energy Limited | Support in part | Given the explicit exemption in the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity (Part 1.3 (3)) ECO-P8 should be amended to acknowledge the functional and operational needs of infrastructure including renewable electricity generation activities and electricity transmission network activities. | <p>Amend ECO-P8 as follows:</p> <p>'ECO-P8 Management of effects on other indigenous vegetation</p> <p>...</p> <p>c. the effects of the modification on the significance and values of the vegetation and habitat, including potential cumulative effects.</p> <p>d. the functional needs and operational needs of infrastructure.'</p> |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P2 | S220.026 | Meridian Energy Limited | Oppose in part | The criteria in NFL-P1 apply to outstanding natural features and landscapes. It is not appropriate to apply those to landscapes that are not outstanding without some clarification of how they are to be applied. | Amend NFL-P2 to delete the reference to NFL-P1 and insert assessment criteria specifically suited to identifying special amenity landscapes. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O2 | S220.027 | Meridian Energy Limited | Oppose in part | The approach to management of natural character in the coastal environment is set out in the NZCPS and in the Regional Policy Statement. Both higher order documents direct that natural character is to be protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. This should be replicated in the District Plan. Some forms of development are appropriate in the coastal environment, | <p>Amend CE-O2 as follows:</p> <p>'Objective CE-O2 Coastal Natural Character</p> <p>The natural character...</p> <p>a. protecting the qualities, characteristics, and values of areas of Outstanding Natural Character and Very High Natural Character in the landward extent of the coastal environment from inappropriate subdivision, use and development; and</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | including where they may affect natural character. | b. maintaining, and where appropriate...' |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P4 | S220.028 | Meridian Energy Limited | Oppose in part | CE-P4 should provide for, as well as manage, activities in the coastal environment. | Amend CE-P4 as follows: 'Policy CE-P4 Activities and subdivision within the coastal environment Provide for Manage subdivision, use, and development within the coastal environment to ensure where: a. there is a functional need or operational need...' |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P6 | S220.029 | Meridian Energy Limited | Oppose in part | CE-P6 should be amended to provide for infrastructure, reflecting the enabling approach of the higher order NPS-REG. | Amend CE-P6 as follows: 'Policy CE-P6: Infrastructure ... c. provide for the maintenance, repair, and removal of existing infrastructure in areas identified as Very High Natural Character; and d. Only allow Provide for new infrastructure and the upgrade of existing infrastructure within areas identified as Very High and High Natural Character where: i. it has an operational need or functional need for the location; ii. it is designed to maintain the natural character values; and...' |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P7 | S220.030 | Meridian Energy Limited | Oppose in part | Given the explicit exemption in the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity (Part 1.3 (3)) ECO-P7 should be amended to include renewable electricity generation activities and electricity transmission network activities as appropriate activities. The word 'and' at the end of clause (h) should be 'or'. | Amend ECO-P7 as follows: 'Policy ECO-P7: Appropriate modification of other indigenous vegetation Provide for the... h. activities are carried out subject to and in accordance with any specific covenants or other legal agreements |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | | entered into with the District Council, or Greater Wellington Regional Council, or Department of Conservation, or QEII Trust; and i. the activity is either a renewable electricity generation activity or electricity transmission network activity; or j. it is necessary for the construction or maintenance of a firebreak.' |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB - Table 1 | S244.001 | Michael David Walters Hodder | Amend | Notes there are many smaller lots than 40ha in the zone. Smaller holdings can produce high yield horticultural or pastoral activities. Considers more analysis should have been undertaken about land use in the Wairarapa and the size of rural properties rather than assuming larger sites are better. Notes clause 3.10(4) of NPS-HPL which states "the side of the land holding in which the highly productive land occurs is not itself a determinant". Considers there is demand for smaller rural lots. Notes policies GRUZ-P1 to GRUZ-P10 provide helpful guidance for subdivision in the zone. | Amend SUB-Table 1 to make the minimum lot size 4ha in the General Rural Zone |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S3 | S244.002 | Michael David Walters Hodder | Amend | Opposes 10m minimum setback from any boundary due to narrowness of some rural properties that are larger than 4,500m ³ , where a smaller setback of 1.5 m is permitted for accessory buildings. | Amend GRUZ-S3: ... 6. For sites larger than 4,500m³ having side boundaries less than 150 meters apart, accessory buildings may be located up to 5 meters from the side boundaries. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S244.003 | Michael David Walters Hodder | Oppose | Opposes area of land between Connollys Line, Belvedere Road, Sparks Park, and Kenwyn Drive being included in the General Residential Zone. Notes issues with stormwater disposal, increased traffic and effects on safety, and the intensity of | Amend the planning maps to rezone the area of land between Connollys Line, Belvedere Road, Sparks Park, and Kenwyn Drive from General Residential Zone to either General Rural Zone or Rural Lifestyle Zone. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|---|------------------|---|------------|--|---|
| | | | | | development not in keeping with the existing environment. | |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S244.004 | Michael David Walters Hodder | Not Stated | Does not support extension of the Rural Lifestyle Zone beyond Masterton as it would change amenity values and reduce the area of land being used for productive purposes. | Retain the current extent of the Rural Lifestyle Zone. |
| Designations | SWDC - South Wairarapa District Council | S134.001 | Michael PhilipHeald and Nicole Anne Preston | Oppose | <p>The submission states the designation area will have adverse effects on surrounding properties and shared waterways. The submission also raises health related concerns with the new disposal areas.</p> <p>The submission also notes concerns around reverse sensitivity of the Transfer Station.</p> | Amend SWDC-S-26 designation boundaries to prevent the use of Pain Farm in the Martinborough wastewater disposal area. |
| Planning Maps | General District-Wide Matters | S180.001 | Michelle Hight | Oppose | This submission relates to the mapping of Highly Productive Land. The submitter argues that the blanket allocation of Highly Productive Land and not being able to develop rural lifestyle blocks that are deemed HPL without consultation from the land owners is unsustainable for future development. | Amend Highly Productive Land mapping in order to not restrict further development and growth. |
| Planning Maps | Hazards and Risks | S88.001 | Miles Sutherland | Oppose | Submitter opposes the inclusion of maps on the District Plan that relate to GNS Science mapping of fault hazards and liquefaction risk. | Delete the liquefaction and earthquake fault risk zone layers from the District Plan maps until they have been validated or disproven. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S198.001 | Millicent Williams | Oppose | Considers the opt-in/opt-out process for the Māori Purpose Zone was contentious, speculative, and unclear as to the involvement of the Māori Land Court (MLC) in relation to opting in of all lands under their jurisdiction. Considers that representatives of MLC should have been involved in consultation and needed to seek permission with Māori o Wairarapa. Considers that the Councils breached Te Tiriti (i.e. Article 2 - not enabling tangata whenua to participate in decision making and solely relying on advice of MLC & Article 3 equitable opportunity to opt-in or out of Māori Purpose Zone opposed to determining just the opt-in advice from MLC). | Amend submissions deadline to afford tangata whenua o Wairarapa time to consult wider with their whānau and beneficiaries that reside within and outside of Wairarapa, engage with both the Māori Land Court o Takitimu, and the Combined Wairarapa District Council representatives. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| Interpretation | Definitions | S245.001 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports the definition for educational facility as it is consistent with the National Planning Standards. | Retain definition for 'Educational facilities' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S245.002 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports the definition for educational facility as it is consistent with the National Planning Standards. | Retain definition for 'Hazard Sensitive Activities' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S245.003 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support in part | The Ministry supports the inclusion of educational facilities in the definition of sensitive activity which aims to protect educational facilities. | Retain definition for 'Sensitive Activities' as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O3 | S245.004 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports the inclusion of objective UFD-O3 as it provides high-level strategic direction ensuring there is sufficient development capacity (such as educational facilities) to meet the growing needs Wairarapa. | Retain UFD-O3 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P3 | S245.005 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports ENG-P3 as it provides adequate separation of renewable electricity generation activities from educational facilities (being a sensitive activity) is considered. | Retain as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P4 | S245.006 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports ENG-P4 as it provides adequate separation of renewable electricity generation activities from educational facilities (being a sensitive activity) is considered. | Retain as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P4 | S245.007 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports the inclusion of this policy as network utilities need be managed in order to minimise potential effects on sensitive activities (which include educational facilities). | Retain as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P6 | S245.008 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry acknowledges that sensitive activities should not be located in or near the National Grid corridor. | Retain as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-O1 | S245.009 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports this objective as it will enable a safe, efficient, and well-connected transport network around educational facilities. | Retain as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P2 | S245.010 | Ministry of Education Te | Support | The Ministry supports this policy to encourage good design outcomes that will maximises | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|----------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | | opportunities for walking, cycling, and public transport around educational facilities. | |
| TR - Transport | TR-S23 | S245.011 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry support the requirements for minimum cycle parking spaces. | Retain as notified. |
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | HAZ-O1 | S245.012 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports the inclusion of this Objective that activities associated with the use, storage, and disposal hazardous substance are managed so that the unacceptable risk to educational facilities is avoided. | Retain as notified. |
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | HAZ-P1 | S245.013 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports the inclusion of this policy as it encourages significant hazardous facilities to locate in zones/areas away from sensitive activities. | Retain as notified. |
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | HAZ-P2 | S245.014 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports the inclusion of this policy as it recognises the need for sensitive activities, including educational facilities, to avoid locating near significant hazardous facilities. | Retain as notified. |
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | HAZ-R1 | S245.015 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports the requirement for significant hazardous facilities, including additions, to be set back from sensitive activities (including educational facilities). The Ministry also supports the activity status for the establishment of significant hazardous facilities as a way to avoid and minimise risks to people, property, and the environment. | Retain as notified. |
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | HAZ-R2 | S245.016 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports the noncomplying activity status for sensitive activities locating near significant hazardous facilities. The Ministry supports the inclusion of a specific distance which educational facilities must be setback from existing significant hazardous facilities to manage adverse effects on school students and staff and to manage reverse sensitivity effects. | Retain as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P2 | S245.017 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports this policy as it recognises that although the Ministry would prioritise locating schools out of high hazard areas, the Ministry may have an operational | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | need to locate an educational facility in a hazard areas. | |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P3 | S245.018 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry acknowledges the risk which natural hazards can pose on people, property and the environment and supports the management of development in hazard areas. | Retain as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P4 | S245.019 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports the inclusion of this policy as it recognises that hazard sensitive activities (including educational facilities) can locate in areas with low risk, provided appropriate mitigation measures are incorporated. The adoption of these measures will ensure that the potential natural hazards do not jeopardize the health and safety of people and properties. | Retain as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R3 | S245.020 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports NH-R3 to allow for the construction of hazard sensitive activities (such as educational facilities) in moderate and low hazard areas. | Retain as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R7 | S245.021 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports NH-R7 to allow for the construction of hazard sensitive activities (such as educational facilities) to be constructed in within flood alert areas as a restricted discretionary activity. The Ministry considered the matters of discretion appropriate. | Retain as proposed. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P4 | S245.022 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports the proposed policy as it recognises that certain activities have a functional and operational need to be located within the Coastal Environment. | Retain as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-O1 | S245.023 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports the inclusion of objective NOISE-O1 as it recognises benefits of noise generating activities while the activity does not compromise the well-being of communities, which broadly covers educational facilities. | Retain as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P1 | S245.024 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports the inclusion of policy NOISE-P1, as it enables noise generating activities provided, they do not compromise the health, safety and well-being of people and communities, which broadly covers educational facilities. | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P2 | S245.025 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports the inclusion of policy NOISE-P2 as it enables noise from activities to be generated provided steps are taken to, avoid conflict with existing noise sensitive activities. | Retain as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P4 | S245.026 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports the inclusion of policy NOISE-P4 as it incorporates acoustic insulation measures for noise sensitive activities, such as educational facilities. This policy recognises that noise sensitive activities should be appropriately located and separated from state highways, and rail corridors. | Retain as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P6 | S245.027 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry support the inclusion of the policy NOISE-P6 as it enables noise sensitive activities, such as educational facilities to be located within commercial and industrial zones provided they are located, designed, constructed, and operated to reduce adverse noise and health and safety effects are minimised, and will reduce any adverse effects on reverse sensitivity. | Retain as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-R12 | S245.028 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry support NOISE-R12 as it provides for acoustic insulation measures for noise sensitive activities in Commercial and Mixed Use Zones and General Industrial Zones. | Retain as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-R13 | S245.029 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry support NOISE-R13 as it provides for acoustic insulation measures for noise sensitive activities in Rural Zones and Residential Zones. | Retain as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-O3 | S245.030 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry is supportive of objective GRZ-O3 as it limits non-residential activities such as social infrastructure (which includes educational facilities) to be located within the Residential zone. | Retain as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P3 | S245.031 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry is supportive of the inclusion of this objective as it encourages the development of non-residential activities within the Residential zone provided that it meets the anticipated character, amenity of the Residential Zone, does not generate | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | reverses sensitivity effects and has an operational and functional need to be located within the zone. | |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P3 | S245.032 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry is supportive of the inclusion of this objective as it encourages the development of non-residential activities within the Residential zone provided that it meets the anticipated character, amenity of the Residential Zone, does not generate reverses sensitivity effects and has an operational and functional need to be located within the zone. | Retain as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-O1 | S245.033 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | <p>The Ministry acknowledges that the intention of the Settlement Zone is to provide for small-scale coastal and rural settlements that comprise of residential areas along with some commercial activities that provide services to local coastal or rural communities.</p> <p>The Ministry supports this Objective as it enables the establishment of community activities which broadly captures educational facilities through Policy SETZ-P1 and Rule SETZ-R9.</p> | Retain as notified. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-P1 | S245.034 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | <p>The Ministry is supportive of the inclusion of policy SETZ-P1 as it identifies those activities which are considered appropriate and complementary to be located within the Settlement Zone, such as educational facilities.</p> <p>Educational facilities tend to be located in environments which have a growing population and can support role growth. In some cases, educational facilities may also be required within the Settlement Zone.</p> | Retain as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O1 | S245.035 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry acknowledges that the primary purpose of the General Rural Zone is to provide for primary production and compatible activities. The Ministry is supportive of the inclusion of Objective GRUZ-O1 as it provides for a range of activities, which includes | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | educational facilities, which may have an operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone. | |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P1 | S245.036 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports the inclusion of this policy as the Ministry may have an operational need to establish educational facilities in General Rural Zone to support existing rural communities. | Retain as notified. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-P1 | S245.037 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry support TCZ-P1 as it provides for compatible activities within the Town Centre Zone, which includes educational facilities. | Retain as notified. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-R9 | S245.038 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports the permitted activity standard for educational facilities in the Town Centre Zone. | Retain as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-P3 | S245.039 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports the establishment of educational facilities in the General Industrial Zone where there is an operational need (e.g. forklift driver training). | Retain as notified. |
| OSZ - Open Space Zone | OSZ-O1 | S245.040 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports the purpose of the Open Space Zone being used for recreational activities and other associated facilities to support such activities (e.g. educational facilities for outdoor educational activities) | Retain as notified. |
| OSZ - Open Space Zone | OSZ-P3 | S245.041 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports this policy as it provides for activities which have an operational need to be established in the Open Space Zone, such as educational facilities for outdoor educational activities. | Retain as notified. |
| SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ-O1 | S245.042 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports the purpose of the Sport and Active Recreation Zone being used for recreational activities and other associated facilities to support such activities (e.g. educational facilities for outdoor educational activities). | Retain as notified. |
| SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ-P3 | S245.043 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports this policy as it provides for activities which have an operational need to be established in the Sport and Active Recreation Zone, such as educational facilities for outdoor educational activities. | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-P2 | S245.044 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports the inclusion of clause (h) which provides for the development of additional infrastructure (including schools) to support the future community as the area develops | Retain as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R17 | S245.045 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports the permitted activity standards to provide for educational facilities in the Māori Purpose zone to support communities in the area. | Retain as notified. |
| Planning Maps | Designations | S245.046 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support | The Ministry supports all designations listed in the plan's designation chapter and shown in the plan maps. | Retain as notified. |
| Designations | MEDU - Minister of Education | S245.047 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support in part | The Ministry requests that the name of Gladstone School (MEDU-C-02) is amended to Gladstone School (Masterton). | Amend to be 'Gladstone School (Masterton)' |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S245.053 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support in part | 'Educational activities' is not a defined term under the plan. The Ministry requests that council amend 'educational activities' to 'educational facilities.' A consistent term and definition should be used throughout the plan. | Amend definition for 'Noise Sensitive Activity' as follows: Means: a. Any habitable room in a residential unit (including visitor accommodation and retirement accommodation); b. Any educational activity facilities (teaching areas and sleeping rooms only);... |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O3 | S245.054 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support in part | The Ministry is supportive of objective UDF-O4 as it identifies that urban development and growth is integrated with the efficient provision, including timing and funding, of schools. However, the Ministry requests that 'school' used in the objective is amended to educational facilities as this is a defined term in the PWCDP. | Amend UFD-O3 as follows: Infrastructure Capacity Urban growth and development is integrated with the efficient provision, including the timing and funding, of infrastructure, schools educational facilities , and open spaces. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S16 | S245.055 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support in part | The NPS-UD requires Tier 1, 2 and 3 territorial authorities to remove any minimum car parking requirement in their District Plans (see subpart 8 - section 3.38). An Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) is often supplied | Amend TR-S16 to remove educational facilities and associated parking requirements from Table TR-9. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | through the Notice of Requirement process when the Ministry establishes new schools. The ITA can determine the appropriate need for parking on each school site. | |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-S3 | S245.056 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Oppose | The Ministry seeks an amendment to this rule to exclude educational facilities. The Ministry have their own acoustic treatment requirements specific to school uses that ensure children have a quite productive classroom environment and can reduce effects on reverse sensitivity. | Amend NOISE-S3 as follows: Noise insulation standards for noise sensitive activities in Zones (excluding educational facilities) Note: Educational facilities designated by the Ministry of Education are excluded from NOISE-S3 as the Ministry of Education has their own noise insulation requirements. ... |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R13 | S245.057 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support in part | The Ministry considers that educational facilities should be provided for in this zone as educational facilities are considered essential social infrastructure and therefore supports the Restricted Discretionary status. | Amend GRZ-R13 as follows: Educational facilities 1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Note: This does not apply to childcare home businesses (refer Home business). Matters of discretion: 1. Whether the activity is compatible with the character of the surrounding neighbourhood. 2. The intensity and scale of the activity and adverse effects on the amenity of neighbouring properties and the surrounding neighbourhood. 3. Whether the activity is appropriately located on the site. 4. Topography, site orientation, and planting. 5. The effects on the safe, effective, and efficient functioning of the transport network, site access, parking, servicing, and traffic generation, including safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and other road |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | <p>users, including a safe pick up and drop off area. 6. Methods to mitigate noise for outdoor facilities. 7. The relevant matters contained in the Residential Design Guide. 8. The effect of non-compliance with the relevant standard that and the matters of discretion of any standard that is not met.</p> <p>1. The effects on the streetscape and amenity 2. Scale, design, layout and setbacks 3. Onsite landscaping and amenity 4. Adverse effects on the safe, efficient and effective operation of the road network</p> |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-R9 | S245.058 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support in part | Ministry supports the inclusion of this provision to manage the operation of educational facilities within the Settlement Zone. The Ministry requests that the matters of discretion be altered to ensure that the consideration of effects is appropriately limited to matters of relevance. | <p>Educational Facility</p> <p>1. Activity Status: Permitted ...</p> <p>Matters of discretion: 1. Whether the activity is compatible with the character of the surrounding neighbourhood. 2. The intensity and scale of the activity and adverse effect on the amenity of nearby neighbouring properties and the surrounding neighbourhood, including: i. privacy and cumulative effects of other nearby non-residential activities, including noise; ii. hours of operation; iii. loss of landscaping; and iv. methods to mitigate noise for outdoor facilities. 3. Topography, site orientation, and planting. 4. The adverse effects on traffic generation, road safety, parking,</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | <p>access, and a safe pick-up and drop-off area, and extent to which the activity internalises adverse effects on the safe and efficient functioning of the transport network, as evidenced by a supporting Integrated Traffic Assessment. 5. The extent of impervious surfaces and landscaping. 6. Whether the activity is appropriately located on the site or whether the activity can be better located in a nearby centre or within walking distance to a nearby centre. 7. Infrastructure requirements. 8. The effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard and the matters of discretion of any standard that is not met</p> <p>1. The effects on the streetscape and amenity 2. Scale, design, layout and setbacks 3. Onsite landscaping and amenity 4. Adverse effects on the safe, efficient and effective operation of the road network</p> |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O2 | S245.059 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support in part | The Ministry request that the word 'schools' is replaced with 'educational facilities' to as educational facilities is defined under the PWCDP. | Amend GRUZ-O2 as follows: Rural character and amenity The predominant character and amenity values of the General Rural Zone are maintained and enhanced, which include: ... 2. sparsely developed landscape with open space between buildings that are predominantly used for agricultural, pastoral and horticultural activities (e.g. barns and sheds), low density rural living (e.g. farmhouses, worker's cottages, and a small |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | degree of rural lifestyle), and community activities (e.g. rural halls, domains, and schools-educational facilities); |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R18 | S245.060 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Oppose | Educational facilities should be enabled in this zone as educational facilities are considered essential social infrastructure. The Ministry requests a new rule be inserted that specifically enable educational facilities as a restricted discretionary activity This will allow the Ministry to better service the social and economic wellbeing within the rural areas of the district. Matters of discretion should be limited to matters of relevance. | Delete GRUZ-R18 and replace with new provisions as follows: GRUZ-RX Educational Facility Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary Activity Note: This does not apply to childcare home businesses (refer Home business). Matters of discretion: 1. The effects on the streetscape and amenity 2. Scale, design, layout and setbacks 3. Onsite landscaping and amenity 4. Adverse effects on the safe, efficient and effective operation of the road network 5. Potential reverse sensitivity effects on rural production activities and any proposed mitigation |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-O3 | S245.062 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support in part | The Ministry has an obligation to provide educational facilities to existing communities in both rural and residential zones. If there is a community large enough in the Rural Lifestyle Zone, educational facilities should be enabled to support those communities. Objective RLZ-O3 and Policy RLZ-P1 should be amended to reflect that. Should the relief sought be accepted in point S245.064, then the proposed amendments in this submission points and S245.063 are not necessary. | Amend RLZ-O3 as follows: Enable compatible activities Residential activities, light primary production activities, ancillary activities and educational facilities that are compatible with the character and amenity values of the Rural Lifestyle Zone are provided for. |
| RLZ - Rural | RLZ-P1 | S245.063 | Ministry of Education Te | Support in part | The Ministry has an obligation to provide educational facilities to existing communities in both rural and residential zones. If there is | Amend RLZ-P1 as follows: Appropriate activities Enable residential activities, primary |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| Lifestyle Zone | | | Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | | <p>a community large enough in the Rural Lifestyle Zone, educational facilities should be enabled to support those communities. Objective RLZ-O3 and Policy RLZ-P1 should be amended to reflect that.</p> <p>Should the relief sought be accepted in point S245.064, then the proposed amendments in this submission points and S245.062 are not necessary.</p> | production, and ancillary activities and educational facilities that are compatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the Rural Lifestyle Zone. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-R16 | S245.064 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Oppose | <p>Educational facilities should be enabled in this zone as they are considered essential social infrastructure. The Ministry requests a new rule be inserted that specifically enables educational facilities as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. This will allow the Ministry to better service the growth within the rural areas of the district and support the local communities' needs.</p> | <p>Delete RLZ-R16 and replace with a new provision as follows: RLZ-RX Educational Facility Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary Activity Note: This does not apply to childcare home businesses (refer Home business). Matters of discretion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The effects on the streetscape and amenity 2. Scale, design, layout and setbacks 3. Onsite landscaping and amenity 4. Adverse effects on the safe, efficient and effective operation of the road network 5. Potential reverse sensitivity effects on rural production activities and any proposed mitigation |
| NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone | NCZ-O1 | S245.065 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support in part | <p>The Ministry supports the Neighbourhood Centre Zone providing for community activities. However, the Ministry requests that complementary and compatible non-residential activities which have an operational need to be in the Neighbourhood Centre zone, such as educational facilities, are enabled. Consider the proposed relief.</p> | <p>Amend NCZ-O1 as follows: Purpose of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone The Neighbourhood Centre Zone provides for a limited range of small-scale commercial and community activities and educational facilities that service the needs of the immediate residential neighbourhood.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone | NCZ-P1 | S245.066 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support in part | <p>The Ministry supports the Neighbourhood Centre Zone providing for activities compatible with the purpose of the Zone. Educational facilities should be included under compatible activities.</p> <p>Also NCZ-P1 references the Town Centre Zone. The Ministry seek clarification that this should say 'Neighbourhood Centre Zone'.</p> | <p>Amend NCZ-P1 as follows: Compatible use and development Allow use and development that is compatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone, where: ...</p> <p>4. the activity is not of a scale and nature that it would undermine the purpose, function, and amenity values of the Town Centre Zone Neighbourhood Centre Zone. Compatible activities may include the following (where they can meet the above criteria):</p> <p>a. Food and beverage activities; b. Retail activities; c. Educational facilities; d. Healthcare activities; and e. Residential activities</p> |
| NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone | NCZ-R12 | S245.067 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Oppose | <p>The Ministry opposes the Discretionary activity status for educational facilities in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone and requests the change to Restricted Discretionary. It is important to locate educational facilities near places of employment as well as residential communities.</p> | <p>Amend activity status as follows: Educational facilities Activity status: Discretionary Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. The effects on the streetscape and amenity 2. Scale, design, layout and setbacks 3. Onsite landscaping and amenity 4. Adverse effects on the safe, efficient and effective operation of the road network</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-O1 | S245.068 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support in part | The Ministry requests that complementary and compatible nonresidential activities which have an operational need to be in the Mixed Use zone, such as educational facilities, are enabled. Consider the proposed relief. | Amend MUZ-O1 as follows: Purpose of the Mixed Use Zone The Mixed Use Zone provides a compatible mixture of residential, commercial, light industrial, recreational, educational and community activities. |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-P1 | S245.069 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support in part | The Ministry supports the inclusion of MUZ-P1, to allow use and development of activities that are compatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the Mixed Used Zone. However, requests that compatible activities include educational facilities. MUZ-P1 references the Town Centre Zone. The Ministry seek clarification that this should say 'Mixed Use Zone' instead. | Amend as follows: Compatible use and development Allow use and development that is compatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the Mixed Used Zone, where: ... 3. the activity is not of a scale and nature that it would undermine the purpose, function, and amenity values of the Mixed Use Zone Town Centre Zone . Compatible activities may include the following (where they can meet the above criteria): a. residential activities consistent with MUZ- P3 b. healthcare activities; c. visitor accommodations; d. community facilities; e. trade suppliers; and f. recreation activities; and g. educational facilities. |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-R12 | S245.070 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Oppose | The Ministry opposes the Discretionary activity status for educational facilities in the Mixed Use Zone and requests this be changed to Restricted Discretionary to enable educational facilities in the Mixed Use Zone. | Amend activity status as follows: Educational Facilities Activity status: Discretionary Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. The effects on the streetscape and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | amenity; 2. Design and layout; 3. Scale of the activity and hours of operation; 4. Onsite landscaping and amenity; 5. Adverse effects on the safe, efficient and effective operation of the road network; and |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-O1 | S245.071 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support in part | The Ministry support TCZ-O1 as it enables community activities within the Town Centre Zone. However, the Ministry requests the inclusion of educational facilities, which will serve the immediate and local community and will better reflect TCZ-R9. Consider the proposed relief. | Amend TCZ-O1 as follows: Purpose of the Town Centre Zone Town centres are the principal focal point of a community and provide vibrant areas where a range of appropriately scaled commercial, community, cultural, educational , and recreational activities are enabled. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-O3 | S245.072 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support in part | The Ministry supports that the role and function of the industrial zone should be supported by industrial and other compatible activities. However, the Ministry considers educational facilities (e.g. forklift driver training) to have an operational need in the General Industrial Zone. Consider the proposed relief. This supports GIZP3 in the proposed district plan. | Amend as follows: Protection of General Industrial Zone The role and function of the General Industrial Zone is not compromised by non-industrial or incompatible activities, unless they have an operational need to be located within the zone. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-P5 | S245.073 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support in part | The Ministry supports that the role and function of the industrial zone, but considers educational facilities to have an operational need in the General Industrial Zone. Consider the proposed relief. | Amend as follows: Sensitive activities Restrict activities that could be sensitive to the effects of industrial activities from being located within, or in proximity to, the General Industrial Zone, unless they have an operational need to be located within the zone. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-O1 | S245.074 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Support in part | <p>The Ministry considers that educational facilities should be provided for around existing communities and where there is potential for a population to develop.</p> <p>The Ministry uses the designation process to reserve land for future schools. Therefore, the Ministry requests that 'additional infrastructure'(which includes schools) is added to FUZ-O1 to recognise the importance of enabling FUZ land to be supported by educational facilities as the area urbanises. This addition to FUZ-O1 will support clause (h) in FUZ-P2.</p> | Amend as follows: Purpose of the Future Urban Zone The Future Urban Zone enables existing uses and ensures that inappropriate subdivision and development does not compromise the efficient and effective transition from rural to urban environments and any necessary development of strategic three waters, and transport infrastructure, and additional infrastructure. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | New provision request | S245.075 | Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga | Amend | Educational facilities have not been provided for as an activity in the Future Urban Zone. For activities not otherwise listed in the chapter (FUZR14), the activity status is Discretionary. Educational facilities should be provided for as a Restricted Discretionary activity. | Add new provision to FUZ as follows: Educational Facility Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Note: This does not apply to childcare home businesses (refer Home business). Matters of discretion: 1. The effects on the streetscape and amenity 2. Design and layout 3. Scale of the activity and hours of operation 4. Onsite landscaping and amenity 5. Adverse effects on the safe, efficient and effective operation of the road network |
| Introduction | Foreword | S174.001 | Monique Leerschool | Amend | Consider the question "What should Wairarapa of tomorrow look like?" is not answered with a succinct overall vision in the proposed Wairarapa Plan. A clear vision statement needs to be added like this proposed vision statement. | Amend Foreword: Wairarapa of tomorrow provides national leadership in supporting economic generative farming practices, effective native biodiversity protection, and resilient and thriving community life. |
| Strategic Direction | NE-O1 | S174.002 | Monique Leerschool | Amend | Notes indigenous biodiversity in New Zealand has been reported to be in a general state of crises, including in the Wairarapa. Considers | Amend NE-O1: The natural environment, especially the indigenous biodiversity, is |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | District Councils need to be more proactive about managing and protecting indigenous biodiversity, including as a land owner in all the areas they own, such as parks, reserves, water supply areas and plantations. The Wairarapa Plan needs to signal this intention more clearly. | proactively managed and protected. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | Introduction | S174.003 | Monique Leerschool | Support | Notes indigenous biodiversity in New Zealand has been reported to be in a general state of crises, including in the Wairarapa. It's endemic biodiversity is unique and needs to be protected so that future generations can enjoy it as well. | Retain ECO-Introduction as notified. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S174.004 | Monique Leerschool | Amend | Concerned that the proposed Natural Open Spaces Zones only cover a fraction of the whole Wairarapa area. In order to manage and protect our indigenous biodiversity and natural heritage effectively, more areas and a larger part of the Wairarapa need to be zoned as Natural Open Spaces. | Amend the planning maps to increase the extent of the Natural Open Space Zone. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | New provision request | S174.005 | Monique Leerschool | Amend | Requests more future-proofed opportunities would be available by rezoning from a General Rural Zone to a Natural Open Space with its main function to regenerate indigenous biodiversity and support community recreation. | Insert provisions to facilitate rezoning General Rural Zone land to Natural Open Space Zone. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | Introduction | S21.001 | Murray Hemi | Support | Ensure wording and purpose of the zone is clear and consistent. | Amend the introduction (paragraph 2) to align with MPZ-P1. 'Other activities that support and/or are compatible with Māori Purpose Activities are anticipated in this zone, such as small-scale offices, commercial , and general retail activities.' |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-P3 | S21.002 | Murray Hemi | Support | Make it clear that effects can impact both ways from MPZ on to an adjoining zone and from an adjoining zone on to a MPZ. | Amend MPZ-P3. 'Avoid land use and development, including industrial and commercial activities, in adjacent zones to the Māori Purpose Zone , that are |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | incompatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the Māori Purpose Zone.' |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-P4 | S21.003 | Murray Hemi | Support | The submitter requests that council ensure it is clear that effects can impact both ways from an MPZ on to an adjoining zone and from an adjoining zone on to a MPZ. | Amend MPZ-P4 to 'Maintain the character and amenity of the Māori Purpose Zone and mitigate adverse effects from adjoining properties associated with land use activities and development adjacent to the Māori Purpose Zone....' |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S21.004 | Murray Hemi | Support | If MPZ are to include all Maori freehold land held under the Te Ture Whenua Maori Act (TTWMA) then that data needs to accurate. The WCDP map data provided needs to reflect Maori land with complete accuracy not just for MPZ purposes but in order that the entire plan functions appropriately around the MPZs. | Amend mapping to include all TTWMA land block data. This map needs to be reconciled with the Maori Land Court data. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S128.001 | Nelson Francis Rangi | Not Stated | Part Papawai DCOB Parcel 3823308 (Maori owned land) is subject to an exchange between owners and SWDC to allow for legal access to Council-owned land. At the time of the exchange it is intended to create an Ahu Whenua Trust of the descendants of the strip owners (all deceased) to protect the ownership of the exchange land. This submission gives notice that in the event that some under-employed council or other authority officer attempts to rezone the exchange land as rateable, the Ahu Whenua Trustees will vehemently oppose any such attempt. | Amend so the Part Papawai DCOB Parcel 3823308, following exchange with SWDC, be non-rateable Ahu Whenua. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S225.001 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support | This definition excludes temporary military training activities from the definition of significant hazardous facilities. This is appropriate as military training activities are materially different from the other activities listed. | Retain definition for 'Significant hazardous facility' as notified |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Interpretation | Definitions | S225.002 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support | The definition includes 'temporary military training activities'. This is supported as TMTA are non-repetitive and transient in nature. | Retain definition for 'Temporary Activities' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S225.003 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support | This definition identifies military training activities as separate from other temporary activities, which is appropriate. This definition is consistent with the definition included in the National Planning Standards. | Retain definition for 'temporary military training activity' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S225.004 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support in part | This definition has the same meaning as in section 2 of the RMA. NZDF requests the addition of 'national defence facilities' which constitute nationally significant infrastructure and should be recognised and provided for in the definition of infrastructure. | Amend the definition of 'infrastructure' to include 'national defence facilities'. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S225.005 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support | It is appropriate to define noise sensitive activities to help guide interpretation of objectives, policies and rules. The definition captures the relevant activities. | Retain definition for 'noise sensitive activities' as drafted. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S225.006 | New Zealand Defence Force | Amend | NZDF does not operate any sites within the three Districts. However, NZDF sites elsewhere in New Zealand are often subject to reverse sensitivity issues, due to encroaching residential development. Therefore, it is important that 'reverse sensitivity' is defined in the plan (acknowledging also that the term is used throughout the proposed plan). It is noted that a definition was included in the draft plan but has been removed in the proposed plan. | Add definition for 'reverse sensitivity' (as provided in the draft plan) |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S225.007 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support | It is appropriate that buildings and structures associated with temporary activities (which includes TMTA) are included within this definition. | Retain 'NH-Natural Hazards: Less hazard sensitive activities' definition as notified. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-R2 | S225.008 | New Zealand Defence Force | Oppose | The rule is currently very limiting. If an activity is not specifically identified, then a resource consent is required (even if the scale and effects are the same as an identified activity). | Amend ECO-R2 to provide a permitted threshold (e.g. 50m ³ as per the existing threshold which currently only applies to 'reasonable personal use'). |
| ASW - Activities | ASW-R1 | S225.009 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support in part | NZDF assumes the intent of this rule is to require activities such as tourist jet boat tours | Retain ASW-R1 rule as drafted, subject to confirmation that temporary military training |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| on the Surface of Water | | | | | to obtain resource consent (under ASW-R3). Our interpretation is that the use of commercial or recreational motorised craft on water and TMTA involving the use of motorised craft on water are permitted under this rule. | activities involving the use of motorised craft on water are permitted under this rule. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-R2 | S225.010 | New Zealand Defence Force | Oppose | Regional plans typically manage structures in, on or over the bed of lakes and rivers. This is unnecessary duplication that may mean consent is required with Regional and Local Councils for the same activity. If the rule is retained, the existing permitted activity threshold is very limiting e.g. for temporary structures associated with TMTA. | Delete ASW-R2. As secondary relief, seeks ASW-R2 be amended to make an exemption for temporary structures. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P5 | S225.011 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support | This policy provides direction that less hazard sensitive activities (i.e., buildings and structures associated with temporary activities) should be enabled in all hazard areas. Given their lower risk this is appropriate. | Retain NH-P5 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R2 | S225.012 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support in part | TMTA may require the placement of temporary buildings and structures in flood hazard areas to enable realistic training. It is appropriate that these temporary structures are provided for as a permitted activity. | Amend Rule NH-R2 as follows: ... a. Any buildings must not be located in the overlandflowpath or river corridor of the flood hazard overlays, with the exception of temporary buildings associated with temporary military training activities. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-R1 | S225.013 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support | TMTA may require the placement of temporary buildings and structures in the coastal environment to enable training exercises such as beach landings. As such this rule is supported by the inclusion of TMTA as a permitted activity. | Retain CE-R1 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-O1 | S225.014 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support | NZDF supports the recognition of reverse sensitivity as an issue for noise generating activities, the enabling of noise-generating activities in appropriate areas and the provision for noise generating activities where effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Recognition of the benefits of activities that | Retain NOISE-O1 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | generate noise is also supported (noting TMTA contribute directly to public health, safety and wellbeing). | |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-O2 | S225.015 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support | NZDF supports the recognition of reverse sensitivity as an issue for noise generating activities, the enabling of noise-generating activities in appropriate areas and the provision for noise generating activities where effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Recognition of the benefits of activities that generate noise is also supported (noting TMTA contribute directly to public health, safety and wellbeing). | Retain NOISE-O2 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P1 | S225.016 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support | NZDF supports the recognition of reverse sensitivity as an issue for noise generating activities, the enabling of noise-generating activities in appropriate areas and the provision for noise generating activities where effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Recognition of the benefits of activities that generate noise is also supported (noting TMTA contribute directly to public health, safety and wellbeing). | Retain NOISE-P1 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P2 | S225.017 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support | NZDF supports the recognition of reverse sensitivity as an issue for noise generating activities, the enabling of noise-generating activities in appropriate areas and the provision for noise generating activities where effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Recognition of the benefits of activities that generate noise is also supported (noting TMTA contribute directly to public health, safety and wellbeing). | Retain NOISE-P2 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P7 | S225.018 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support | This policy acknowledges and recognises the importance of TMTA to the community and provides for TMTA subject to appropriate noise standards. | Retain NOISE-P7 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | Introduction | S225.019 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support in part | NZDF supports this exclusion but notes that emergency response and training activities are by necessity regularly undertaken outside of emergency service facilities. This is required to respond to an emergency, or for | Amend subsection h of Rules as follows: h. Activities at emergency service facilities associated with emergency response and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | training to ensure that responders are adequately trained in 'real world' situations to be able to respond. | emergency response training; |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-R8 | S225.020 | New Zealand Defence Force | Oppose | This rule appears to require resource consent for any helicopter landing. This is unduly onerous including for helicopter landings associated with TMTA which would occur on a very limited number of occasions. | Amend NOISE-R8 to provide for helicopter landings on a District-wide basis subject to limits on the number of landings. As secondary relief, amend NOISE-R8 to clarify that the rule does not apply to one-off or a very limited number of helicopter landings within any particular area. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-R11 | S225.021 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support in part | NZDF have recently developed an alternative approach to noise standards, applying to both stationary or mobile noise sources. | Replace NOISE-R11.1 (and NOISE-S2.8) with NZDF's updated standards (refer to original submission for full table). Noise from stationary or mobile noise sources Time 7.00am - 10.00pm 55dBA LAeq(15 min) Time 10.00pm - 7.00am 45dBA LAeq(15 min), 75dBA LAFmax Where the noise limits for zones in NOISE-S1 are higher, then those higher limits shall apply. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-R11 | S225.022 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support in part | NZDF acknowledges that this reflects the provisions it sought through the draft district plan feedback process. While NZDF supports these provisions, it has recently developed an alternative approach which Council may wish to consider. | Replace NOISE-R11.2 with NZDF's updated standards and amalgamate with Noise-R11.1 so there is only one rule that applies to noise from stationary or mobile noise sources. Noise from stationary or mobile noise sources Time 7.00am - 10.00pm 55dBA LAeq(15 min) Time 10.00pm - 7.00am 45dBA LAeq(15 min), 75dBA LAFmax Where the noise limits for zones in NOISE-S1 are higher, then those higher limits shall apply. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------|---|--|
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-R11 | S225.023 | New Zealand Defence Force | Oppose | NZDF has sought independent expert advice to develop noise standards that appropriately manage adverse noise effects from TMTA, such that they can be a permitted activity in all zones. The current approach is not consistent with the approach to the emission of noise from airblasts (NOISE-R3) and the emission of noise from bird scaring devices (NOISE-R4) in the proposed plan notwithstanding the nature of the noise and effects are similar. | <p>Delete NOISE-R11.3 and replace with NZDF's proposed standards which have been specifically developed to manage the noise effects of weapons firing and the use of explosive across all zones in a district. Delete standards a. to d. and replace with the following: Temporary military training activities involving weapons firing and/or the use of explosives a. Notice is provided to the Council at least 5 working days prior to the commencement of the activity. b. The activity complies with the following minimum separation distances to the notional boundary of any building housing a noise sensitive activity: i. 0700 to 1900 hours: 500m ii. 1900 to 0700 hours: 1,250m c. Where the minimum separation distances specified above cannot be met, then the activity shall comply with the following peak sound pressure level when measured at the notional boundary of any building housing a noise sensitive activity: 0700 to 1900 hours: 95 dBC 1900 to 0700 hours: 85 dBC</p> <p>And provide for TMTA involving the use of weapons and explosives as a permitted activity across all zones (similar to Rules NOISE-R3 and R4).</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------|--|---|
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-R11 | S225.024 | New Zealand Defence Force | Oppose | TMTA are essential activities with local and national benefits and are undertaken to meet statutory purposes under the Defence. NZDF needs certainty that TMTA can be undertaken which is better provided by a controlled activity status. Effects can be controlled through appropriate conditions of resource consent if PA standards cannot be met. | Amend NOISE-R11 to replace the 'restricted discretionary' activity status with 'controlled'. Amend the matters of discretion (or control) in NOISE-R11.4. to be consistent with other rules (e.g. NOISE-R5.2 and R6.2) and to more appropriately respond to the nature and effects of the activity. Matters of discretion: ... 3. Whether the noise levels are likely to cause alarm or adversely affect the character and amenity values of the location and adjacent activities. 4. Any management and mitigation of the noise proposed, in accordance with a best practicable option approach (e.g. site layout and design, design and location of structures, buildings and equipment and the timing of operations, communication and engagement with surrounding properties), including: i. The extent to which alternative locations and methods have been considered to avoid, or mitigate any adverse effects, recognising the practical constraints associated with temporary military training activities; and ii. The ability to mitigate adverse effects through the imposition of conditions. 5. The positive effects of the activity including on the health, safety and wellbeing of people and communities. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-R11 | S225.025 | New Zealand Defence Force | Oppose | NZDF has obtained independent expert advice to develop noise standards that appropriately manage adverse noise effects from TMTA, such that they can be a permitted activity in all zones. Through the implementation of the standards, zonebased resource consent triggers, such as in the proposed plan, are not required. | Delete NOISE-R11.5 and replace with NZDF's proposed standards set out above which have been specifically developed to manage the noise effects of weapons firing and the use of explosive across all zones: Temporary military training activities involving weapons firing and/or the use of explosives . Notice is provided to the Council at least 5 working days prior to the commencement of the activity. b. The activity complies with the following minimum separation distances to the notional boundary of any building housing a noise sensitive activity: i. 0700 to 1900 hours: 500m ii. 1900 to 0700 hours: 1,250m c. Where the minimum separation distances specified above cannot be met, then the activity shall comply with the following peak sound pressure level when measured at the notional boundary of any building housing a noise sensitive activity: 0700 to 1900 hours: 95 dBC 1900 to 0700 hours: 85 dBC |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-S2 | S225.026 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support in part | NZDF acknowledges that this reflects the provisions it sought through the draft district plan feedback process. While NZDF supports these provisions, it has recently developed an alternative approach which Council may wish to consider. | Delete NOISE-S2.8 and replace it with: Noise from stationary or mobile noise sources Time 7.00am - 10.00pm 55dBA LAeq(15 min) Time 10.00pm - 7.00am 45dBA LAeq(15 min), 75dBA |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | LAFmax Where the noise limits for zones in NOISE-S1 are higher, then those higher limits shall apply. |
| TEMP - Temporary Activities | TEMP-O1 | S225.027 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support | It is important to recognise the benefits of temporary activities. | Retain TEMP-O1 as notified. |
| TEMP - Temporary Activities | TEMP-P1 | S225.028 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support | It is important to recognise the minor adverse effects of temporary activities and to enable them. | Retain TEMP-P1 as notified. |
| TEMP - Temporary Activities | TEMP-R6 | S225.029 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support | It is appropriate that TMTA are provided for as a permitted activity in all zones. | Retain TEMP-R6.1 as notified. |
| TEMP - Temporary Activities | TEMP-R6 | S225.030 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support in part | The restricted discretionary activity status is supported with a suggested amendment to matter of discretion 2. NZDF typically provides notice to surrounding properties regardless of whether or not they are considered to be 'adversely affected'. | Amend TEMP-R6.2: ... Matters of discretion: ... 2. The provision of information about the activity to surrounding properties including information on that may be affected by any adverse effects generated by the activity... |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S187.001 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Oppose | More consistency is being sought nationally regarding definitions in regulatory documents. A number of Council's have adopted the term 'frost fan' with the same or similar definitions and is also the term used in the horticultural industry. | Delete all references to frost protection devices and replace with frost fans . |
| Planning Maps | Specific Controls | S187.002 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support | The Martinborough Soils Overlay generally aligns with 'land with highly productive characteristics' including climate, soils and other factors which consistent with the criteria set out in 3.4(3) of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. | Retain Martinborough Soils overlay as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S187.003 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support | The definition appropriately gives effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. | Retain definition for Highly Productive Land as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Interpretation | Definitions | S187.004 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support | The definition appropriately gives effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly productive Land. | Retain definition for Land based primary production as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S187.005 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support in part | The definition is generally supported but would benefit from clarity when used in the Natural Hazard rule framework. The addition of fences, machinery and equipment for land based primary production to the definition both recognises the appropriate level of sensitivity to natural hazards of those structures and their impact on the effects of natural hazards. | Amend the definition for Less hazard sensitive activities as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission: Less hazard sensitive activities means activities that are less sensitive to natural hazards, which are: a. Accessory buildings used for non-habitable purposes; b. Park management activity; and c. Buildings and structures associated with temporary activities; and d. Fences, machinery and equipment for land based primary production. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S187.006 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support | The definition appropriately gives effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. | Retain the definition for productive capacity as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S187.007 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Amend | More consistency is being sought nationally regarding definitions in regulatory documents. A number of Council's have adopted the term 'frost fan' with the same or similar definitions and is also the term used in the horticultural industry. | Insert new definition 'Frost Fan' as follows: Frost Fan - means a land based device designed or adapted to mitigate frost damage by fanning warmer air over potentially frost affected surfaces and includes; a. Fan blades; b. Motive source; c. Support structure/tower d. Plinth e. Associated probes and communications and networking devices |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S187.008 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Amend | A definition of 'land with highly productive characteristics' to support the introduction of the Martinborough Soils Overlay that is consistent with the matters set out in cl3.4(3) | Insert new definition for 'Land with highly productive characteristics' as follows: Land with highly productive characteristics means land that has or has the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land is appropriate. | potential to be highly productive for land based primary production with its combination of the following characteristics; a. Soil type, and b. Physical characteristics of the land and soil, and c. Climate |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S187.009 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Amend | The provision is appropriate and necessary to measure sound appropriately as set out in section 6.3 of the New Zealand Standard 6802:2008 Acoustics - Environmental Noise and will be required for clarity for the framework in the Proposed District Plan. | Insert new definition for 'Special Audible Characteristic' as follows: Special audible characteristic Has the same meaning as 'special audible characteristic' in section 6.3 of New Zealand Standard 6802:2008 Acoustics - Environmental Noise. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S187.010 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Amend | The definition of 'reverse sensitivity' is narrow and only applies in circumstances where activities are established and more sensitive activities establish later. | Insert new definition for 'Sensitivity effects' as follows: Sensitivity effects means the vulnerable potential for the operation of a not yet established activity or an amended activity, that is prioritised in its location above other activities sensitive to its actual or potential effects, to be compromised, constrained, or curtailed by the presence or establishment or alteration of another activity which may be sensitive to the actual, potential or perceived adverse effects generated by the prioritised activity. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Strategic Direction | RE-O1 | S187.011 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support | The proposed is an appropriate objective and supports land based primary production and the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. | Retain as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O2 | S187.012 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support in part | While the objective is generally supported, it is the resources of the zone and their productive capacity, not the zone itself, that should be available for primary production to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. | Amend RE-O2 as follows: RE-O2 Productive Capacity The productive land resources of the General Rural Zone remains available for primary production and their productive capacity is maintained. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O3 | S187.013 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support in part | The Objective should include the matters set out in 3.4(3) of the National Policy Statement as they have a strong relationship to the Wairarapa and the Martinborough Soils Overlay in particular. | Amend Re-O3 as follows: RE-O3 Highly productive land and land with highly productive characteristics Highly productive land and land with highly productive characteristics is protected and prioritised for use in land based primary production, both now and for future generations. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O4 | S187.014 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support in part | Objective should refer to amenity as well as character. In particular this will address the conflicts of uses with differing amenity expectations. | Amend Re-O4 as follows: RE-O4 Character and amenity of the rural environment The character and amenity of the rural environment is maintained and or enhanced |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O5 | S187.015 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support in part | It is not just the location of lifestyle of primary production that creates conflict; it is the design, construction and use. This is a vital part of managing sensitivity effects and giving effect to the NPSHPL. | Amend RE-O5 as follows: Rural Lifestyle Opportunities for rural lifestyle subdivision and development are only provided in parts of the rural environment and associated use is located, designed and constructed |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | where they in a manner which does not conflict with enabling primary production and protecting the productive capacity of land. |
| ENG - Energy | Introduction | S187.016 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support in part | The conflict with land based primary production and highly productive land in the Wairarapa context is significant enough that it should be identified. | Amend introduction as follows:By their nature, there is tensions between other competing land uses, in particular primary production, including on Highly Productive Land and land with highly productive characteristics. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-O1 | S187.017 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support | Objective is appropriate. | Retain ENG-O1 as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-O2 | S187.018 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support | Objective is appropriate. | Retain as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-O3 | S187.019 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support | Objective is appropriate. | Retain as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P2 | S187.020 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support | Policy is appropriate. | Retain as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P3 | S187.021 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support in part | Provision should be expanded to include land with highly productive characteristics as consistent with the matters set out in cl3.4(3) of the NPSHPL. | Amend ENG-P3 as follows:d. the ability to protect the productive capacity of highly productive land, and land with highly productive characteristics; ... |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R4 | S187.022 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support in part | The provision should be expanded to include land with highly productive characteristics as consistent with the matters set out in cl3.4(3) of the NPSHPL. | Amend ENG-R4 as follows:ix. Highly productive land and land with highly productive characteristics. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R6 | S187.023 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support in part | Does not currently provide for new 'specified infrastructure' on Highly Productive Land. An activity status of non-complying is more appropriate. | Insert activity status for large scale renewable electricity generation activities or upgrade of existing large-scale renewable electricity generation activities located on Highly Productive Land or in the Martinborough Soils |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | Overlay as follows: ENG-R6 Large-scale renewable electricity generation activities or upgrade of existing large-scale renewable electricity generation activities General Rural Zone1. Activity Status: Discretionary All other zones2. Activity status: Non-complying Located on Highly Productive Land or in the Martinborough Soils Overlay 3. Activity status: Non-complying |
| TR - Transport | New provision request | S187.024 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Amend | Transport chapter is extremely technical. To provide some clarity and to enable minor works on rural land for the purpose of land based primary production. | Insert new rule as follows: TRAN-RSX Exemption Rural Zones1. the installation of fences, equipment and machinery for land based primary production complying with all other aspects of plan will not require upgrade of existing vehicle crossings to meet TR-S2, TR-S5 - TR-S15. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | Introduction | S187.025 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support in part | The introduction would benefit from additional clarity when used in the Natural Hazard rule framework. The addition of fences, machinery and equipment for land based primary production to the definition both recognises the appropriate level of sensitivity to natural hazards for those matters and also their impact on the effects of natural hazards. | Amend the introduction to include a fifth bullet point as follows:- Fences, machinery and equipment for land based primary production. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P5 | S187.026 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support in part | The policy has an appropriate framework to manage less hazard sensitive activities, subject to minor matters being included in the definition, including fencing, machinery and equipment for land based primary production. | Retain NH-P5 Less hazard sensitive activities in all hazard areas notified subject to the amendment proposed in this submission to the definition of 'less hazard sensitive activities' or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | submission. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R2 | S187.027 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support in part | The addition of fences, machinery and equipment for land based primary production to the rule both recognises the appropriate level of sensitivity to natural hazards for those matters and also their impact on the effects of natural hazards. I | Amend NH-R2 Less hazard sensitive activities within all hazard areas as follows: All Zones1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Any buildings must not be located in the overland flowpath or river corridor of the flood hazard overlays. b. Fences, machinery and equipment used for land based primary production activities are located in any hazard areas. 2. Activity status: Restricted: Restricted discretionaryWhere: a. Compliance is not achieved with NH-R2(1)(a) Matters of discretion:1. the matters in Policy NH-P5. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R5 | S187.028 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support in part | As written, the rule does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. fences, machinery and equipment for land based primary production where this would have no effects or effects are less than minor should be exempt from compliance. | Amend NH-R5 as follows: NH-R5 Earthworks within flood hazard areasAll Zones1. Activity status: PermittedWhere:a. The earthworks are not located in a river corridor or overland flow path. b. The earthworks are solely that necessary for the installation of farm fencing, machinery and equipment for land based primary production. 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where:a. Compliance is not achieved with NH-R5(1) Matters of discretion:1. The matters in |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | Policy NH-P9 |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O1 | S187.029 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support in part | The objective would benefit by addressing additional matters set out in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. In particular the protection of the productive capacity of highly productive land and other land, and also address conflicts between land uses. | Amend SUB-O1 to add: ...g. protects the productive capacity of highly productive land and land with highly productive characteristics; and, h. avoids where possible or otherwise minimises conflicts between land uses. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P5 | S187.030 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support in part | The policy does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land in that land based primary production is not prioritised, merely enabled. | Amend as follows: SUB-P5 Rural character and amenity values of subdivision in the General Rural Zone Provide for subdivision, use, and development where it does not compromise the purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone by: a. enabling and promoting openness and predominance of vegetation; ...c. enabling prioritising primary production and ancillary activities; ... g. retaining a clear delineation including buffers , and contrast between the district's rural areas and urban areas; h. and avoiding, remedying, or mitigating reverse sensitivity effects and land use conflicts arising from the establishment of new and expanded sensitive non-rural activities. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P6 | S187.031 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support in part | The design and construction of a subdivision and its consequent use can be a significant matter as to whether the overall proposal contributes to conflicts of uses and therefore inappropriate. For example, matters such as sealing driveways. | Amend SUB-P6 as follows: ... Avoid subdivision in the General Rural Zone that will result insites that are of a size, scale, or location design and construction that is contrary to the anticipated purpose, character, or amenity values of the zone by: a. limiting small lot subdivision within the General Rural Zone to only areas where the soil resource is fragmented, is not located on highly productive land, and it does not compromise the use of land for primary production activities; and b. and avoiding the cumulative effects associated with small lot subdivision on the productive use and potential within the General Rural Zone; and c. where appropriate, specifying subdivision design and construction requirements and consent notices, to avoid where possible, or otherwise minimise amenity conflicts between uses. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P7 | S187.032 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support in part | The definition of 'reverse sensitivity' is narrow and only applies in circumstances where activities are established and more sensitive activities establish later. The NPSHPL and the Objectives and Policies both support primary production on highly productive land and land with highly productive characteristics generally. In | Amend SUB-P7 as follows: ... d. reverse -sensitivity effects when urban development occurs; e. reverse -sensitivity effects on existing rural activities in adjoining rural zones, or infrastructure; ... |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | circumstances where sensitive activities are established and there is a change from one land based primary production activity to another, for example from pastoral farming to pip fruit, the term 'reverse sensitivity' does not apply | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P8 | S187.033 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support | The policy gives effect to the NPSHPL. | Retain as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R1 | S187.034 | New Zealand Frost Fans | Support | The rule is appropriate and gives effect to the NPSHPL. | Retain as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S8 | S252.001 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports the provisions for relocated buildings across the zones, but opposes the performance bond requirement. Considers a performance bond is not necessary as many councils manage adverse effects of relocatable buildings without them. Considers performance bonds put an unnecessary cost on intended owners, and is not appropriate in terms of section 32 RMA. Seeks removal of transport route requirement and traffic management plans prior to relocating the building. | Amend GRUZ-S8: ... 2. The transportation route and any traffic management plans shall be provided to the Council no later than 10 working days before relocating the building. ... 4. Performance bond. A refundable performance bond of 125% of the cost of external reinstatement works identified in the Building Inspection Report under Performance Standard GRUZ-S8(1) in cash to be lodged with the Council along with application for building consent as a guarantee that external reinstatement works are completed. b. The bond shall be lodged in terms of the form of Deed annexed as Appendix 6 to the District Plan. c. Subject to the provisions of the Deed, the bond will be refunded after the Council has inspected and confirmed compliance with external reinstatement requirements. Note: The Council will in good faith consider the partial release of |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | the bond to the extent that reinstatement works are completed (i.e. on a proportional basis). |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P9 | S252.002 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports provisions relating to relocated buildings, but seeks deletion of reference to performance bonds in the zone policies. Seeks the zone policies be amended and recognise and provide for the positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance the amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. | Amend GRZ-P9 to delete reference to performance bonds, recognise positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S252.003 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Amend | That a new appendix be added to the Plan, being a relocatable building pre-inspection report template (example attached to original submission), and reference to the new appendix added throughout the relevant zone standards. | Insert a new Appendix - Relocatable Building Pre-inspection Report Template. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-S12 | S252.005 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports the provisions for relocated buildings across the zones, but opposes the performance bond requirement. Considers a performance bond is not necessary as many councils manage adverse effects of relocatable buildings without them. Considers performance bonds put an unnecessary cost on intended owners, and is not appropriate in terms of section 32 RMA. Seeks removal of transport route requirement and traffic management plans prior to relocating the building. | Amend GRZ-S12: ... 2. The transportation route and any traffic management plans shall be provided to the Council no later than 10 working days before relocating the building. ... 4. Performance bonds. A refundable performance bond of 125% of the cost of external reinstatement works identified in the Building Inspection Report under Performance Standard GRZ-S12(1) in cash to be lodged with the Council along with application for building consent as a guarantee that external reinstatement works are completed. b. The bond shall be lodged in terms of the form of Deed annexed as Appendix 6 to the District Plan. c. Subject to the provisions of the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | Deed, the bond will be refunded after the Council has inspected and confirmed compliance with external reinstatement requirements. Note: The Council will in good faith consider the partial release of the bond to the extent that reinstatement works are completed (i.e. on a proportional basis). |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-S12 | S252.006 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports the provisions for relocated buildings across the zones, but opposes the performance bond requirement. Considers a performance bond is not necessary as many councils manage adverse effects of relocatable buildings without them. Considers performance bonds put an unnecessary cost on intended owners, and is not appropriate in terms of section 32 RMA. Seeks removal of transport route requirement and traffic management plans prior to relocating the building. | Amend SETZ-S12: ... 2. The transportation route and any traffic management plans shall be provided to the Council no later than 10 working days before relocating the building. ... 4. Performance bonds. A refundable performance bond of 125% of the cost of external reinstatement works identified in the Building Inspection Report under Performance Standard SETZ-S12(1) in cash to be lodged with the Council along with application for building consent as a guarantee that external reinstatement works are completed. b. The bond shall be lodged in terms of the form of Deed annexed as Appendix 6 to the District Plan. c. Subject to the provisions of the Deed, the bond will be refunded after the Council has inspected and confirmed compliance with external reinstatement requirements. Note: The Council will in good faith consider the partial release of the bond to the extent that |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | reinstatement works are completed (i.e. on a proportional basis). |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-S8 | S252.007 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports the provisions for relocated buildings across the zones, but opposes the performance bond requirement. Considers a performance bond is not necessary as many councils manage adverse effects of relocatable buildings without them. Considers performance bonds put an unnecessary cost on intended owners, and is not appropriate in terms of section 32 RMA. Seeks removal of transport route requirement and traffic management plans prior to relocating the building. | Amend RLZ-S8: ... 2. The transportation route and any traffic management plans shall be provided to the Council no later than 10 working days before relocating the building. ... 4. Performance bond. A refundable performance bond of 125% of the cost of external reinstatement works identified in the Building Inspection Report under Performance Standard RLZ-S8(1) in cash to be lodged with the Council along with application for building consent as a guarantee that external reinstatement works are completed. b. The bond shall be lodged in terms of the form of Deed annexed as Appendix 6 to the District Plan.c. Subject to the provisions of the Deed, the bond will be refunded after the Council has inspected and confirmed compliance with external reinstatement requirements. Note: The Council will in good faith consider the partial release of the bond to the extent that reinstatement works are completed (i.e. on a proportional basis). |
| NCZ - Neighbourhood | NCZ-S10 | S252.008 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports the provisions for relocated buildings across the zones, but opposes the performance bond requirement. Considers a performance bond is not | Amend NCZ-S10: ... 2. The transportation route and any traffic management plans shall be |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| Centre Zone | | | | | necessary as many councils manage adverse effects of relocatable buildings without them. Considers performance bonds put an unnecessary cost on intended owners, and is not appropriate in terms of section 32 RMA. Seeks removal of transport route requirement and traffic management plans prior to relocating the building. | provided to the Council no later than 10 working days before relocating the building. ... 4. Performance bonds. A refundable performance bond of 125% of the cost of external reinstatement works identified in the Building Inspection Report under Performance Standard NCZ S10(1) in cash to be lodged with the Council along with application for building consent as a guarantee that external reinstatement works are completed. b. The bond shall be lodged in terms of the form of Deed annexed as Appendix 6 to the District Plan. c. Subject to the provisions of the Deed, the bond will be refunded after the Council has inspected and confirmed compliance with external reinstatement requirements. Note: The Council will in good faith consider the partial release of the bond to the extent that reinstatement works are completed (i.e. on a proportional basis). |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-S11 | S252.009 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports the provisions for relocated buildings across the zones, but opposes the performance bond requirement. Considers a performance bond is not necessary as many councils manage adverse effects of relocatable buildings without them. Considers performance bonds put an unnecessary cost on intended owners, and is not appropriate in terms of section 32 RMA. Seeks removal of transport route requirement | Amend MUZ-S11: ... 2. The transportation route and any traffic management plans shall be provided to the Council no later than 10 working days before relocating the building. ... 4. Performance bonds. A refundable performance bond of 125% of the cost of external reinstatement works identified |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | and traffic management plans prior to relocating the building. | <p>in the Building Inspection Report under Performance Standard MUZ-S11(1) in cash to be lodged with the Council along with application for building consent as a guarantee that external reinstatement works are completed.</p> <p>b. The bond shall be lodged in terms of the form of Deed annexed as Appendix 6 to the District Plan.</p> <p>c. Subject to the provisions of the Deed, the bond will be refunded after the Council has inspected and confirmed compliance with external reinstatement requirements.</p> <p>Note: The Council will in good faith consider the partial release of the bond to the extent that reinstatement works are completed (i.e. on a proportional basis).</p> |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-S11 | S252.010 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | <p>Generally supports the provisions for relocated buildings across the zones, but opposes the performance bond requirement. Considers a performance bond is not necessary as many councils manage adverse effects of relocatable buildings without them. Considers performance bonds put an unnecessary cost on intended owners, and is not appropriate in terms of section 32 RMA. Seeks removal of transport route requirement and traffic management plans prior to relocating the building.</p> | <p>Amend TCZ-S11:</p> <p>... 2. The transportation route and any traffic management plans shall be provided to the Council no later than 10 working days before relocating the building.</p> <p>... 4. Performance bond. A refundable performance bond of 125% of the cost of external reinstatement works identified in the Building Inspection Report under Performance Standard TCZ-S11(1) in cash to be lodged with the Council along with application for building consent as a guarantee that external reinstatement works are completed.</p> <p>b. The bond shall</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | be lodged in terms of the form of Deed annexed as Appendix 6 to the District Plan.c. Subject to the provisions of the Deed, the bond will be refunded after the Council has inspected and confirmed compliance with external reinstatement requirements.Note: The Council will in good faith consider the partial release of the bond to the extent that reinstatement works are completed (i.e. on a proportional basis). |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-S11 | S252.011 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports the provisions for relocated buildings across the zones, but opposes the performance bond requirement. Considers a performance bond is not necessary as many councils manage adverse effects of relocatable buildings without them. Considers performance bonds put an unnecessary cost on intended owners, and is not appropriate in terms of section 32 RMA. Seeks removal of transport route requirement and traffic management plans prior to relocating the building. | Amend GIZ-S11: ... 2. The transportation route and any traffic management plans shall be provided to the Council no later than 10 working days before relocating the building. ... 4. Performance bonda. A refundable performance bond of 125% of the cost of external reinstatement works identified in the Building Inspection Report under Performance Standard GIZ-S11(1) in cash to be lodged with the Council along with application for building consent as a guarantee that external reinstatement works are completed.b. The bond shall be lodged in terms of the form of Deed annexed as Appendix 6 to the District Plan.c. Subject to the provisions of the Deed, the bond will be refunded after the Council has inspected and confirmed compliance with external reinstatement |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | requirements. Note: The Council will in good faith consider the partial release of the bond to the extent that reinstatement works are completed (i.e. on a proportional basis). |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-S9 | S252.012 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports the provisions for relocated buildings across the zones, but opposes the performance bond requirement. Considers a performance bond is not necessary as many councils manage adverse effects of relocatable buildings without them. Considers performance bonds put an unnecessary cost on intended owners, and is not appropriate in terms of section 32 RMA. Seeks removal of transport route requirement and traffic management plans prior to relocating the building. | Amend NOSZ-S9: ... 2. The transportation route and any traffic management plans shall be provided to the Council no later than 10 working days before relocating the building. ... 4. Performance bonds. A refundable performance bond of 125% of the cost of external reinstatement works identified in the Building Inspection Report under Performance Standard NOSZ-S9(1) in cash to be lodged with the Council along with application for building consent as a guarantee that external reinstatement works are completed. b. The bond shall be lodged in terms of the form of Deed annexed as Appendix 6 to the District Plan. c. Subject to the provisions of the Deed, the bond will be refunded after the Council has inspected and confirmed compliance with external reinstatement requirements. Note: The Council will in good faith consider the partial release of the bond to the extent that reinstatement works are completed (i.e. on a proportional basis). |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| OSZ - Open Space Zone | OSZ-S9 | S252.013 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports the provisions for relocated buildings across the zones, but opposes the performance bond requirement. Considers a performance bond is not necessary as many councils manage adverse effects of relocatable buildings without them. Considers performance bonds put an unnecessary cost on intended owners, and is not appropriate in terms of section 32 RMA. Seeks removal of transport route requirement and traffic management plans prior to relocating the building. | Amend OSZ-S9: ... 2. The transportation route and any traffic management plans shall be provided to the Council no later than 10 working days before relocating the building. ... 4. Performance bonds. A refundable performance bond of 125% of the cost of external reinstatement works identified in the Building Inspection Report under Performance Standard OSZ-S9(1) in cash to be lodged with the Council along with application for building consent as a guarantee that external reinstatement works are completed. b. The bond shall be lodged in terms of the form of Deed annexed as Appendix 6 to the District Plan. c. Subject to the provisions of the Deed, the bond will be refunded after the Council has inspected and confirmed compliance with external reinstatement requirements. Note: The Council will in good faith consider the partial release of the bond to the extent that reinstatement works are completed (i.e. on a proportional basis). |
| SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ-S9 | S252.014 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports the provisions for relocated buildings across the zones, but opposes the performance bond requirement. Considers a performance bond is not necessary as many councils manage adverse effects of relocatable buildings without them. Considers performance bonds put an unnecessary cost on intended owners, and is | Amend SARZ-S9: ... 2. The transportation route and any traffic management plans shall be provided to the Council no later than 10 working days before relocating the building. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | not appropriate in terms of section 32 RMA. Seeks removal of transport route requirement and traffic management plans prior to relocating the building. | ... 4. Performance bond. A refundable performance bond of 125% of the cost of external reinstatement works identified in the Building Inspection Report under Performance Standard SARZ-S9(1) in cash to be lodged with the Council along with application for building consent as a guarantee that external reinstatement works are completed. b. The bond shall be lodged in terms of the form of Deed annexed as Appendix 6 to the District Plan. c. Subject to the provisions of the Deed, the bond will be refunded after the Council has inspected and confirmed compliance with external reinstatement requirements. Note: The Council will in good faith consider the partial release of the bond to the extent that reinstatement works are completed (i.e. on a proportional basis). |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-S8 | S252.015 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports the provisions for relocated buildings across the zones, but opposes the performance bond requirement. Considers a performance bond is not necessary as many councils manage adverse effects of relocatable buildings without them. Considers performance bonds put an unnecessary cost on intended owners, and is not appropriate in terms of section 32 RMA. Seeks removal of transport route requirement and traffic management plans prior to relocating the building. | Amend FUZ-S8: ... 2. The transportation route and any traffic management plans shall be provided to the Council no later than 10 working days before relocating the building. ... 4. Performance bond. A refundable performance bond of 125% of the cost of external reinstatement works identified in the Building Inspection Report under Performance Standard FUZ-S8(1) in cash to be lodged with the Council along with |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | application for building consent as a guarantee that external reinstatement works are completed.b. The bond shall be lodged in terms of the form of Deed annexed as Appendix 6 to the District Plan.c. Subject to the provisions of the Deed, the bond will be refunded after the Council has inspected and confirmed compliance with external reinstatement requirements.Note: The Council will in good faith consider the partial release of the bond to the extent that reinstatement works are completed (i.e. on a proportional basis). |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-S10 | S252.016 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports the provisions for relocated buildings across the zones, but opposes the performance bond requirement. Considers a performance bond is not necessary as many councils manage adverse effects of relocatable buildings without them. Considers performance bonds put an unnecessary cost on intended owners, and is not appropriate in terms of section 32 RMA. Seeks removal of transport route requirement and traffic management plans prior to relocating the building. | Amend MPZ-S10: ... 2. The transportation route and any traffic management plans shall be provided to the Council no later than 10 working days before relocating the building. ... 4. Performance bonds. A refundable performance bond of 125% of the cost of external reinstatement works identified in the Building Inspection Report under Performance Standard MPZ-S10(1) in cash to be lodged with the Council along with application for building consent as a guarantee that external reinstatement works are completed.b. The bond shall be lodged in terms of the form of Deed annexed as Appendix 6 to the District Plan.c. Subject to the provisions of the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|-----------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | Deed, the bond will be refunded after the Council has inspected and confirmed compliance with external reinstatement requirements. Note: The Council will in good faith consider the partial release of the bond to the extent that reinstatement works are completed (i.e. on a proportional basis). |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | SETZ-P3 | S252.017 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports provisions relating to relocated buildings, but seeks deletion of reference to performance bonds in the zone policies. Seeks the zone policies be amended and recognise and provide for the positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance the amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. | Amend SETZ-P3 to delete reference to performance bonds, recognise positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P10 | S252.018 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports provisions relating to relocated buildings, but seeks deletion of reference to performance bonds in the zone policies. Seeks the zone policies be amended and recognise and provide for the positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance the amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. | Amend GRUZ-P10 to delete reference to performance bonds, recognise positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | New provision request | S252.019 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports provisions relating to relocated buildings, but seeks deletion of reference to performance bonds in the zone policies. Seeks the zone policies be amended and recognise and provide for the positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance the amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. | Insert a relocatable buildings policy that does not refer to performance bonds, recognises positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintains and enhances amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. |
| NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone | NCZ-P6 | S252.020 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports provisions relating to relocated buildings, but seeks deletion of reference to performance bonds in the zone policies. Seeks the zone policies be amended and recognise and provide for the positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain | Amend NCZ-P6 to delete reference to performance bonds, recognise positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | and enhance the amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. | |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-P6 | S252.021 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports provisions relating to relocated buildings, but seeks deletion of reference to performance bonds in the zone policies. Seeks the zone policies be amended and recognise and provide for the positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance the amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. | Amend MUZ-P6 to delete reference to performance bonds, recognise positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-P12 | S252.022 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports provisions relating to relocated buildings, but seeks deletion of reference to performance bonds in the zone policies. Seeks the zone policies be amended and recognise and provide for the positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance the amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. | Amend TCZ-P12 to delete reference to performance bonds, recognise positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-P7 | S252.023 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports provisions relating to relocated buildings, but seeks deletion of reference to performance bonds in the zone policies. Seeks the zone policies be amended and recognise and provide for the positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance the amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. | Amend GIZ-P7 to delete reference to performance bonds, recognise positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-P5 | S252.024 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports provisions relating to relocated buildings, but seeks deletion of reference to performance bonds in the zone policies. Seeks the zone policies be amended and recognise and provide for the positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance the amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. | Amend NOSZ-P5 to delete reference to performance bonds, recognise positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. |
| OSZ - Open Space Zone | OSZ-P5 | S252.025 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports provisions relating to relocated buildings, but seeks deletion of reference to performance bonds in the zone policies. Seeks the zone policies be amended and recognise and provide for the positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance the amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. | Amend OSZ-P5 to delete reference to performance bonds, recognise positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone | SARZ-P5 | S252.026 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports provisions relating to relocated buildings, but seeks deletion of reference to performance bonds in the zone policies. Seeks the zone policies be amended and recognise and provide for the positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance the amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. | Amend SARZ-P5 to delete reference to performance bonds, recognise positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-P5 | S252.027 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports provisions relating to relocated buildings, but seeks deletion of reference to performance bonds in the zone policies. Seeks the zone policies be amended and recognise and provide for the positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance the amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. | Amend FUZ-P5 to delete reference to performance bonds, recognise positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-P5 | S252.028 | New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc | Support in part | Generally supports provisions relating to relocated buildings, but seeks deletion of reference to performance bonds in the zone policies. Seeks the zone policies be amended and recognise and provide for the positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance the amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. | Amend MPZ-P5 to delete reference to performance bonds, recognise positive effects of relocated buildings, and maintain and enhance amenity values of areas in relation to relocatable buildings. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S229.001 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support in part | <p>The submitter seeks an amendment to include the burying of material infected by unwanted organisms as declared by the Ministry for Primary Industries Chief Technical Officer or an emergency declared by the Minister under the Biosecurity Act 1993'; allowing farmers to undertake earthworks related to burying material in the event of a biosecurity incident as a permitted activity.</p> <p>Not all biosecurity incursions would constitute a biosecurity emergency that would trigger provisions in the RMA or the Biosecurity Act to override consenting requirements. Biosecurity incidences which do not result in a declared emergency must therefore be managed to regional and district council plan requirements, including limitations on</p> | Amend 'Earthworks' definition to include provision for biosecurity related activity including the burying of material infected by unwanted organisms. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>earthworks which may hinder any urgent response activity required to adequately address the incursion.</p> <p>The intersect with the District Plan may well be in a response that requires burial of animal carcasses. The Regional Plan is in place to manage discharges from such activities but constraints on earthwork activity (volume and area) may inhibit a timely, efficient and effective response.</p> | |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S229.002 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support a definition which encompasses both indoor and outdoor intensive farming activities and support the separate definitions for each. | Retain definition of 'Intensive Primary Production' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S229.003 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support in part | Opposes lack of definition to provide specifically for workers accommodation as the activity is currently provided for as part of 'Minor Residential Unit'. | Insert definition for 'Workers Accommodation'. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S229.004 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Supports the National Planning Standards definition of Primary Production. | Retain definition of 'Primary Production' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S229.005 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support in part | Support provisions for worker accommodation but oppose seasonal requirements. Many farming activities accommodate workers year round. | Amend definition 'Seasonal Work Accommodation' as follows: Seasonal Worker Accommodation: Means the use of land and buildings for the sole purpose of accommodating the short-term labour requirement of a primary production activity and rural industry. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S229.006 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support in part | Support list of sensitive activities, but the list doesn't the cover the full extent of activities that could be deemed sensitive to effects from the surrounding environment. | Amend definition of 'Sensitive activities' by adding the following activities: Conservation Activities, Camping grounds, Conference facilities |
| Strategic Direction | CCR-O1 | S229.007 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support a direction for the Wairarapa that will see a transition to a low -carbon economy. | Retain CCR-O1 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | CCR-O4 | S229.008 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support an objective to support and enhance water resilience and adaptive management. | Retain CCR-O4 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Strategic Direction | RE-O1 | S229.009 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support objective that recognises the rural environment's contribution to the region's economic and social wellbeing | Retain RE-O1 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O2 | S229.010 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support in part | Support an objective that seeks the general Rural Zone remains available for primary production activities and productive capacity is protected, however the link to the defined term of productive capacity confuses the direction on other non-land based primary production activities. | Amend RE-O2 follows: ' Productive capacity Primary Production The General Rural Zone remains available for primary production activities and productive capacity is protected.' |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O3 | S229.011 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | The objective repeats Objective 2.1 of the NPSHPL. | Retain RE-O3 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O4 | S229.012 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support objective to maintain and enhance the character of the rural environment. | Retain RE-O4 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O5 | S229.013 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support objective to limit rural lifestyle subdivision to areas not conflicting with primary production and the productive potential of the land. | Retain RE-O5 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P5 | S229.014 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support policy to enable primary production activities within the zone, to retain a clear delineation between rural and urban areas to and to avoid, remedy or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects | Retain SUB-P5 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P6 | S229.015 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support an 'avoid' policy approach that seeks to limit small lot subdivision to areas where it will not comprise the use of land for primary production activities. | Retain SUB-P6 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R2 | S229.016 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Oppose | Oppose controlled activity status. Prefer a restricted discretionary activity status that would enable a proposal that might conflict with primary production activity to be declined. A directive matter of discretion (or matter of control if the proposed activity status remains) would be required to address potential reverse sensitivity effects that may affect primary production activity. Matter of Control 15 appears directed at the effects of primary production on sensitive activities. | Insert new matter of discretion/control as follows: The measures to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established, or permitted, primary production activities. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S229.017 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Oppose | <p>Oppose controlled activity status. Prefer a restricted discretionary activity status that would enable a proposal that might conflict with primary production activity to be declined.</p> <p>A directive matter of discretion (or matter of control if the proposed activity status remains) would be required to address potential reverse sensitivity effects that may affect primary production activity. Matter of Control 15 appears directed at the effects of primary production on sensitive activities.</p> | Insert new matter of discretion/control as follows: The measures to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established, or permitted, primary production activities |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S2 | S229.018 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support in part | Support the requirement for a building platform to be identified on a rural lot. The matters of discretion should extend to reverse sensitivity consideration | Insert new matter of discretion as follows: The measures to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established, or permitted, primary production activities. |
| LIGHT - Light | Introduction | S229.019 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support in part | The section introduction fails to identify that artificial lighting is a typical and necessary part of primary production activity used on mobile machinery and around areas of activity for operational need, safety and security. | Amend the introduction to identify the particular artificial lighting needs of primary production activity |
| LIGHT - Light | LIGHT-S1 | S229.020 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support in part | An exception is noted in the standard as follows: The provisions do not apply to specific types of activities or lighting which have an important functional or operational role, such as navigational aids and vehicle lights. The exception should also apply to mobile machinery associated with primary production. | Amend as follows: Exception: The provisions do not apply to specific types of activities or lighting which have an important functional or operational role, such as navigational aids, mobile machinery associate with primary production and vehicle lights. |
| NOISE - Noise | Introduction | S229.021 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support recognition that rural activities can be inherently noisy and are unable to locate elsewhere or be practically avoided. | Retain Noise Introduction as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-O2 | S229.022 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | The objective is clear that the function and operation of existing and permitted noise generating activities are not compromised by reverse sensitivity effects from noise sensitive activities. | Retain NOISE-O2 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P1 | S229.023 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support directive policy on enabling noise-generating activities in appropriate areas. | Retain NOISE-P1 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | | S229.024 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support the identification that the following activities are not subject to the rules and standards d. Agriculture, horticulture, and pastoral farming activities undertaken for a limited duration, including using agricultural vehicles, machinery, frost protection equipment or equipment used on a seasonal or intermittent basis, forestry planting, and forestry harvesting in the General Rural and Rural Lifestyle Zones. | Retain RULES exclusion d. Agriculture, horticulture, pastoral farming, and conservation, activities undertaken for a limited duration, including using agricultural vehicles, agricultural aviation, helicopter landing areas, machinery, frost protection equipment or equipment used on a seasonal or intermittent basis, forestry planting, and forestry harvesting in the General Rural and Rural Lifestyle Zones as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | Introduction | S229.025 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support in part | Support the description of the rural zone as an area used predominantly for primary production, including intensive primary production. Support recognition of the economic value of the primary production activities to the district and the contribution that this brings to the vitality of the urban environment of the district. Suggest amendment to description to explicitly reference the anticipated sights, sounds and smells that are associated a productive farming environment. The defined term of 'productive capacity' is relevant to HPL and should be used in that context in the plan noting that primary production can be land-based and non-land based. | Amend GRUZ Introduction as follows: Character and amenity values of the zone include spaciousness, sparsely developed landscape, vegetation cover, and the presence of a productive farming environment and the visual, odour and noise effects associated with farming activities. Amend as follows: Activities undertaken in the General Rural Zone need to be managed in a way that preserves rural character, primary production capability and the productive capacity of land which is directed through this chapter. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O1 | S229.026 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support objective and particular recognition of functional and operational need of other activities in the General Rural Zone. | Retain GRUZ-O1 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O2 | S229.027 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support in part | Support descriptive objective. Support reference to worker accommodation, but this shouldn't be limited to seasonal workers, many farms provide accommodation for staff year-round. Point d suggests Intensive primary production | Amend GRUZ-O2 as follows; b. sparsely developed landscape with open space between buildings that are predominantly used for agricultural, pastoral, intensive primary production and horticultural activities (e.g. barns and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | is a Rural Industry which does not appear to align with the rule structure. The activity nests better in the elements described in point 2. | sheds), low density rural living (e.g., farmhouses, seasonal worker accommodation and a small degree of rural lifestyle), and community activities (e.g. rural halls, domains, and schools); d. interspersed existing rural industry facilities associated with the use of the land for intensive primary production, quarrying, and cleanfills; and |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O3 | S229.028 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support objective for the provision of rural production oriented and resource dependent activities within the GRZ. | Retain GRUZ-O3 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O4 | S229.029 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support objective to enable primary production, ancillary activities and other activities that have a functional or operational need to be located within the GRZ. | Retain GRUZ-O4 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O5 | S229.030 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support objective, however note that there is no corresponding rule to AVOID the establishment of any new sensitive activity near existing intensive farming activity | Retain GRUZ-O5 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O6 | S229.031 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support objective to manage rural lifestyle subdivision and development to avoid fragmentation of productive land development in appropriate locations. | Retain GRUZ-O6 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O7 | S229.032 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support in part | Support requirement to protect highly productive land and other land with special characteristics, but objective should state the aim of the protection more explicitly. | Amend GRUZ-O7 as follows: Recognise and protect from inappropriate subdivision, use and development: a. highly productive land; and b. land that utilises the finite combination of climate and soil characteristics which make it suitable for high value crops including viticulture, orchards and olives. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P1 | S229.033 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support policy to enable primary production activities and ancillary activities that are compatible with the purpose, character and amenity values of the GRZ. | Retain GRUZ-P1 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P2 | S229.034 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support policy to avoid incompatible activities, those that will cause fragmentation of productive land, or will cause reverse sensitivity/conflict with primary production and ancillary activities. | Retain GRUZ-P2 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P3 | S229.035 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support policy to provide for subdivision, use and development where it does not compromise the purpose, character and amenity values of the zone. Support clause to avoid, remedy or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects | Retain GRUZ-P3 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P4 | S229.036 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support policy to avoid inappropriate subdivision in the GRZ | Retain GRUZ-P4 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P6 | S229.037 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support policy, however note that there is no corresponding rule to AVOID the establishment of any new sensitive activity near existing intensive farming activity. | Retain GRUZ-P6 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P9 | S229.038 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support use of HPL as per the NPS-HPL provisions | Retain GRUZ-P9 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R1 | S229.039 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support in part | Support permitted activity status for buildings and structures that comply with required standards. The minimum setback set out in GRUZ-S3 (2) for residential units should apply buildings and structures associated with sensitive activities (not just residential units). | Amend GRUZ-R1 to apply the minimum setback for residential units to buildings and structures associated with sensitive activities. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R4 | S229.040 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support in part | Support permitted activity rule for worker accommodation, but this should not be limited to seasonal worker accommodation, nor to land-based primary production. Many farms provide accommodation for workers year-round. Oppose reference to land-based primary production activities within the rule. There is no rationale for only providing worker accommodation for land-based primary | Amend as follows: Seasonal Worker Worker Accommodation 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with: i. GRUZ-S1; ii. GRUZ-S2; and iii. GRUZ-S3; and b. Is used primarily to meet labour |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>production. Many indoor pig farms require on-site worker accommodation.</p> <p>Oppose provision of worker accommodation on highly productive land as a controlled activity. Clause 3.9 (2)(a) of the NPS-HPL provides an exemption for supporting activities on HPL. Worker accommodation should be considered a supporting activity, as it is vital to the functioning of the farming activity. Therefore, this should be considered a permitted activity.</p> <p>Support GFA of 150m2.</p> | <p>requirements for land-based primary production;</p> <p>c. There is no more than one seasonal worker accommodation building per site;</p> <p>d. The gross floor area of the seasonal worker accommodation building is no more than 150m2;</p> <p>e. The seasonal worker accommodation building is not located on highly productive land or the Martinborough Soils Overlay.</p> |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R5 | S229.041 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Note that without a separate definition and rule structure for Extensive Pig Farming, these activities will fall under this rule. Support this approach as effects of extensive pig farming are similar to other pastoral operations. | Retain GRUZ-R5 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R7 | S229.042 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Oppose | Oppose permitted activity status for residential visitor accommodation. The definition provides for 90 days stays which is not a temporary activity. Visitor accommodation, even on a small scale, is a sensitive activity which could cause reverse sensitivity effects on established intensive primary production operations. The suitability of any site in the general rural zone for visitor accommodation should be assessed via a consenting approach. | Amend GRUZ-R7 activity status to Restricted Discretionary OR Amend GRUZ-R7 to require compliance with GRUZ-S3. Amend Matters of Discretion to include proximity to any existing intensive primary production activities and methods to avoid, remedy or mitigate any potential reverse sensitivity effects. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R9 | S229.043 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support permitted activity status where standards can be met. Support restricted discretionary status where standards cannot be met. | Retain GRUZ-R9 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R10 | S229.044 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Oppose | Oppose the lack of clarity in the definition of 'Conservation Activities' might enable in the GRUZ and the permitted activity status with no standards or controls. The activity range is assumed to extend to training, education, organised events and conflict with primary production including reverse sensitivity may result. | Amend GRUZ-R10 activity status to Restricted Discretionary OR Amend GRUZ-R10 to require compliance with GRUZ-S3. Amend Matters of Discretion to include proximity to any existing intensive primary production activities and methods to avoid, remedy or mitigate any potential reverse sensitivity effects. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R15 | S229.045 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support discretionary activity status for visitor accommodation. | Retain GRUZ-R15 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R16 | S229.046 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support discretionary activity status for rural industry. | Retain GRUZ-R16 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R18 | S229.047 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support discretionary activity status for commercial and industrial activities not otherwise provided for. | Retain GRUZ-R18 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S1 | S229.048 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support standard | Retain GRUZ-S1 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S2 | S229.049 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support standard | Retain GRUZ-S2 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S3 | S229.050 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support in part | Oppose the requirement that all buildings and structures should be 25m from any front boundary of unsealed roads. In a largely rural environment, this will unnecessarily affect the practical location of ancillary primary production buildings and structures. Seek clearer rationale as to the purpose of setbacks to waterbodies. There are already national policy instruments that include or manage setbacks to waterways for various activities and structures with respect to managing water quality. Any setbacks to waterways in the district plan should not duplicate controls that are in place elsewhere. | Amend GRUZ-S3 as follows: 1. Buildings or structures must not be located within: c. 25m of any front boundary of unsealed roads; d. 25m of any significant waterbody; and e. 10m of any surface waterbody. 2. Residential units Sensitive activities must also not be located within: b. 300m of a boundary with untreated agricultural effluent disposal areas; |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>GRUZ-S3 (2) should apply to all sensitive activities.</p> <p>Support proposed setback from effluent disposal areas, but this should apply to both treated and non-treated areas. Treatments can vary by type and duration, and not all treatments will achieve a reduction in odour sufficient to warrant the removal of any setback requirements.</p> | |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S4 | S229.051 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support standard | Retain GRUZ-S4 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S5 | S229.052 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support in part | <p>Support standard. The clear matter of discretion that requires the extent to which the activity, including any buildings, compounds, or part of a site used for housing animals are sufficiently designed and located or separated from sensitive activities, residential units, and boundaries of residential zones to avoid adverse effects on residents.</p> <p>Oppose the restriction of Intensive Primary Production within the Urban Water Supply Protection Areas. Risks to urban water supply from intensive farming operations would arise primarily from the storage and disposal of effluent associated with the activity, not the activity itself. For intensive outdoor operations, contaminants may be more diffuse in nature. The Wellington Natural Resources Plan prevents discharge of animal effluent and solid animal waste within a community drinking water supply protection area and therefore the restriction is not necessary in the District Plan.</p> | Retain GRUZ-S5 as notified. Inferred that the submitter seeks to delete GRUZ-S5(c). |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-O1 | S229.053 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support objective for the RLZ to be used primarily for residential lifestyle, while still providing for primary production to occur. | Retain RLZ-O1 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-O2 | S229.054 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support objective to maintain the character and amenity values of the zone, and the description of those values. | Retain RLZ-O2 as notified. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-O3 | S229.055 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support objective to enable compatible activities within the zone. | Retain RLZ-O3 as notified. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-P1 | S229.056 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support policy to enable activities that are compatible with the purpose, character and amenity values of the zone. | Retain RLZ-P1 as notified. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-P2 | S229.057 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support policy to avoid activities that are incompatible with the purpose, character and amenity values of the zone. | Retain RLZ-P2 as notified. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-P3 | S229.058 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support policy to provide for subdivision, use and development that supports the purpose, character and amenity values of the zone. | Retain RLZ-P3 as notified. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-R5 | S229.059 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support permitted activity status for primary production excluding intensive farming in the RLZ. | Retain RLZ-R5 as notified. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-R11 | S229.060 | New Zealand Pork Industry Board | Support | Support discretionary activity status for Intensive primary production in the RLZ. | Retain RLZ-R11 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | | S242.001 | Ngaere Webb | Oppose in part | Generally supports the concept of a Māori Purpose Zone, but opposes blanket of the Māori Purpose Zone to all Māori lands without considering the different categories of Māori lands, such as urupa and marae reservations that have special status in legal terms as well as family, spiritual, cultural and historical significance. Considers iwi do not have the mandate to speak for Māori land trusts and landowners. Notes that councils may have met their obligations around consultation, but they have not met their responsibilities in consulting with landowners, resulting in landowners or their representatives have not | Amend the approach of the Māori Purpose Zone to allow Māori to exercise their Rangatiratanga and decide whether they wish to opt in or opt out of the zone without financial impact. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|---|------------------|--|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | had adequate opportunity to consider the proposed change of status. Considers the injustices that have been inflicted upon our people by the Crown and central government are long-standing, across many generations and this is our opportunity to right the wrongs. | |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | | S106.001 | Ngāi Tūmapūhia-ā-Rangi i Mōtuwairaka Inc | Amend | The rohe of Ngai Tumapuhia-a-Rangi, is located on the eastern shores of the district of Wairarapa and extends inland to the Maungaraki Range and south to the Awhea River. The traditional rohe is defined by the following boundary markers"Mai i Whareama ki Taueru, whiti atu ki te Taumata o te Hangatu, ahu atu ki te Karaka o Waimatua ki Wainuioru, ahu atu ki te Karaka ki Te Awhea rere atu ki te ngutu awa o Te Awhea, rere atu ma te takutai ki Whareama" Within those traditional markers there are numerous wāhi tapu or sites of significance, that need to be included on maps that will be part of the Proposed Plan | Amend planning maps to include wāhi tapu and sites of significance. |
| Tangata Whenua | Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi | S106.002 | Ngāi Tūmapūhia-ā-Rangi i Mōtuwairaka Inc | Oppose | Despite the fact that consultation hui were held (thank you) the information provided on how lands owned or administered by individuals, whānau, marae, land trusts etc, the process of opt-in and opt-out was very contentious and speculative. The involvement of the Māori Land Court (MLC) in relation to opting in of all lands under their jurisdiction was not made clear until the last consultation hui held on 10 December 2023. Representatives of MLC should have been involved with the series of consultation and more so needed to seek permission direct with Māori o Wairarapa in regard to the Māori Purpose Zone opt -in or out, kaupapa. | To extend the submission date, to afford tangatawhenua o Wairapapa time to consult wider with their whānau and beneficiaries that reside within and outside of Wairarapa. To enable this process to occur, extending the submission date for tangata whenua and engage with both the Māori Land Court o Takitimu and Combined Wairarapa District Council representatives, is requested. |
| Appendix 1 - Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Tāmaki | Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Tāmaki nui-a-Rua | S256.001 | Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Iwi Development Trust | Oppose in part | Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Tāmaki nui-a-Rua Treaty Settlement Trust was not informed on this appendix being entered with good intentions. The areas under the approach do not establish the precise boundaries of the statutory area | Collaboration between Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Tamaki nui-a-Rua Treaty Settlement Trust as the Trustees of the Act to collaborate with the Wairarapa Combined District Plan Committee to ensure the chapter |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|---|------------------|--|-----------------|--|---|
| nui-a-Rua Statutory Acknowledgement | Statutory Acknowledgement | | | | | is reflected correctly. |
| Appendix 1 - Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Tāmaki nui-a-Rua Statutory Acknowledgement | Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Tāmaki nui-a-Rua Statutory Acknowledgement | S256.002 | Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Iwi Development Trust | Support in part | The Wairarapa District Plan has included statutory Acknowledgement from two of the three Wairarapa Treaty Settlement Acts. The third Act "Te Rohe o Rongokako Joint Redress Act" should also be included. Local authorities have specific outcomes under the Te Rohe o Rongokako Joint Redress Act 2022. | Amend Proposed District Plan to include Te Rohe o Rongokako Joint Redress Act. Referring to specific provisions 44-70, 98, 111, 115 and 121. Including other sections of the Act that include one or three Wairarapa local authorities including the regional council. |
| Introduction | Mihi | S256.003 | Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Iwi Development Trust | Support in part | The tauparapara represents both Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa. The tauparapara is a traditional tauparapara, therefore, Joe Potangaroa is not and can not be the author. | Delete credits to mihimihi and include Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa alongside Rangitāne o Wairarapa. |
| Introduction | Foreword | S256.004 | Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Iwi Development Trust | Support in part | There is no reference to the Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Tāmaki Nui-a-Rua Claims Settlement Act 2022 and Te Rohe o Rongokako Joint Redress Act 2022. The WCDP sets out rules for land use and subdivision in the Wairarapa balancing the need for growth, desired environment outcomes and tangata whenua aspirations through the respective Wairarapa Treaty Settlements, Marae, Māori Land Trusts and Hāpu aspirations. | Insert reference to the Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Tāmaki Nui-a-Rua Claims Settlement Act 2022 and Te Rohe o Rongokako Joint Redress Act 2022. The WCDP sets out rules for land use and subdivision in the Wairarapa balancing the need for growth, desired environment outcomes and tangata whenua aspirations through the respective Wairarapa Treaty Settlements, Marae, Māori Land Trusts and Hāpu aspirations. |
| How the Plan Works | Statutory context | S256.005 | Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Iwi Development Trust | Support in part | The Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Tāmaki Nui-a-Rua Settlement Claims Act 2022 and Te Rohe o Rongokako Joint Redress 2022 are not mentioned, however they are legislative acts that influence the WCDP, as outlines in the Te Rohe o Rongokako Joint Redress Act 2022, under section 89 to prepare a reserves management plan under the Act. Section 98 of the Act "must recognise and provide for the content of the natural | Insert Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Tāmaki Nui-a-Rua Settlement Claims Act 2022 and Te Rohe o Rongokako Joint Redress Act 2022, in the 'Relationship with relevant RMA planning and other documents' table. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|-------------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | resources document to the extent that it is relevant to matters covered by the statement plan." | |
| How the Plan Works | Statutory context | S256.006 | Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Iwi Development Trust | Support in part | It is not accurate to state, 'The principles are not explicitly defined in the RMA and will vary depending upon the special needs of the iwi within each district.' | Amend statutory context as follows "... The councils have a duty under section 8 of the RMA to take into account the principals of the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi). The principles are not explicitly defined in the RMA and will vary depending upon the special needs of the iwi within each district. Te Tiriti o Waitangi will be implemented by iwi on a case by case basis. Recognising and accepting the there are different conceptions of resource consent allocation between Tangata Whenua and the Councils... ..." |
| How the Plan Works | Statutory context | S256.007 | Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Iwi Development Trust | Support | There are a couple of words that should be changed as the tone could be improved. | Amend Statutory Context as follows "Recognising and accepting that there are different conceptions of resource allocation between Tangata Whenua and the Councils is an important resource management issue. Consultation Wānanga between parties will provide the basis for achieving a greater empathy understanding between Tangata Whenua and the Councils." |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S256.008 | Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Iwi Development Trust | Support in part | Key definitions missing from the Interpretation Add definition for Wāhi tapu. | Insert definition as follows: Wāhi tapu - places sacred to Māori in the tradition, spiritual, religious, ritual or mythological space. Generally, areas |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | such as urupā or burial caves. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S256.009 | Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Iwi Development Trust | Support in part | There are key definitions missing. Add definition for Wāhi tīpuna. | Insert definition as follows: Wāhi tīpuna - a place important to Māori for its ancestral significance and associated cultural and traditional values. Generally, pā, papakāianga, marae, tauraka waka. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S256.010 | Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Iwi Development Trust | Support in part | There are key definitions missing. Add definition for site of significance. | Insert definition as follows: Site of significance - places and features that are of historical, cultural/ or spiritual significance to Māori. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S256.011 | Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Iwi Development Trust | Amend | All te reo Māori words need to be translated and where necessary, defined. | Amend the plan so all te reo Māori words are translated throughout the document. |
| Tangata Whenua | Introduction | S256.012 | Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Iwi Development Trust | Support in part | As legislative documents, Wairarapa Treaty Settlements need to be included. The Wairarapa District Councils, recognise they must give effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and section 30 of the Ngāti Kahungunu Tāmaki Nui-a-Rua Settlement Act 2022 states "a relevant consent authority must have regard to the statutory acknowledgement relating to the statutory area in deciding, under section 95E of the Resource Management Act 1991, whether the trustees are affected persons in relation to the activity." | Amend Tangata Whenua Introduction as follows: "...This chapter offers practical examples of how Treaty of Waitangi principals can be implemented alongside best practice engagement advice. This chapter provides practical examples of how Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the Wairarapa Treaty Settlement Acts provisions can be implemented alongside best practice engagement advice. ..." |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|---|------------------|--|-----------------|---|---|
| Tangata Whenua | Introduction | S256.013 | Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Iwi Development Trust | Support in part | Tangata Whenua and Mana Whenua need to be clearly defined as both terms have been used in the current draft document. | Amend Tangata Whenua Introduction as follows: "For the purpose of the Wairarapa Combined District Plan, Tangata Whenua applies to uri (descendants of Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa and Rangitāne o Wairarapa). We acknowledge that for many Wairarapa Māori, Mana Whenua is also referred to as Wairarapa uri whose mana derives from the whenua over centuries acknowledging their whakapapa to the whenua." |
| Tangata Whenua | Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi | S256.014 | Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Iwi Development Trust | Support in part | Rangatiratanga is our intent right through whakapapa not Te Tiriti o Waitangi. | Amend Tangata Whenua - Mātāpono, Rangatiratanga as follows "The inherent right through whakapapa and reiterated under Te Tiriti o Waitangi, to protect the environment, including, but not exclusive to whenua, awa, moana, wāhi tapu and taonga tuku iho through kaitiakitanga practices. Active and meaningful participation of both iwi in the decision-making process." |
| Tangata Whenua | The Area of Interest | S256.015 | Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Iwi Development Trust | Support in part | Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa section of Tangata Whenua chapter. | Insert new Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa section of Tangata Whenua chapter. A new version of the chapter has been attached, with reference to the Wairarapa Treaty Settlements as noted but not referenced in first version. Note: Ngāti Kahungunu not Ngāti Kahungūnu. No macron on the second 'u'. Amend spelling for Ngāti Kahungunu where |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | applicable as follows: Ngāti Kahungunu Ngāti Kahungunu |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P8 | S256.016 | Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Iwi Development Trust | Support in part | No reason specified. | Amend Policy SASM-P8 as follows: Under section 3B engagement with Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa and Rangitāne o Wairarapa is required where activities have the potential to adversely effect sites or areas of significance to Māori. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | | S256.017 | Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Iwi Development Trust | Oppose in part | Supports the Māori Purpose Zone chapter, however, oppose the auto 'opt-in' approach for Māori Titled Land under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1991. Māori Titled Land have complex structures with multiple land owners. Māori Land Trusts need sufficient time to make an informed decision regarding the transfer to the Māori Purpose Zone. Suggests that the transfer of Māori Titled Land to the Māori Purpose Zone should be conducted on the request of the owner for a minimal fee. | Amend Māori Purpose Zone to remove the auto-opt in on Māori Land and allow for Māori Titled Land Trusts or Owners sufficient time to decide whether or not they want to opt their land into the Māori Purpose Zone. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S100.001 | Ngati Te AhuAhu Hapū | Support in part | Notes statutory requirements to include RMA 1991 section 35A(1)(a)(b)(c) and (2)(a)(i)(ii)(iii) and (b) (3)(b), which outlines the Council's Statutory responsibilities to include Ngati Te AhuAhu Hapū as part of it's Te Tiriti o Waitangi 1840 and Crown duty, obligations and partnership. Under these sections Ngati Te AhuAhu Māori Incorporation Regulations and Constitution shall be incorporated into the plan giving legal effect and hapū authority. A copy of this document will be presented at the hearing for Council to hold on file and on record according to the Statutory requirements under the RMA 1991. | Retain the Māori Purpose Zone as it relates to Ngati Te AhuAhu Hapū. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R11 | S219.001 | Nigel & Philippa Broom | Support in part | Submitter seeks to protect the amenity of existing residential activities in the General Rural Zone so that the enjoyment of existing residents is not eroded by the effects which | Amend rule GRUZ-R11 to add additional clauses relating to the scale of activities, number of visitors, etc. Any activity not complying with these new clauses (i.e. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | rural retail activities might bring (e.g. noise, reduced privacy and disruption from traffic and large volumes of people which are inconsistent with the rural character and generally quiet lifestyle offered in the General Rural Zone). | exceeding number of visitors) should trigger a resource consent when activities exceed a certain scale (which is not governed by building number/ size). |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-S1 | S219.002 | Nigel & Philippa Broom | Oppose | Submitter considers that the ambient night-time noise levels are likely to be very low for existing residential activities located in the General Rural Zone, so any noise from non-primary production/non-residential/rural produce retail activities may have a significant potential to impact on residential amenity, sleep and well-being. | Amend NOISE-S1 standard to make noise standards more stringent for non-rural and non-residential activities such as rural produce, retail and commercial activities in the GRUZ. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | New provision request | S219.003 | Nigel & Philippa Broom | Amend | Submitter considers that the close proximity of proposed non-primary production and non-residential activities, including rural produce retail, to residential activities within the General Rural Zone should allow neighbouring residents to oppose these activities where they may have a significant impact on amenity and enjoyment. | Amend GRUZ chapter where necessary to include a requirement for a resource consent where non-primary production and non-residential activities (i.e. rural produce, retail) are proposed within a certain distance (e.g. within 100m) of a dwelling on a neighbouring property. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S22.001 | NZ Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | The definition covers the appropriate scope of agricultural aviation activities. | Retain the definition - Agricultural Aviation |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S22.002 | NZ Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | The definition covers the appropriate scope of conservation activities. | Retain the definition - Conservation Activities |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S22.003 | NZ Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | Inclusion of the NPS definition is appropriate | Retain the definition - Primary Production |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S22.004 | NZ Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | The definition clearly defines the function that supports primary production | Retain the definition - Rural Airstrip |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Strategic Direction | RE-O2 | S22.005 | NZ Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | Primary production is important to the economic and social wellbeing of the region therefore productive capacity should be protected. | Retain RE-O2 as notified. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-R2 | S22.006 | NZ Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | It is important to provide for conservation activities, weed and pest control and maintenance of existing pasture. | Retain ECO-R2 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P5 | S22.007 | NZ Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | The policy provides protection for primary production and ancillary activities, and provides for protection from reverse sensitivity effects | Retain SUB-P5 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-O1 | S22.008 | NZ Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | Recognising the benefits of appropriate noise generating activities is important to the economic wellbeing of the region. | Retain NOISE-O1 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-O2 | S22.009 | NZ Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | Where appropriate, protecting noise generating activities from reverse sensitivity effects is important | Retain NOISE-O2 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P8 | S22.010 | NZ Agricultural Aviation Association | Support in part | Seeks a policy that enables noisy equipment and recognises agricultural aviation as an ancillary activity supporting primary production | Amend the policy as follows: The use of noisy equipment that has a limited duration and frequency (in particular, audible bird scaring devices, agricultural aviation activities and frost protection devices, and harvesters) that supports agricultural primary production in the rural environment is enabled by exempting these activities from noise limits, subject to reasonable use. |
| NOISE - Noise | New provision request | S22.011 | NZ Agricultural Aviation Association | Support in part | Enabling short duration intermittent activities that support primary production and conservation in the GRUZ and RLZ provides for the economic and social being of the region. Maintaining and enhancing biodiversity values | Retain the Noise rule exemptions and Insert: I. conservation, activities undertaken for a limited duration, including agricultural aviation activities and, helicopter landing areas, in the Natural Open |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | in the NOSZ is dependent on activities that control or eradicate biodiversity threats. | Space Zone. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O1 | S22.012 | NZ Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | Objectives that recognise that primary production, activities that support primary production and activities that have a functional need to be located in the GRUZ acknowledge the importance of primary production and ancillary activities to the region. | Retain GRUZ-O1 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P1 | S22.013 | NZ Agricultural Aviation Association | Support in part | Seek to ensure that ancillary activities to primary production are recognised and provided for. | Retain policy and Insert: b. Provide for ancillary activities to primary production and other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located in the General Rural Zone that are not incompatible with primary production. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P6 | S22.014 | NZ Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | The policy provides protection for primary production and ancillary activities and provides for protection from reverse sensitivity effects | Retain GRUZ-P6 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R6 | S22.015 | NZ Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | A rule providing for agricultural aviation activities in the GRUZ chapter provides clarity. | Retain GRUZ-R6 as notified. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-O2 | S22.016 | NZ Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | The objective to retain or enhance indigenous biodiversity, ecological, cultural, landscape, and/or historic heritage values of the Natural Open Space Zone acknowledges the importance of biodiversity values to the district | Retain NOSZ-O2 as notified. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-P4 | S22.017 | NZ Agricultural Aviation Association | Support in part | It is important to provide for activities that maintain or enhance biodiversity values in the Natural Open Space Zone | Retain policy and Insert: d. providing for weed and pest control activities. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S149.001 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Oppose in part | There is no national planning standard for the definition of accessway. Accessway in the proposed plan is a term used to define an area for transport passage (of any kind) within | Amend the definition of Accessway: Means any area or part of private land where the primary purpose is to provide access, including vehicle access, between the body of |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | a property; accessway is also a term used by NZTA standards connection between a road and a property. The NZTA definition for accessway aligns with the Proposed District Plan definition for 'vehicle crossing'. Where access to a state highway is concerned, the conflicting definitions between documents could be confusing, and there are many vehicle access or crossing points from the state highways within the Wairarapa. | any allotment(s) or site(s) and any public road, footpath, or cycling path. Accessway includes any rights of way, private way, access lot, access leg, or private road. (For the vehicle access to/from a legal road, see the definition for 'vehicle crossing'). |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S149.002 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Oppose | Including this term will assist with the consideration of the effects from subdivision proposals and the activities accommodated by new boundary arrangements and associated accessways and vehicle crossing places, which can affect state highway and other roads. It is a term that is defined by National Planning Standards and there is no additional term in the proposed plan with the same or equivalent meaning as the 'boundary adjustment' term defined in the standards. | Insert the definition for Boundary Adjustment provided by National Planning Standards: 'Means a subdivision that alters the existing boundaries between adjoining allotments, without altering the number of allotments.' |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S149.003 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Oppose | A crossing place is the location of an approved vehicle access from a state highway that has been gazetted as a Limited Access Road. State Highway 2 has limited access roads in the Wairarapa. The requirement for a crossing place is identified in the Plan standards so a definition would assist the interpretation and administration of the standards. A crossing place notice is the document which confirms legal access to a Limited Access Road. The requested wording is consistent with the Planning Policy Manual 2007. | Insert the following definition for Crossing Place (CP): "A point on the boundary of a site with a Limited Access Road (LAR) State Highway at which the has authorised vehicles to proceed to and from the LAR State Highway under either section 90 or section 91 of the Government Roding Powers Act 1989. A Crossing Place is also a 'vehiclecrossing,' a term that is also defined in this Plan". |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| Interpretation | Definitions | S149.004 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | The definition provided does not cover a sufficient range of noise sensitive activities and NZTA seek additions to this definition to ensure that when applying reverse sensitivity rules under the Noise chapter, all appropriate activities are captured for the benefit of the health and wellbeing of the occupants of a property. | Amend the definition for 'noise sensitive activities' as follows: Means: a. Any habitable room in of a residential unit activity (including visitor accommodation, seasonal worker accommodation , and retirement accommodation); b. Any educational activity (teaching areas including libraries, and drama and music studios , and sleeping rooms only) c. Any healthcare facility (rooms used for overnight patient medical care and consultation rooms only). d. Any congregations within places of worship/marae and community facilities . |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S149.005 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Oppose | There are several vehicle crossing or accessway standards that rely on the application of traffic generation, however there is no guidance in the plan on how to calculate this. A definition will assist with plan administration and ensure standards are applied in the same way across the districts. Where larger or slower vehicles are involved (trucks, truck and trailers, towed trailers, camper vans, tractors, busses etc), equivalent car movements ⁴ should be used to account for the different effects these vehicles have at an access or intersection. The vehicles need more room to manoeuvre and take longer to make turns and are associated with higher/different levels of safety risk requiring different access and intersection design responses. | Insert a definition for the term Traffic Generation as follows - Means the calculation of vehicle movements to and from, and from and to any parcel of land or accessway and a road and relates to any single or group of land use activities using a vehicle crossing or crossings, or an intersection. Vehicle movements shall be calculated using equivalent car movements in the following way: • 1 car to and from the property = 2 vehicle movements • 1 truck to and from the property = 6 vehicle movements • 1 truck and trailer to and from the property = 10 vehicle |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | movement |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S149.006 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Oppose | As identified above, the Wairarapa has several sections of state highway gazetted as Limited Access Road for which there are specific requirements in law applying under the Government Roading Powers Act. Reference to Limited Access Roads is provided in the Plan standards, a definition would therefore assist the interpretation and administration of the standards. The requested wording is consistent with the Policy Manual 2007. | Insert the following definition for Limited Access Road : Any Road declared to be A Limited Access Road under section 88 GRPA, section 346A of the Local Government Act 1974, or the corresponding provisions of any former or later enactment." |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S149.007 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Oppose | The natural hazards section of the plan relies heavily on the use of this term whereas it is not defined and there is no national planning standard for this term. The Local Government Act 2022 defines 'Statutory obligation' to mean: "means any responsibility, duty, or legal obligation conferred by or under any Act, and includes any powers associated with that responsibility, duty, or legal obligation." NZTA seeks to confirm they are a statutory agency for the purposes of administering these provisions as they relate to hazards affecting state highway infrastructure. | Insert definition of 'statutory agency' as follows: A statutory agency is any agency that has the responsibility, duty, or legal obligation conferred by or under any Act, and includes any powers associated with that responsibility, duty, or legal obligation. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S149.008 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | The proposed definition could be amended to assist in the application of proposed standards where they relate to a vehicle crossing that already exists but requires to be reformed to support a site. This also relates to submission point below on rule TR-R1(1). The words in the definition 'can be formed' may also indicate assurances that do not exist and the words 'proposed to be formed' would be more suitable. | Amend the definition as follows: Means that part of the legal road area that has been or can be or is proposed to be formed, reformed , or otherwise constructed to enable vehicle access between a site and a formed public road or live traffic lane. |
| TR - Transport | TR-O1 | S149.009 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support | The objectives together cover most if not all necessary transport network resource management issues requiring consideration, including touching on integrated planning in | Retain TR-O1 subject to relief sought for TR-R1 and TR-R2. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | TR-O1(d). Plan administration could be improved by accepting NZTA's submission points that request changes to Rule TR-R1 and TR-R2 to ensure that land use and subdivision are sufficiently connected to the outcomes of the Transport chapter. | |
| TR - Transport | TR-P1 | S149.010 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | Supports this policy which seeks to ensure a range of transport options are designed and delivered to support the transport network, recognising it is not just a vehicle network. There is a good design element to multi-modal facilities and connections which this policy could support. There are many design guidance documents available through NZTA, Austroads publications, Standards New Zealand, and Auckland Transport that could be relied upon for best practice guidance. The NZTA website lists a range of Multi-modal transport planning and design guidance. | Amend Policy TR-P1 as follows: ... a. Maximising safe and accessible opportunities for walking, cycling, and public transport use by the creation of new and/or the extension of existing multi-modal connections in the transport network when subdividing and developing; b. Requiring multi-modal options to meet with any best practice guidance current at the time of consenting; and b. c. Requiring cycle parking as appropriate for the proposed use and end of trip cycle facilities where cycle parking is required to be provided. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P2 | S149.011 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | Recognising and protecting the role of transport corridors is vital to good design outcomes for the network. Policy linkages important to achieving TR-O1. This policy seeks good design outcomes that 'promotes integrated planning and supports strategic directions;', which should be achieved through alignment with the roading hierarchy of the Plan. Issues that have the potential to undermine the roading hierarchy, and therefore the One Network Framework (ONF) are cumulative effects on roads or parts of roads. These occur when dispensations to standards are granted consecutively along a corridor, or when vehicle generation increases over time and the corridor can no longer adequately serve the needs of the land uses without upgrades. The layout of the | Amend Policy TR-P2: ... a. Promotes integrated planning and supports strategic directions and the roading hierarchy; b. Roads and vehicle crossings meet minimum design standards to allow for safe, effective and efficient traffic movement and can safely accommodate the intended number of users and the intended function of the road or crossing, without giving rise to cumulative effects on the road corridor; ... |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | Wairarapa state highway network makes it vulnerable to cumulative effects. The existing state highway environment in the Wairarapa already has established cumulative effects in places, mainly on rural lengths of state highway. These effects have not been recognised and an amendment to Policy TR-P2 could accommodate the issue of cumulative effects when considering design outcomes and maintaining the roading hierarchy. Addressing the matter here will mean that when a resource consent is required for an activity, a transport matter, or for subdivision with transport infrastructure, the matter of cumulative effects can be considered relative to the role of the transport corridor. | |
| TR - Transport | TR-P5 | S149.012 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | Support intent of the policy requiring development to meet minimum standards for access and require assessment of effects when these standards are not met. The policy TR-P5 requires effects be avoided, remedied or mitigated when standards are not met, which works in conjunction with TR-P4 that requires effects on the safe, effective and efficient functioning of the transport network to be avoided, mitigated or remedied. However, remedying or mitigating adverse traffic safety effects will not always result in the network being maintained or improved, as set out in TR-P2. Cumulative effects can still evolve and can undermine the role of the transport corridors and compromise their function as set out in TR-P3. The Wairarapa state highway network is particularly susceptible to cumulative effects, therefore it is important to recognise the potential for cumulative effects in the policy framework as a resource management tool. | Amend TR-P5: Require development (new or changes to existing lawfully established activities) to meet minimum standards when connecting to road, cycling, pedestrian and public transport corridors, or where these are not met, ensure development avoids, remedies, or mitigates any adverse effects, including cumulative effects , on the safe, effective, and efficient functioning of the transport network and provides a safe, suitable, legal, and practicable access to and from a transport corridor. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P7 | S149.013 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support | High traffic generating activities can have significant effects on transport networks. The proposed policy adequately traverses these | Retain TR-P7 subject to the relief sought to insert a definition for the term 'traffic |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | resource management issues and seeks to manage them. High traffic generating activities is not defined but is captured by standards related to vehicle movements. The calculation of vehicle movements or traffic generation, therefore, becomes pivotal. In an earlier submission point NZTA seeks the inclusion of a definition for the term 'traffic generation' which will assist with the application of the rules related to this policy. | generation'. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R1 | S149.014 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Oppose | TR-R1(1) does not specifically state that activities must meet TR-S1 - S28, only when changing an access point do these standards apply. If the access point is not proposed to be changed in any way, there is no provision to require the land use to be assessed against and comply with the access standards TR-S1 - TR-S28. The requirement for subdivision to meet with TR-Transport chapter standards has been made under the SUB-Subdivision chapter via standard SUB-S7, but there is no similar rule or standard connection for land use, which appears to be an oversight. | Amend TR-R1(1) to require all activities to comply with or meet the requirements of TR-S1 - TR-S29. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R1 | S149.015 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | Supports a permitted activity rule where a new vehicle crossing is proposed on a State Highway. However, does not consider a permitted activity status is appropriate where a modification to an existing vehicle crossing is required to support a change in land use or subdivision (such as an increase in scale of an existing lawfully established activity, a new activity related to an existing crossing, or subdivision of land related to an existing crossing). Changes in land use and/or subdivision can often be incompatible with the formation, location or standard of an existing vehicle crossing, resulting in adverse traffic safety effects including where cumulative effects exist or are triggered. The proposed rule and standards framework does not recognise the need to re-evaluate a crossing | Amend TR-R1: 1. Activity status Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with TR-S1 - TR-S28; and i. There is no new, or reformation to an existing , vehicle crossing onto a State Highway; and ii. All sites, allotments and activities have legal and physical access to and from a road. Note 1: Any vehicle crossing onto a section of State Highway which has been declared a Limited Access Road, requires production of an up-to-date crossing place notice issued under the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>when land use or subdivision change occurs. Similarly, existing use rights can be claimed for the location or standard of an existing vehicle crossing even when it does not meet the standards in TR-S1 - TR-S28. Many vehicle crossings are long established, and traffic on the state highways grows and speed limits change, other nearby land uses change and subdivision patterns create land use change; this can all happen subsequent to the establishment of a vehicle access and all these changes have a bearing on whether the access design standards of TR-S1 - TR-S28 are or could be met, such as access spacing or access geometry. Considers an advice note would also be useful to confirm that legal access, in relation to a Limited Access Road, requires an up to date crossing place notice pursuant to s91 of the Government Roding Powers Act 1989, which is the only way to confirm if an access onto or from a LAR is lawfully established.</p> | <p>Government Roding Powers Act 1989 from NZTA, that relates directly to the activities on site. Note 2: Where a subdivision or land use change is proposed to rely on an existing vehicle crossing, that crossing must comply with all standards in TR-S1 - TR-S28 as if the crossing were a new crossing that was not in existence prior to these standards coming into effect.</p> |
| <p>TR - Transport</p> | <p>TR-R1</p> | <p>S149.016</p> | <p>NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)</p> | <p>Support in part</p> | <p>Considers a Restricted Discretionary activity status is acceptable when permitted activity standards are not achieved. Notes the matters of discretion does not include cumulative effects which the Wairarapa state highway network is susceptible to, including where cumulative effects already exist because of land use access. Further notes the matters of discretion do not include the role of transport corridors. which is a cornerstone policy of the transport chapter enabling consideration of road classification and function, and several standards relate to this. Considers that the advice note could be modified to helpfully reinforce the need for an up-to-date CP notice to confirm legal access to a state highway limited access road. Supports the identification of NZTA as an affected party for any new vehicle access onto a state highway. Requests a change to</p> | <p>Amend TR-R1: Matters of Discretion: ... 7. The cumulative effects of the non-compliance with any one or more of the relevant standard(s) 8. The effect of the non-compliance with any one or more of the vehicle crossing design standard(s) on the role of the relevant transport corridor. ... Note 1: any access proposed onto a section of a State Highway which has been declared a Limited Access Road will also require an up-to-date crossing place notice issued under the Government Roding Powers Act 1989 from NZTA, that relates directly to the</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | reflect matters raised above with respect to changes to existing vehicle crossing points. | activities on site. Licenced Crossing place approval from NZTA under the Government Roading Powers Act 1989 . Note 2: If a resource consent application is made under this rule for a new, or the modification or change in use of an existing , crossing onto a State Highway, NZTA will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R2 | S149.017 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | Considers the rule only limits activities with a new road intersection with a State Highway. Increasingly other aspects of the transport network may need to connect to a state highway such as a cycleway, footpath, or bridleway. NZTA would like the opportunity to be involved in such proposals to assess their suitability and safety of connection. | Amend TR-R2(1): ...b. there is no new road intersection transport network connection or intersection with a State Highway. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R2 | S149.018 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | Generally supports the rule, but seeks amendment so NZTA is notified when there is any new transport connection with a state highway, as well as when there is a new road intersection. | Amend TR-R2(2) as follows: Note: If a resource consent application is made under this rule for a new intersection or transport network connection onto a State Highway, NZTA will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R5 | S149.019 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | Considers it is not clear that High Traffic Generating Activities are required to comply with rule TR-R1(1) permitted activity standards for vehicle access. Whether the thresholds are met or not, any High Traffic | Amend TR-R5: 1. Activity Status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Any activity generates an average daily traffic volume or peak hour traffic volume that |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>Generating Activity should meet these permitted activity standards, and where those standards are not met a concurrent resource consent sought (thus maintaining the restricted discretionary activity status). Considers that where an ITA is required for an RDA under this rule, and the ITA is required to take account of effects to a state highway, NZTA should be identified as an affected person.</p> | <p>exceeds the thresholds in Standards TR-S29., and b. Compliance is achieved with TR-S1 - S28 and where compliance is not achieved, a concurrent resource consent is sought.</p> <p>... Note: If a resource consent application is made under this rule and the required Integrated Transport Assessment identifies a state highway as part of the transport network, NZTA will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided.</p> |
| TR - Transport | TR-S2 | S149.020 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | <p>Considers separation distances should be greater for State Highway 2 as it is an Interregional Connector in the roading hierarchy. Greater separation distances will support the high movement function this road corridor performs in the network. A separation distance of 500m where a state highway is high volume or high speed. This supports TR-P2 and TR-P3.</p> | <p>Amend TR-S2 (Table TR-2 Minimum intersection separation distances): Roading hierarchy identification or Posted speed limit (km/h)</p> <p>(Insert new row) Interregional connector: 500m</p> <p>(Insert note following the table) A road hierarchy takes precedence over a speed limit.</p> |
| TR - Transport | TR-S6 | S149.021 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | <p>Does not support that Table TR-4 permits two vehicle crossings per road frontage where the length of the frontage is greater than 200m because most locations on the rural sections of the state highway network are LAR where NZTA would not support more than one access per frontage. Additionally, some locations on the state highway network in the Wairarapa are Interregional Connector roads</p> | <p>Amend TR-S6:</p> <p>Table TR-4: Reduce the maximum number of vehicle crossings per site on a state highway from two to one, regardless of frontage length.</p> <p>Figure TR-3, point 4: Point B: position the centreline of driveway where sight distance is measured (note - this is measured from the edge lane line and where there is no edge</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>with a high movement function where the separation distances are required to be 500m, so two points of access 200m apart is considered unacceptable.</p> <p>Notes an apparent typo in Figure TR-3. There is a typo with the word 'from' instead of 'for'. In addition 5m would be required rather than 3m in a rural setting for rural residential access.</p> <p>Considers the minimum separation distances in Table TR-6 are acceptable. Seeks an additional criteria for separation distances between accessways and intersections for roads classified in the roading hierarchy as Interregional Connector. A 10,000vpd threshold is used as a proxy to represent Interregional Connector roads which have a high movement function. Aligning access separation with the roading hierarchy however would allow a more consistent whole-network approach compared with the threshold of 10,000 vpd. This supports policies TR-P2 and TR-P3.</p> | <p>lane line, from the edge of seal) and is 3.5 from for residential houses in an urban area and 5m for all other activities and in rural locations.</p> <p>Table TR-6:Roading hierarchy identification or posted speed limit: (Add a new row)Interregional connector: 500m</p> <p>(Add note after table) A road hierarchy takes precedence over a speed limit.</p> |
| TR - Transport | TR-S10 | S149.022 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | <p>Notes there are separate definitions for 'vehicle crossing' and 'accessway', and considers the standard better aligns with the definition for 'vehicle crossing' given it primarily relates to how to design the access within in the legal road to access a private property. Considers introducing a definition for 'traffic generation' will assist with implementing this standard. Notes this standard also requires the development of intersections but does not indicate which standard.</p> <p>Requests an access consistent with Figure TR-7 be required where a vehicle access is located on an Interregional Connector, irrespective of the volume of traffic using the access due to the movement function of these</p> | <p>Amend TR-S10 :</p> <p>Apply TR-S10 to all Interregional Connectorroads by adding the roading classification 'Interregional Corridor' to the TR-S10 column after Future Urban zone TR-S10 Rural vehicle crossing accessway design</p> <p>1. Any accessway vehicle crossing with a traffic generation daily volume of vehicle movements of less than 100 vehicles per day shall be formed in accordance with the requirement of Table TR-8. 2. Any accessway vehicle crossing with a daily volume of vehicle movements traffic generation with an</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>corridors being paramount.</p> <p>Considers TR-S10 should apply in the Future Urban and Urban Zone north of Masterton as this urban area is expanding, land uses are changing, and roading infrastructure has not kept up. However, the road corridor remains a rural Interregional Connector with a posted speed limit of 100km/h and no footpaths or other multi-modal connections that an expanding urban area requires. NZTA therefore seeks that this section of road be treated as rural and that TR-S10 apply to all vehicle access until there is a plan for investment. Considers failure to address this issue would be at odds with the TR-O1, TR-P1, TR-P2, TR-P3, TR-P5, UFD-O1, and INF-O1. Considers that because the land to be rezoned fronts an Interregional Connector it would be more straight forward to add that roading category to the application of TR-S10, rather than have site-specific rules. This standard provides a trigger for requiring an access or an intersection, that trigger point of 100 vehicles per day is supported.</p> | <p>average of 100 or more vehicles per day shall be formed as a road intersection in accordance with the relevant industry standards, including Austroads. ...</p> <p>Matters of Discretion:</p> <p>1. Effects on the safety of the accessway vehicle crossing and the adjacent transport network.</p> <p>... Table TR-8 Rural accessway vehicle access design</p> <p>Average volume of vehicle movements using access per day traffic generation (vpd)</p> <p>... Figure TR-7 Low volume accessway.</p> <p>... Figure TR-8 Low volume accessway.</p> |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P3 | S149.023 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | <p>SH2 and SH53 both traverse identified flood hazard areas in the high, moderate, and low hazard zones; management of stormwater and flood hazards in these locations is an ongoing maintenance issue which can be made worse by developments on property flanking the state highway. Requests stormwater neutral development when new activities establish involving the displacement of stormwater (from new hard stand or buildings), the effects on state highway infrastructure needs to be recognised and provided for as a matter of assessment across several of the proposed policies. These policies are important because they</p> | <p>Amend NH-P3:</p> <p>... 3. The risk to other properties, infrastructure including state highways, activities, and people is not increased as a result of the activity proceeding.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | form the matters of discretion in assessment of restricted discretionary activities. | |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R1 | S149.024 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | Both state highways in the Wairarapa are within flood hazard areas and susceptible to flooding. It is important that NZTA can effectively undertake flood mitigation works to support highway resilience. The term 'statutory agency' is not defined by the proposed plan, and it is therefore unclear to NZTA if this rule applies to them or their activities. Some flood prone locations on SH2 and SH53 are not located in any of the flood hazard areas. NZTA seeks that flood mitigation works affecting state highways, but which fall outside the designation boundary of a state highway, be included as permitted activities. | Amend NH-R1: Flood mitigation or stream or river management works undertaken by a statutory agency for their nominated agent within any of the flood hazard areas or where roads have been affected by ponding or flooding. (subject to relief sought for inserting a definition for "statutory agency") |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-R1 | S149.025 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | There are scheduled trees that either have limbs that extend over a state highway, or which significantly shade a state highway. Section 55 of the Government Roadway Powers Act provides for the trimming or removal of trees that is overhanging or overshadowing a road to such an extent as to damage the road, or to endanger or obstruct the lawful use of the road to be detrimental to the maintenance of the road and any associated draining system. NZTA seeks that this provision is added to the permitted activity status in the same way the electricity statute is. | Amend TREE-R1: ... iii. the trimming is required by statute or regulations, including the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003 or the Telecommunications Act 2001; or the Government Roadway Powers Act 1989. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P2 | S149.026 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | The TR-Transport chapter also has a policy framework around integrating the transport network with subdivision development. With the changes requested above, the TR-Transport chapter has a strong framework that should be relied upon to assess the appropriateness or otherwise of subdivision development. | Amend SUB-P2: ... g. achieving safe and efficient access onto and from state highway in accordance with the roading hierarchy and meeting the TR-Transport objectives and policies. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P4 | S149.027 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | Considers that often subdivision can exacerbate the effects of natural hazards on road infrastructure, which should be | Amend SUB-P4: ... b. results in adverse effects on the stability of land and buildings and on infrastructure |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | recognised in the Policy, particularly as SH2 and SH53 are both affected by flooding hazards. | (including roads) ; c. accelerates, worsens, or results in material damage to land, buildings, infrastructure (including roads) or people from natural hazards; or... |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P7 | S149.028 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | The state highways in the Wairarapa are generally flanked by rural areas where they do not traverse the townships or the Waingawa industrial zone. Maintaining the Interregional Collector function between Wairarapa's towns can be compromised by rural subdivision and the subsequent intensification of land use. Subdivision of rural properties that has this effect is inappropriate and is a resource management issue that should be picked up by this policy. There are already several locations on the transport network where cumulative effects from rural subdivision have established and created unsafe sections of state highway and threatened to undermine the through road function of the state highway. This matter should be identified under this policy. | Amend SUB-P6: ... c. Avoid cumulative effects that can arise from subdivision located fronting roads with an Interregional Collector function in accordance with the roading hierarchy. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P7 | S149.029 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | Supports restricting subdivision of future urban zoned land until and unless the required infrastructure is in place to serve development. The policy has a strong focus on three waters infrastructure but is light on the transport network infrastructures. The locations of the Future Urban zones are generally appropriate, however the impacts on the transport network, its intersections and the role of roads in the hierarchy, could all be significantly affected by these zones. As the state highways are the transport network spine that all these zones will ultimately rely upon, this policy should have a stronger transport network focus. | Amend SUB-P7:... b. The need for significant upgrades, provisions, or extensions to the reticulated wastewater, reticulated water supply, or stormwater networks, the transport network , or other infrastructure in advance of planned integrated urban development. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R2 | S149.030 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Oppose | Urban subdivision within the Cashmere Oaks precinct would have significant effects on the Transport Network. As such, was provided for as a discretionary activity. Although the precinct does not directly connect to the state highway, there is only one way in and one way out of the greenfield area at the intersection of Cashmere Oaks Drive and State Highway 2. The state highway corridor and the intersection are on a rural 100km/h road that has an Interregional Connector role (which has been incorrectly mapped in the Plan as Urban Connector to Cashmere Oaks Drive). Ongoing development relying on this intersection is at odds with the Interregional Connector function and would give rise to significant safety concerns and network issues. Development of the PREC3-Cashmere Oaks prior to investment and roading upgrades along with a change in the road function would be at odds with the policy framework of the Plan. For the road function to change, an investment in roading infrastructure would be required, prior to such an investment all subdivision should remain discretionary. | Amend SUB-R2: SUB-R2(1): PREC3- Cashmere Oaks Development Precinct SUB-R2(7): PREC3: Cashmere Oaks Development Precinct Note: For any subdivision resource consent application made under this rule, NZTA will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R1 | S149.031 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Oppose in part | Considers that boundary adjustments can alter vehicle access and crossing requirements and can alter the legal status of an access if it is located on a state highway gazetted as Limited Access Road where the Crossing Place notice would be required to be updated. Amending boundaries can also give rise to increase in land use intensity whereby the new allotments are able to contain additional development meeting requirements of the zone rules. The controlled activity rule does not recognise these factors in determining an appropriate activity status for changing access arrangements on state highway road frontages, which can deem an access to be | Amend SUB-R1:1. Activity Status: Controlled Where... c. The boundary adjustment has legal and physical access to and from a road, including an up-to-date crossing place notice where the allotments rely on access to and from a Limited Access Road... ... 3. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where:... c. Compliance with SUB-R1(1)(c) is not met. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | unlawful unless the crossing place notice is updated by NZTA. | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R1 | S149.032 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Oppose in part | Boundary adjustments can alter vehicle access and crossing requirements and can alter the legal status of an access if it is located on a state highway gazetted as Limited Access Road where the Crossing Place notice would be required to be updated. Amending boundaries can also give rise to increase in land use intensity whereby the new allotments are able to contain additional development meeting requirements of the zone rules. The controlled activity rule does not recognise these factors in determining an appropriate activity status for changing access arrangements on state highway road frontages, which can deem an access to be unlawful unless the crossing place notice is updated by NZTA. | Amend SUB-R1(2) with an additional criteria as follows: 2.Activity Status: Controlled Where:... c. The boundary adjustment has legal and physical access to and from a road, including an up-to-date crossing place notice where the allotments rely on access to and from a Limited Access Road ... 5. Activity status: Discretionary Where: c. Compliance is not achieved with SUB-R1(2)(a) or SUB-R1(2)(c). |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R2 | S149.033 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Oppose in part | Considers this rule is more permissive than the operative plan rules because it applies whether the site being subdivided has access to a state highway. The rule requires compliance with SUB-S7, which requires the relevant provisions of the TR-Transport chapter to be complied with. The Future Urban Zone in Opaki fronts State Highway 2 whereas that road corridor has an Interregional Connector role in the roading hierarchy, it is a fast 100km/h speed road that is not ready or suitable for subdivision or residential development. As the zone is less than 40Ha it could not be subdivided and meet SUB-S1. That notwithstanding, because the road environment is not presently equipped to cater for future urban development, NZTA request an additional criteria that excludes properties gaining access from a state highway. This would only affect the FUZ land north of Masterton. | Amend SUB-R2: 3. Activity Status Controlled Where..... d. there is no direct access to or from a state highway. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S149.034 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Oppose in part | The Restricted discretionary activity status is appropriate however, NZTA has not been identified as a notifiable party and should be given the trigger for this rule is whether the site to be subdivided fronts a state highway. Additionally, vehicle access is not specifically included or listed as a matter for discretion. | Amend Rule SUB-R4 to add an advisory footnote: Note: If a resource consent application is made under this rule, NZTA will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R5 | S149.035 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Oppose in part | This rule framework is acceptable, however NZTA has not been identified as a notifiable party and should be given the trigger for this rule is whether the site to be subdivided fronts a state highway. Additionally, vehicle access is not specifically included or listed as a matter for discretion. | Amend SUB-R5(3): ... Matters of discretion: ...9. Relevant vehicle access standards under TR-S1-S28... Note: If a resource consent application is made under this rule, NZTA will be considered an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S7 | S149.036 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | This standard is supported and generally requires legal and physical access to a road in accordance with transport chapter standards. The standard is generic because of the way the TR-Transport chapter is structured; subdivisions should be specifically required to meet with TR-S1-TR-S28 rather than just 'the relevant' standard which leaves matters open for interpretation. | Amend SUB-S7: 1. All new allotments created must have legal and physical access to a road in accordance with TR-R1(1) and the relevant standards TR-S1 - TR-S28 in TR-Transport. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB - Table 1 | S149.037 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | Supports minimum allotments sizes for all zones except for the residential zone accessed via State Highway 2 and Cashmere Oakes Drive intersection which is located on a 100km/hr speed zone; and the part of the residential zone with frontage and access to State Highway 2 north of Masterton within a 100km/h speed zone (includes the Hansels | Retain SUB Table 1 provided the following amendments to other provisions and maps are made: - Require discretionary activity subdivision status for all residential subdivision relying the 100km/h sections of SH2 north of Masterton, including Cashmere Oakes Drive intersection with SH2 (note previous submission point |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | Factory site, the Arvida retirement village site, and properties on Opaki Meadows Drive along the eastern side of the state highway.) Considers that given the road's status of the state highway, it is not able to service the level of development for these residential areas at the densities proposed in SUB-Table 1 (noting the Cashmere Oaks Development Concept Plan had densities of 1,2000m2 at the time NZTA approved it). | requesting amendment of activity status of subdivision in PREC3 - Cashmere Oaks Development Precinct in Rule SUB-R2) - Accept the relief sought on TR-S10 - Correct the roading hierarchy shown on the planning maps as urban connector instead of Interregional Connector in these areas |
| LIGHT - Light | LIGHT-S1 | S149.038 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | NZTA often requires bright lights for road maintenance and emergency works, which have an operational and safety need. These would not meet the LIGHT-S1 standards for lux, colour temperature or lumens. | Amend LIGHT-S1: Exceptions to LIGHT-S1: the provisions do not apply to specific types of activities or lighting which has a function need or operational need, such as navigational aids and vehicle lights, a. All illuminated signs required to be displayed by any other legislation or discharging a statutory function and displayed in accordance with the provisions of that legislation. b. All illuminated signs required for night-time works for the construction, maintenance and upgrading of network utilities. c. Activities and lighting which has a function need or operation need including navigational aids and vehicle lights. |
| Planning Maps | Specific Controls | S149.039 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | Support use of the state highway noise boundary as a tool to manage reverse sensitivity however, the symbol should align with national planning standards. | Amend the name of 'State highway noise boundary' to Noise control boundary overlay (state highways) and amend map key to align with national planning |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | standards. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-O2 | S149.040 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | NZTA supports this reverse sensitivity objective and seeks to confirm its relevance to roading infrastructure. | Amend NOISE-O2: The function and operation of existing and permitted noise generating activities, including infrastructure , are not compromised by reverse sensitivity effects from noise sensitive activities. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-R12 | S149.041 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | Notes that NOISE-R13 only applies in the rural and residential zones. Considers all zones should be covered as there is provision within all zones for noise sensitive activities to establish, including residential activities, and properties within all zones adjoin a state highway at locations throughout the Wairarapa. Notes the rule would not cover a scenario where a change of use of an existing building occurs, and the change is to a noise sensitive activity. It is foreseeable however, that a noise sensitive activity could occupy an existing building to which alterations are made, and that would constitute a change of use. Seeks that within all zones, noise sensitive activities protect themselves from state highway noise whether occupying an existing building, occupying an extension to an existing building, or occupying a new building. Notes other relief sought on the definition for noise sensitive activity are sought above and will strengthen the understanding of these activities. | Amend rule NOISE-R12(1) to apply to all zones, and: NOISE-R12: New buildings, change in use of existing buildings, and additions and alterations to existing buildings to be occupied by a noise sensitive activity located within the noise control boundary overlay (state highway) as shown on the planning maps. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-S3 | S149.042 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | Concerned that the standard not applying to and not adequately deal with building alterations and mechanical ventilation requirements to adequately preserve an indoor living environment. To ensure existing established uses within existing established buildings maintain their existing use rights, the submitter seeks to apply reverse sensitivity | Amend NOISE-S3: Residential and rural zones All Zones 1. Any noise sensitive activities in a new building, or an addition or alteration to an existing building within the state highway noise boundary noise control boundary |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>rules. This would cover for example, an existing dwelling on an existing site (because the use is not changing) but not a new or additional dwelling on the same site.</p> | <p>overlay (state highway) (as shown on the planning maps) must be designed, constructed, and maintained to achieve an internal noise level of 40dB LAeq(24hr) inside all habitable spaces; and</p> <p>2. Where it is necessary to have the windows closed to achieve the above design requirements, a ventilation system must be provided. The ventilation system must be designed to satisfy the requirements of the New Zealand Building Code and achieve a noise level of no more than Noise Criteria (NC) 30 in any habitable space and the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provides mechanical ventilation to satisfy clause G4 of the NZ Building Code; b. Is adjustable by the occupant to control the ventilation rate in increments up to a high air flow setting that provides at least 6 air changes per hour; c. Provides relief for equivalent volumes of spill air; d. Provides cooling and heating that is controllable by the occupant and can maintain the inside temperature between 18oC and 25oC; e. Does not generate pre than 35dB LAeq(30s) when measured 1 metre away from any grille or diffuser |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| How the Plan Works | General Approach | S149.043 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | The zone descriptions detail how to apply the Plan by using all Plan chapters, however the links between Area Specific Matters for land use and TR-Transport chapter are not strong. Such links are important because transport matters affect every land use in the district and are a functional requirement for integrated planning outcomes the Plan seeks to achieve, as different from other district wide resource management issues which can be site specific. This approach has been taken under the SUB-Subdivision chapter by use of Standard SUB-S7, which requires all new allotments to have an access meeting the requirements of the relevant TR-Transport chapter rules and standards. The land use chapter does not have a similar rule or standard framework; the submission points and relief sought to the TR-Transport chapter will provide a sound framework to address and implement these important resource management issues. | Amend the TR-Transport Chapter in accordance with the relief sought in other submission points. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S149.044 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Oppose | Opposes rezoning the current Hansel's factory site from Industrial to General Residential. The subject site fronts and has access to an Interregional Connector Road under council's roading hierarchy, which are characterised with high levels of movement function. The proposed zoning is inconsistent with the adjoining roading hierarchy listed in both the One Network Framework and Council's roading hierarchy and appears to be inconsistent with rezoning in the immediate surrounding environment which introduces a future urban zone across the road. Changing the land use from industrial to residential will generate a different type of vehicle generation and introduce more land for living on where future residents will need multi-modal options that cannot be provided in the current 100km/h speed zone as it is not safe. There are no footpaths, cycle lanes or road | Amend the planning maps to rezone the Hansel's Factory site and Arvida site (State Highway 2, Lansdowne, north of Masterton) from General Residential to Future Urban Zone. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>shoulders to assist people movements in this road corridor. NZTA seeks for Council to apply equal and consistent management to the rezoning of FUZ zones in this locality.</p> <p>Notes the neighbouring Arvida site to the north is also proposed to be rezoned residential. Notes the effects of the retirement village have been managed through resource consent, that will not manage any land use change into the future where there is still insufficient multimodal infrastructure to serve future residents. No such process has been undertaken for the Hansel's site. Rezoning the site to FUZ would provide an appropriate compromise signalling the site is intended to be rezoned for residential purposes, requiring a resource consent should there be a land use change in the interim and whilst transport infrastructure is sorted out as presently the surrounding transport network is unable to service additional people movements without further intervention.</p> | |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | PREC3 Table 1 | S149.045 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | Reference to permitted and controlled activities is unnecessary as none are provided for in PREC 3 - Rules. | Amend PREC3 - R1(3): a. The activity is any other activity that is not otherwise listed a Permitted, Controlled, or Restricted Discretionary activity in PREC- 3 Rules is a Discretionary activity. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | PREC3-R1 | S149.046 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Neutral | Notes PREC3 only provides for retirement villages as restricted discretionary activities while all other activities are discretionary in accordance with PREC3 - R1(3). Rules in the GRZ permit activities such as home businesses, residential visitor accommodation and minor residential dwellings. The plan as currently drafted is silent on which set of rules prevails within the precinct, creating ambiguity. The chapters intent appears to capture any activity which falls outside PREC | Amend PREC3 Chapter to clarify the relationship between the rules of PREC3 and the GRZ chapters. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | 3 - R1.1 as a discretionary activity which is supported by NZTA. | |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S4 | S149.047 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | Notes GRUZ-S4 provides for the number of residential units permitted on varying sizes of rural properties. This implies this is functionally focused on ensuring primary production activities have sufficient homes to support those who need to live on and work on the land, the standard does not link the number of permitted units to the underlying land use. The objectives and policies of the zone support the development of residential activities which are ancillary to rural productive activities. Notes the GRUZ contains multiple allotments used for rural residential purposes. The standard as currently drafted would permit intensification of these legacy rural residential allotments, which appears contrary to the purpose and directives of the GRUZ. Requests an additional subclause allowing the proposed intensification of residential units for sites less than 40ha used for rural productive purpose, while rural residential sites are limited to 1 permitted dwelling per site. | Amend GRUZ-S4: 1. For sites comprising less than 40 ha and used primarily for rural productive purposes: a. One residential unit per site: and b. One minor residential unit per site, where the minor residential unit is located within 30m of the primary residential unit and has a gross floor area of no more than 80m ² . 2. For sites comprising less than 40 ha and used primarily for rural residential purposes: a. One residential unit per site. 2- 3. For sites comprising 40ha or more... |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-O1 | S149.048 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | NZTA is not opposed to the proposed rezoning. The proposed zoning is located close to a city centre and for the most part does not directly front the state highway network. NZTA would suggest no access onto Fifth Street is supported with higher density living until road hierarchy and function of the current Interregional Collector corridor is altered to better accommodate additional traffic. Like the residential rezoned land south of Fifth Street, an investment in the corridor is required to provide additional capacity and a different road function to support ongoing development. | Amend the RLZ chapter to restrict access from the RLZ area to SH2 via Fifth Street, until the Interregional Connector function of the transport corridor is changed. |
| Designations | NZTA - New Zealand | S149.050 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support | NZTA supports the drafting for the schedule of designations and boundaries shown on Councils planning maps. The proposed | Retain NZTA-C-01 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | Transport Agency | | | | designations are in accordance with past consultation undertaken with Council. | |
| TR - Transport | TR-O2 | S149.051 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support | TR-O2 deals with effects from operating and maintaining transport infrastructure, in most cases infrastructure will operate and be maintained or developed within a designation and objective TR-O2 will not apply. Plan administration could be improved by accepting NZTA's submission points that request changes to Rule TR-R1 and TR-R2 to ensure that land use and subdivision are sufficiently connected to the outcomes of the Transport chapter. | Retain TR-O2 subject to relief sought on TR-R1 and TR-R2. |
| TR - Transport | TR-O3 | S149.052 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support | Considers the transport network is prioritised under TR-O3, ensuring it is not compromised or constrained by incompatible land use or subdivision. Some of the links between land use, subdivision and transport chapters rules and standards is tenuous, and integrated planning could easily be overlooked. Plan administration could be improved by accepting NZTA's submission points that request changes to Rule TR-R1 and TR-R2 to ensure that land use and subdivision are sufficiently connected to the outcomes of the Transport chapter. | Retain TR-O3 subject to relief sought on TR-R1 and TR-R2. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P3 | S149.053 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | Recognising and protecting the role of transport corridors is vital to good design outcomes for the network. Policy linkages important to achieving TR-O1. Policy TR-P3 appropriately relies on the One Network Framework (ONF) to establish the roading hierarchy, which applies to local roads and state highways alike. Policy TR-P3 aligns well with objective UFD-O4 Infrastructure Capacity and INF-O1 Infrastructure. Including the One Network Framework (ONF) in the Plan will align it with strategic transport planning in long term plans, Regional Land Transport Plans (RLTP's), Long Term Council Community Plans (LTCCP), and the National Land | Retain TR-P3 subject to further submission points seeking corrections to the planning maps regarding the One Network Framework and road hierarchy, and insertion of a new appendix "Roading Hierarchy Descriptions and One Network Framework Street Categories". |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | Transport Plan and the relevant funding mechanisms. However, considers the Plan does not provide sufficient information or context on the ONF to assist in the successful implementation of TR-P3, and some of the ONF roading hierarchy mapping is incorrect. Issues that have the potential to undermine the roading hierarchy, and therefore the One Network Framework (ONF) are cumulative effects on roads or parts of roads. These occur when dispensations to standards are granted consecutively along a corridor, or when vehicle generation increases over time and the corridor can no longer adequately serve the needs of the land uses without upgrades. | |
| Planning Maps | Energy, Infrastructure and Transport | S149.054 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Amend | The Plan maps incorrectly identified the hierarchy of road sections in Masterton from the 50km/h threshold northwards. | Amend the roading hierarchy layer of the planning maps which has some errors compared to the published One Network Framework. |
| TR - Transport | New provision request | S149.055 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Oppose in part | Insert new appendix to the Plan to provide sufficient information or context on the One Network Framework to assist in the successful implementation of Policy TR-P3 | Insert new appendix, APPX - Roading Hierarchy Descriptions and One Network Framework Street Categories (see attachment to original submission for proposed appendix) |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P4 | S149.056 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | SH2 and SH53 both traverse identified flood hazard areas in the high, moderate, and low hazard zones; management of stormwater and flood hazards in these locations is an ongoing maintenance issue which can be made worse by developments on property flanking the state highway. Requests stormwater neutral development when new activities establish involving the displacement of stormwater (from new hard stand or buildings), the effects on state highway infrastructure needs to be recognised and provided for as a matter of assessment across several of the proposed policies. These policies are important because they | Amend NH-P4: ... 3. The risk to other properties, infrastructure including state highways , activities, and people is not increased as a result of the activity proceeding. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | form the matters of discretion in assessment of restricted discretionary activities. | |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P5 | S149.057 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | SH2 and SH53 both traverse identified flood hazard areas in the high, moderate, and low hazard zones; management of stormwater and flood hazards in these locations is an ongoing maintenance issue which can be made worse by developments on property flanking the state highway. Requests stormwater neutral development when new activities establish involving the displacement of stormwater (from new hard stand or buildings), the effects on state highway infrastructure needs to be recognised and provided for as a matter of assessment across several of the proposed policies. These policies are important because they form the matters of discretion in assessment of restricted discretionary activities. | Amend NH-P5: ... 3. The risk to other properties, infrastructure including state highways , activities, and people is not increased as a result of the activity proceeding. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P6 | S149.058 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | SH2 and SH53 both traverse identified flood hazard areas in the high, moderate, and low hazard zones; management of stormwater and flood hazards in these locations is an ongoing maintenance issue which can be made worse by developments on property flanking the state highway. Requests stormwater neutral development when new activities establish involving the displacement of stormwater (from new hard stand or buildings), the effects on state highway infrastructure needs to be recognised and provided for as a matter of assessment across several of the proposed policies. These policies are important because they form the matters of discretion in assessment of restricted discretionary activities. | Amend NH-P6: Discourage new buildings and extensive areas of hard stand in flood hazard - overland flow path and ponding areas unless: 1. There is no increase in stormwater discharge , flood flow or level on adjoining sites, or roads . |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P9 | S149.059 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | SH2 and SH53 both traverse identified flood hazard areas in the high, moderate, and low hazard zones; management of stormwater and flood hazards in these locations is an ongoing maintenance issue which can be made worse by developments on property | Amend NH-P9: ... 2. the risk to other properties, the state highway , activities and people is not increased as a result of the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | flanking the state highway. Requests stormwater neutral development when new activities establish involving the displacement of stormwater (from new hard stand or buildings), the effects on state highway infrastructure needs to be recognised and provided for as a matter of assessment across several of the proposed policies. These policies are important because they form the matters of discretion in assessment of restricted discretionary activities. | activityproceeding. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P13 | S149.060 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support in part | SH2 and SH53 both traverse identified flood hazard areas in the high, moderate, and low hazard zones; management of stormwater and flood hazards in these locations is an ongoing maintenance issue which can be made worse by developments on property flanking the state highway. Requests stormwater neutral development when new activities establish involving the displacement of stormwater (from new hard stand or buildings), the effects on state highway infrastructure needs to be recognised and provided for as a matter of assessment across several of the proposed policies. These policies are important because they form the matters of discretion in assessment of restricted discretionary activities. | Amend NH-P13: ... 1. There is no increase in flood flow or level of adjoining sites or the state highway . |
| Designations | NZTA - New Zealand Transport Agency | S149.061 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support | NZTA supports the drafting for the schedule of designations and boundaries shown on Councils planning maps. The proposed designations are in accordance with past consultation undertaken with Council. | Retain NZTA-M-01 as notified. |
| Designations | NZTA - New Zealand Transport Agency | S149.062 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support | NZTA supports the drafting for the schedule of designations and boundaries shown on Councils planning maps. The proposed designations are in accordance with past consultation undertaken with Council. | Retain NZTA-S-01 as notified. |
| Designations | NZTA - New Zealand | S149.063 | NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) | Support | NZTA supports the drafting for the schedule of designations and boundaries shown on Councils planning maps. The proposed | Retain NZTA-S02 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|---|------------------|--------------------------|----------|--|---|
| | Transport Agency | | | | designations are in accordance with past consultation undertaken with Council | |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S110.001 | Panatahi Sue | Oppose | Considers the opt-in/opt-out process for the Māori Purpose Zone was contentious, speculative, and unclear as to the involvement of the Māori Land Court (MLC) in relation to opting in of all lands under their jurisdiction. Considers that representatives of MLC should have been involved in consultation and needed to seek permission with Māori o Wairarapa. Considers that the Councils breached Te Tiriti (i.e. Article 2 - not enabling tangata whenua to participate in decision making and solely relying on advice of MLC & Article 3 equitable opportunity to opt-in or out of Māori Purpose Zone opposed to determining just the opt-in advice from MLC) | Amend submissions deadline to afford tangata whenua o Wairapapa time to consult wider with their whānau and beneficiaries that reside within and outside of Wairarapa, engage with both the Māori Land Court o Takitimu, and the Combined Wairarapa District Council representatives. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S193.001 | Panatahi Takarua | Oppose | Considers the opt-in/opt-out process for the Māori Purpose Zone was contentious, speculative, and unclear as to the involvement of the Māori Land Court (MLC) in relation to opting in of all lands under their jurisdiction. Considers that representatives of MLC should have been involved in consultation and needed to seek permission with Māori o Wairarapa. Considers that the Councils breached Te Tiriti (i.e. Article 2 - not enabling tangata whenua to participate in decision making and solely relying on advice of MLC & Article 3 equitable opportunity to opt-in or out of Māori Purpose Zone opposed to determining just the opt-in advice from MLC). | Amend submissions deadline to afford tangata whenua o Wairapapa time to consult wider with their whānau and beneficiaries that reside within and outside of Wairarapa, engage with both the Māori Land Court o Takitimu, and the Combined Wairarapa District Council representatives. |
| Tangata Whenua | Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi | S112.001 | Papawai Ahu whenua Trust | Support | The Maori Purpose Zone provides for flexibility in land use to ensure desired activities can be undertaken. | Retain the Maori Purpose Zone and relevant activities within it. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S235.001 | Papawai Ahu whenua Trust | Support | Notes many of the Māori owned blocks included in the Māori Purpose Zone is land locked and involves the use of paper roads. Considers any of the advantages that these | Amend the extent of the Maori Purpose Zone to include paper roads and landlocked land. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | two conditions bring to the table are not disadvantaged by the formation of this zone but in fact may be enhanced. | |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S68.001 | Papawai and Kaikokirikiri Trusts | Amend | States that LOT 1 DP 44945 is currently being used for rural purposes but currently rated as urban residential. Land is governed under Papawai and Kaikokirikiri Trusts ACT 1943 and should always operate to benefit Tangata Whenua of the Wairarapa for Education Purposes. Changing the land designation would limit the property Trust in its activities and future choice of development. | Amend zoning of LOT 1 DP 44945 from General Industrial Zone to General Rural Zone. |
| Whole Plan | | S18.001 | Patrick Ward | Not Stated | Seeks that Council prioritises core responsibilities such as water and drainage before other projects such as town halls and events centres due to funding shortfalls. | Not applicable |
| Planning Maps | Natural Environment Values | S211.001 | Paula Gillett and Jane Donald | Oppose in part | The submitter wishes to clarify the scientific data used to identify the extent of these features. The submitter feels concerned for how the ONF will impact everyday farming operations. | Amend the extent of the Outstanding Natural Feature (Wairarapa Moana) across 379 Diversion Road, Featherston. |
| Planning Maps | | S2.001 | Paul Burgin | Amend | 'The town' is constrained to the north, south, and east. Subdivide land to the west of town. It is inferred that the town being referred to is Masterton. | Amend planning maps to enable land to be subdivided to the west of town (inferred that this refers to Masterton, and the land should be rezoned to FUZ or GRZ) |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | | S2.002 | Paul Burgin | Not Stated | Would like provisions to account for an ageing population, through denser and smaller accommodation which is purpose built. | Amend provisions in the District Plan to enable denser and smaller accommodations |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S127.001 | Paul Burgin | Oppose in part | The submitter notes the first draft plan showed this site as Future Urban Zone. It was then amended to be General Rural Zone. Submits that 79a Upper Plain Road should be rezoned to Future Urban or General Residential as it would meet Objective SUB-O3 'Future Development', for the following reasons. 1. 79A Upper Plain Road is flanked by existing urban development on two sides. 2. The site has a 15m accessway to Upper Plain Road and two other points of | Amend the zoning at 79a Upper Plain Road, from General Rural to Future Urban or General Residential. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>ingress/egress on Upper Plain and Chamberlain to allow seamless access.</p> <p>3. Waste and water is available as the site has been subject of significant upgrade in recent years.</p> <p>4. Property is next to a bus route and has 2 rail stations in walking distance.</p> <p>5. Site would not be economic as a dry stock farm or for horticultural use (not suitable for planted crops).</p> | |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | New provision request | S143.001 | Penelope Jane Bargh | Support | There is currently no provision for non-commercial rural airstrips not associated with primary production/agricultural aviation. Compliance is required through NOISE-R1 and NOISE-S1 of 55dB LAeq (15 mins) and would limit the ability of a rural airstrip to be used by aircraft. | Insert in GRUZ - Use of rural airstrips for non commercial general aviation Activity status: Permitted. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S143.002 | Penelope Jane Bargh | Support | Support the submission made by NZ Agricultural Aviation Association. | Amend provisions as requested in the submission by NZ Agriculture Aviation Association. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S250.001 | Peter Clark, Wayne Carmichael, and Dorreen Mackenzie | Oppose | Notes Greytown does not have a large supply of residential land available for greenfield development. Notes that with the current master planning schedule and plan changes required to uplift the Future Urban Zoning, it will be 6-7 years before the land can likely be developed for residential purposes. Considers the identified sites are appropriate for development now without a masterplan process since it is physically separated from the bulk of the Future Urban Zone by Papawai Road. Development within the submission site would help supply land for housing in Greytown and keep the price of residential land in check prior to the Future Urban zone becoming General Residential zone. | Amend the planning maps to rezone nine properties at 20-36 Papawai Road, Greytown, from Future Urban Zone to to General Residential Zone (Low Density Precinct). |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S289.001 | Peter Himona | Oppose | The submitter discusses they oppose the proposed rezoning change to Māori Purpose Zone as: not having enough time to consider it; the plan is too complex to understand, | Amend the Plan to remove the Māori Purpose Zone (inferred - no property address provided). |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | particularly what the effect of all those clauses will be; it does not clearly show the pros and cons for being zoned under the Ture Whenua Act compared to Māori Purpose Zone; and the online submission is so hard to navigate. | |
| Planning Maps | Hazards and Risks | S101.001 | Peter Stout | Oppose | Considers communication has been lacking with residents. Notes GNS maps and reports have disclaimers to the effect that the maps should not be used at a site-specific or property level for liquefaction, and further investigations are needed. Considers the proposed changes will affect land use and insurance. Requests that communications with affected stakeholders be undertaken and the proposed maps not be incorporated at a property specific level until the further testing is complete, as recommended by the named reports. | Delete proposed fault hazard and liquefaction maps until further testing is complete and communication has occurred with all stakeholders, including the affected land owners. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S224.001 | Peter William Gibbs | Oppose in part | Objects to this re-zoning due to lack of consultation with both Māori and non-Māori landowners. Notes many landowners have received no notification, or late notification of the proposal. The submitter also objects due to concerns over how the proposed provisions will affect use of the site. | Amend the planning maps to rezone Title 423034, legal description Akura 3C, 1A3B to General Rural Zone. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S209.001 | Powerco Limited | Oppose in part | The electricity distribution network also utilises customer connection lines in a manner similar to that used by telecommunications operators. Changes are sought to include a reference to electricity customer connections. | Amend definition of Customer Connection Line to the following: Means a telecommunication or electricity line that connects a telecommunications distribution network to a premises for the purpose of enabling the a facility operator to provide telecommunication services to a customer. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S209.002 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this definition. | Retain definition of 'distribution network' as drafted. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S209.003 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this definition. | Retain definition of 'Distributor' as drafted. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Interpretation | Definitions | S209.004 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this definition. | Retain definition of 'Functional need' as drafted. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S209.005 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this definition, although it is noted that some items have minor formatting errors (the numbering in clause a) | Retain definition of 'Infrastructure' and amend/correct the numbering format as per the RMA definition |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S209.006 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this definition | Retain definition of 'network utility operator' as drafted |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S209.007 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this definition | Retain definition of 'network utility' as drafted |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S209.008 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this national planning standards definition. | Retain definition of 'operational need' as drafted. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S209.009 | Powerco Limited | Neutral | Submitter appreciates this is a definition from the NES TF, however the provisions of the plan, particularly the NU chapter refers to both 'pole' and 'telecommunication pole'. The submitter is of the view that this definition should be reframed to 'telecommunication pole'. The submitter utilises poles to carry overhead conductors (lines) and other equipment which would not fall under this definition as they aren't designed to support antennas. | Amend definition of 'Pole', as required to ensure there is a clear distinction between poles used for electricity distribution and telecommunications. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S209.010 | Powerco Limited | Support in part | Submitter supports the need for this definition, however it needs to be clear that replacement infrastructure is anticipated under this definition. Upgrading works often entail replacement components. | Amend definition of 'Upgrade': As it applies to network utilities, means the improvement or increase in carrying capacity, operational efficiency, security, or safety of existing or replacement infrastructure, but excludes maintenance and repair. |
| Strategic Direction | INF-O1 | S209.011 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this objective and the clarity which it provides. | Retain as drafted |
| NU - Network Utilities | Introduction | S209.012 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports the following text included in the introduction to the NU Chapter: The provisions within this chapter apply on a district-wide basis. The rules in the zone chapters do not apply to network utilities | Retain as drafted. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | unless specifically stated within a rule or standard in this chapter. The objectives, policies, and rules in district-wide overlay chapters do apply to network utilities. | |
| NU - Network Utilities | Introduction | S209.013 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports reference to these regulations | Retain as drafted |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O1 | S209.014 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this objective and the clarity which it provides. | Retain as drafted |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O2 | S209.015 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this objective and the clarity which it provides. | Retain as drafted |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O3 | S209.016 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this objective and the clarity which it provides | Retain as drafted. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P1 | S209.017 | Powerco Limited | Support in part | Submitter supports the intent of this policy, however a slight change is sought to refer to the replacement of existing network utilities. | Amend as follows: Recognise the benefits of network utilities by: a. enabling the operation, maintenance, repair, replacement , minor upgrading or removal of existing network utilities throughout the district. b. enabling investigation, monitoring, and navigation activities associated with network utility operations throughout the district; c. providing for substantial upgrades to, and the development of new, network utilities; and d. providing for the functions and responsibilities of network utilities as lifeline utilities during an emergency. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P2 | S209.018 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this policy and the clarity which it provides | Retain as drafted |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|---|---|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P3 | S209.019 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this policy and the clarity which it provides. | Retain as drafted |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P4 | S209.020 | Powerco Limited | Oppose in part | <p>Submitter is concerned that the broad inclusion of amenity values in this policy will become problematic for network utilities as this term is very subjective. The requirement for undergrounding of new networks needs to consider the configuration of existing networks in the area and a blanket encouragement to underground utilities in all areas is opposed - this is simply not feasible nor economic to achieve.</p> <p>The requirement to mitigate visual effects via landscaping can be limited in some scenarios - as landscaping can interfere with the function of some utilities. Lastly, the requirement to adopt a sensitive design can be very problematic for network utilities</p> | <p>Amend as follows: Manage the adverse effects of network utilities, including effects on natural and physical resources, amenity values, sensitive activities, and the health, safety, and wellbeing of people and communities by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. controlling the height, bulk, and location of network utilities; b. requiring compliance with recognised standards or guidelines for the potential adverse effects of noise, vibration, radiofrequency fields, and electric and magnetic fields; c. requiring the undergrounding of new network utilities in urban areas unless the existing networks are overhead, or there are technological or operational constraints, or natural or physical features that make underground placement impractical or unreasonable; d. encouraging the undergrounding of new and existing network utilities in all other areas; e. mitigating adverse visual effects through landscaping and/or the use of recessive colours and finishes, where possible practicable; and f. requiring network utilities to adopt sensitive design to integrate network utilities within the site, existing built form and/or |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | landscape, and to maintain the character and amenity of the surrounding area. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P5 | S209.021 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this policy and the clarity which it provides | Retain as drafted. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R1 | S209.022 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this rule as existing network utilities need to be operated, maintained, repaired and removed as required. | Retain as drafted |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R2 | S209.023 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this rule as underground network utilities need to be established and upgraded | Retain as drafted. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R3 | S209.024 | Powerco Limited | Oppose in part | Submitter is concerned at the requirement for upgrades to be within 5m of the existing alignment or location. Sometimes assets need to be relocated beyond 5m to avoid other network utilities, unsuitable ground conditions or sensitive environments. Moving an asset by more than 5m shouldn't trigger the need for a resource consent. | Amend as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The realignment, relocation, or replacement of a line, pipe, telecommunication pole, pole, tower, conductor, switch, transformer, or ancillary structure is within 5m of the existing alignment or location; |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R4 | S209.025 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this rule as new customer connections to existing above ground utilities is appropriate | Retain as drafted. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R5 | S209.026 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this rule as temporary network utilities are sometimes required. | Retain as drafted. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R6 | S209.027 | Powerco Limited | Oppose in part | Submitter is concerned with arbitrary limits being imposed on zone substations/ switching stations - all of which would exceed the maximum area specified. | Amend as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: b. The maximum area of the substation or energy storage batteries is: |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R7 | S209.028 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this rule as network utilities are required in buildings. | Retain as drafted. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R9 | S209.029 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports overhead lines and support structures being permitted in the rural and general industrial zones. | Retain as drafted. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---|--|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R10 | S209.030 | Powerco Limited | Support in part | Submitter generally supports this rule which is likely to apply to roadside transformers and switch units. As a result of phasing out SF6 from some of the equipment, the replacement equipment is slightly larger. As such larger limits are sought to account for this equipment. | Amend as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The structure does not exceed: i. A height of 3.5m and an area of 1.5m ² ; or ii. A height of 2.2m and an area of 56.25m ² ; and b. Compliance is achieved with: i. NU-S4; and ii. NU-S5. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R15 | S209.031 | Powerco Limited | Support in part | Submitter generally supports this rule, however an exception needs to be made for equipment located in legal road. Road corridor managers often require network utilities to be placed in close proximity to the road boundary. | Amend as follows: 1 c. The building or structure is set back 3m from any site boundary in any Residential Zone (excluding structures located in the road) ; and |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-S1 | S209.032 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports the height limits for poles. | Retain as drafted. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-S2 | S209.033 | Powerco Limited | Support in part | Submitter generally supports this standard, however an exception needs to be made for overhead lines as well as equipment located in legal road. Overhead lines often span across multiple properties and road corridor managers often require network utilities to be placed in close proximity to the road boundary | Amend as follows: Buildings and structures (excluding overhead lines and structures located in the road) comply with the building height, setback, and height in relation to boundary standards for the zone. |
| TR - Transport | Introduction | S209.034 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports the following text included in the introduction to the TR Chapter - as the majority of Powerco assets are located within roads, it supports the clarification of zoning that will apply to roads. | retain as drafted |
| HH - Historic Heritage | | S209.035 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this policy and the clarity which it provides. | Retain as drafted |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R8 | S209.036 | Powerco Limited | Oppose | Submitter is opposed to a blanket rule requiring resource consent for all infrastructure within hazard areas. Our assets need to be located in all environments | Amend the rule so that infrastructure within hazard areas is a permitted activity. Where: a. The alterations are only undertaken in the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | including hazard areas. As prudent asset owners, we assess risk to determine the best location for our infrastructure. | interior of the scheduled heritage building or item where the interior is not specifically listed in SCHED1 Heritage Buildings and Items. b. The works are for a customer connection line |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R3 | S209.037 | Powerco Limited | Oppose in part | Submitter may, on occasion, need to replace or upgrade customer connection lines to listed heritage buildings or items. Such works should be included within this permitted activity rule. | Amend 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The alterations are only undertaken in the interior of the scheduled heritage building or item where the interior is not specifically listed in SCHED1 Heritage Buildings and Items. b. The works are for a customer connection line |
| HH - Historic Heritage | HH-R9 | S209.038 | Powerco Limited | Oppose in part | Submitter seek to ensure that this rule will provide for its infrastructure in Heritage precincts as a permitted activity - for example the Martinborough Town Centre is serviced by a number of overhead lines that need to be operated, maintained, replaced and / or upgraded. It has been assumed the precinct rules applies to works in the road by virtue of the adjacent zoning. | Amend 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The alterations are only undertaken in the interior of the building or structure, or b. The works are undertaken by a Network Utility Operator |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-P2 | S209.039 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this policy and the clarity which it provides. | Retain as drafted |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-R1 | S209.040 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this rule, specifically the references to the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003 and electricity lines. | Retain as drafted. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-R2 | S209.041 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this rule, specifically the references to installation of underground utilities. | Retain as drafted. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|--|---|
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-R3 | S209.042 | Powerco Limited | Oppose | Submitter is concerned that every tree located in road, whether intentionally planted or not, is being afforded a significant amount of protection despite its characteristics / quality. This rule provides 'blanket tree protection' across the whole of the Wairarapa which seems to be contrary to the requirements of s76 of the RMA. | Delete in entirety |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-R4 | S209.043 | Powerco Limited | Oppose | Submitter is concerned that every tree located in road, whether intentionally planted or not, is being afforded a significant amount of protection despite its characteristics / quality. This rule provides 'blanket tree protection' across the whole of the Wairarapa which seems to be contrary to the requirements of s76 of the RMA. | Delete in entirety. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-R5 | S209.044 | Powerco Limited | Oppose | Submitter is concerned that every tree located in road, whether intentionally planted or not, is being afforded a significant amount of protection despite its characteristics / quality. This rule provides 'blanket tree protection' across the whole of the Wairarapa which seems to be contrary to the requirements of s76 of the RMA. | Delete in entirety. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-R7 | S209.045 | Powerco Limited | Oppose | Submitter is concerned that every tree located in road, whether intentionally planted or not, is being afforded a significant amount of protection despite its characteristics / quality. This rule provides 'blanket tree protection' across the whole of the Wairarapa which seems to be contrary to the requirements of s76 of the RMA. | Delete in entirety |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R3 | S209.046 | Powerco Limited | Oppose in part | On occasion, the submitter will need to undertake earthworks in areas that are on a site or area of significance. | Amend as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Earthworks are for burials within an existing urupā; or b. Earthworks are authorised by and located within an approved area in an existing legal instrument (such as consent notice or local authority covenant) for the site. orc. Earthworks are undertaken by a |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | Network Utility Operator |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R6 | S209.047 | Powerco Limited | Oppose in part | On occasion, the submitter will need to replace structures - and sometimes these structures are not exactly the same dimensions. | Amend as follows: Maintenance, and repair or replacement of an existing network utility structure and existing primary production structures within a site or area of significance to Māori listed in SCHED4 Sites and Significance to Māori 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The works do not involve any land disturbance (except where the land disturbance is permitted by SASM-R2); and b. There is no change to the size or location of the foundation or footprint of the existing building or structure is the same or similar ; or c. Is for the trimming of trees or vegetation, providing it is required for the purpose of protecting the integrity of a structure or is otherwise undertaken in accordance with the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R7 | S209.048 | Powerco Limited | Oppose in part | A good majority of the submitters assets are located within legal road - provision needs to be made within this rule for such assets. | Amend as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The new building or structure is authorised by and is located within an approved area in an existing legal instrument (such as consent notice or local authority covenant) for the site. orb. The works are located within legal |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | road. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-R1 | S209.049 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports this rule, specifically the references to the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003 and to avoid interference with network utilities. | Retain as drafted. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-R2 | S209.050 | Powerco Limited | Support in part | Submitter supports the intent of this rule and the reference to the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003. However specific sub-clause e needs to refer to installation and replacement of network utilities - this rule applies to the whole of the Wairarapa outside of SNA's - so the implications of this rule are far reaching | Amend as follows: e. The installation , operation, and/or maintenance, replacement and repair of existing pasture, fences, drains, structures, network utilities, and infrastructure, fire breaks including existing roads or tracks (including walking or cycling tracks); |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R3 | S209.051 | Powerco Limited | Support | Submitter supports the ability for network utilities to undertake subdivisions as a controlled activity. | Retain as drafted. |
| FC - Financial Contributions | | S209.052 | Powerco Limited | Support | Rules table - clause e -Submitter supports clause e which states that additional allotments for network utilities do not attract financial contributions. | Retain Rules Table as drafted. |
| NU - Network Utilities | Introduction | S209.053 | Powerco Limited | Support | Powerco supports the following text included in the introduction to the NU Chapter: The provisions within this chapter apply on a district-wide basis. The rules in the zone chapters do not apply to network utilities unless specifically stated within a rule or standard in this chapter. The objectives, policies, and rules in district-wide overlay chapters do apply to network utilities. | Retain as drafted. |
| ENG - Energy | | S285.001 | Rachael Hughes | Oppose | Supports the submission made by the South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group (SWWAG). | Amend provisions as requested in the submission by SWWAG (Submission number 207). |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Interpretation | Definitions | S288.001 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | | Retain definition of 'functional need' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S288.002 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | | Retain definition of "height" as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S288.003 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | | Retain definition of "infrastructure" as notified |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S288.004 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support in part | RNZ considers it would be helpful if the definition of maintenance also addressed maintenance of infrastructure or network utilities, not just heritage items. This would assist in applying the plan as the definition of "upgrade" in the Proposed Plan explicitly excludes maintenance and repair in relation to network utilities. | Amend the definition of maintenance to also address maintenance of infrastructure or network utilities, not just heritage items. RNZ considers a workable definition of 'maintenance' would be: a. in relation to an identified heritage building or item, the regular ongoing protective care of the building or item to prevent deterioration and retain its heritage values; or b. in relation to network utilities, any work or activity required for the ongoing operation and/or functioning of existing network utilities. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S288.006 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | | Retain definition of "network utility" as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S288.007 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | | Retain the definition of "Network Utility Operator" as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S288.008 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | | Retain definition of "operational need" as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S288.009 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | | Retain definition of "pole" as notified |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S288.010 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | This would assist in applying the plan as the definition of "upgrade" in the Proposed Plan explicitly excludes maintenance and repair in | Amend the definition of repair to also address repair of infrastructure or network utilities, not just heritage items. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | relation to network utilities. Further, Rule NU-R1 specifically includes 'repair' as a regulated activity. | RNZ considers a workable definition for 'repair' would be: Means: a. in relation to an identified heritage building or item, to improve the long-term condition of a heritage item, by using identical or closely similar materials to fix any damaged or decayed heritage fabric; or b. in relation to network utilities, any work or activity required for the ongoing operation and/or functioning of existing network utilities. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S288.011 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | | Retain definition of "sensitive activity" as notified |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S288.012 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | | Retain definition of "structure" as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S288.013 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | As it applies to network utilities, means the improvement or increase in carrying capacity, operational efficiency, security, or safety of existing infrastructure, but excludes maintenance and repair. RNZ notes the relief requested for "maintenance" and "repair" in RNZ's preliminary feedback and repeated above. The Proposed Plan definition of "upgrade" explicitly excludes maintenance and repair - this leaves a potential gap in the definitions for "maintenance" and "repair" works to infrastructure, including network utilities. | Retain definition of "upgrade" as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S288.014 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Oppose | The Proposed Plan does not contain a definition for "reverse sensitivity". The submitter considers it is important that this term is defined given it is widely used in the Proposed Plan. | Insert definition for reverse sensitivity. RNZ suggests Means the vulnerability of an existing lawfully established activity to the establishment or alteration of another activity which is |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | sensitive to adverse environmental effects that may be generated by such existing activity, thereby creating the potential of such existing activity to be compromised or constrained . |
| Strategic Direction | INF-O1 | S288.015 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | The submitter supports INF-O1, particularly the high-level recognition of the importance of protecting infrastructure from reverse sensitivity effects. However, the objective would be improved by also making reference to 'enabling' infrastructure. This would provide clear direction that decisions should not only allow for, but support, outcomes where the benefits of infrastructure (as defined in the RMA) can be realised. | Amend 'The benefits of infrastructure are recognised and enabled , while ensuring its adverse effects are wellmanaged, and infrastructure is protected from incompatible land use, subdivision and development, including reverse sensitivity effects.' |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O1 | S288.016 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | The submitter supports the inclusion of an objective that expressly recognises the benefits of network utilities. As for INF-O1, the submitter would prefer that this objective also refer to 'enabling' benefits. The current wording may not provide sufficient direction to ensure that necessary upgrades and enhancements to existing infrastructure are adequately provided for. | Amend the wording to reference the 'enabling' of benefits. As this would be consistent with the wording used in NU-P1. "The benefits of effective, efficient, resilient and safe network utilities are enabled , recognised and provided for." |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O2 | S288.017 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support in part | RNZ supports NU-O2 and the recognition of the functional and operational needs of the network utilities and the associated positive effects. However, remains of the view that "avoided, remedied or mitigated" is overly restrictive and does not recognise that some adverse effects cannot be mitigated. | Amend the proposed working as it could be overly restrictive for network utilities and RNZ seeks the following amendment which is consistent with the reference to 'functional need' in NU-P5: The adverse effects of network utilities on the environment are avoided, remedied or mitigated where practicable , while recognising... |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O3 | S288.018 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | | Retain Rule NU-O3 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P1 | S288.019 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | RNZ supports recognition of the benefits associated with network utilities. However, it is not clear that the reference to "substantial" in (c) relating to upgrading network utilities is necessary or helpful. Even minor upgrades can be crucial to realise the benefits of, and the safe and efficient functioning of, network utilities. | Amend NU-P1 so the word "substantial" is removed from (c):...c. Providing for substantial upgrades to, and the development of new, network utilities; and |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P2 | S288.020 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | RNZ strongly supports a collaborative approach to urban growth where it intersects with network utilities. | Retain Rule NU-P2 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P3 | S288.021 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | RNZ supports NU-P3. | Retain as notified |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P4 | S288.022 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support in part | NU-P4 requires adverse effects to be managed, without having regard to the functional and operational needs of network utilities. At the same time, NU-P5 requires adverse effects to be considered, while having regard to functional and operational needs. Regardless of how these conflicting policies are reconciled, the submitter seeks that any consideration of adverse effects of network utilities take account of technical and operational constraints, and/or functional and operational needs. | Amend NU-P4 and NU-P5 into the same policy to provide clarity or at a minimum amend NU-P4 so it incorporates recognition of the "functional and operational needs" of network utilities when managing adverse effects of network utilities. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P5 | S288.023 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | RNZ supports this policy, in particular the recognition of the functional and operational needs of network utilities. However RNZ considers "avoid, remedy or mitigate" as a mandatory direction is overly restrictive, and that the requirement to also recognise functional or operational need as part of the policy should be better integrated. | Amend NU-P5 Ensure that network utilities avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the environment, while where this consistent with recognising the functional need and operational need of the network utility, and having regard to: |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P5 | S288.023 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | The submitter considers "avoid, remedy or mitigate" as a mandatory direction is overly restrictive, and that the requirement to also | Amend NU-P5: Ensure that network utilities avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the environment, while where this consistent with |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | recognise functional or operational need as part of the policy should be better integrated | recognising the functional need and operational need of the network utility, and having regard to: |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R1 | S288.024 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | The restricted discretionary status for non-compliance with the permitted activity status, and the matters of discretion (subject to the reference to Network Utilities Standards in (2)), are supported. | Retain a permitted activity rule for the operation, maintenance, repair and removal of existing network utilities. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R2 | S288.026 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | The restricted discretionary status for non-compliance with the permitted activity status, and the matters of discretion, are supported. | Retain Rule NU-R2 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R3 | S288.027 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | RNZ supports a permitted activity standard for the upgrading of existing above ground network utilities; that allows for minor changes. The restricted discretionary status for non-compliance with the permitted activity status, and the matters of discretion, are supported. RNZ notes that, in accordance with RNZ's preliminary feedback, the rule includes "or" between (a) and (b). This is appropriate as upgrading activities should not need to comply with both. RNZ also supports the addition of matter of discretion (9) in the Proposed Plan as it is important that the benefits of network utilities are considered. | Retain Rule NU-R3 as notified |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R5 | S288.028 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | RNZ supports a permitted activity standard for temporary network utilities. The restricted discretionary status for non-compliance with the permitted activity status, and the matters of discretion, are supported. | Retain Rule NU-R5 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R7 | S288.029 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | RNZ support a permitted activity standard for new network utilities in existing buildings. Change to RNZ's equipment in the transmission building will not have effects outside the building and should not require resource consent. Requiring compliance with NU-S4 and NU-S5 in relation to radio | Retain Rule NU-R7 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | frequency and electric and magnetic field standards is appropriate. | |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R11 | S288.030 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support in part | Amend Rule NU-R11 as the reference to "temporary network utility" does not make sense in this rule, and the word "temporary" should be removed. | Amend Rule NU-R11. 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with NU-R11(1); and b. Compliance is achieved with: i. NU-S4; and ii. NU-S5. Matters of discretion: 1. The functional need and operational need of, and benefits from, the temporary network utility, including the potential impact on the levels of service or health and safety if the work is not undertaken. ... |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R15 | S288.031 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | The reference to "temporary network utility" in 2(1) does not make sense in this rule, and the word "temporary" should be removed. | Amend Rule NU-R15. 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with NU-R15(1); and b. Compliance is achieved with: ... Matters of discretion: 1. The functional need and operational need of, and benefits from, the temporary network utility, including the potential impact on the levels of service or health and safety if the work is not undertaken. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-S1 | S288.032 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | RNZ note that it's existing mast is 55m in height and will not comply with this standard. | Retain Standard NU-S1 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-S4 | S288.033 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | RNZ Facilities comply with NZS 2772.1:1999 and its inclusion in the Proposed Plan is supported. | Retain Standard NU-S4 as notified. |
| NOISE - Noise | | S288.034 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | The submitter strongly supports the exemption for generators operated by lifeline utilities for emergency, testing and maintenance. On the rare occasions RNZ's emergency generator is used, a level of noise is unavoidable. It is important for RNZ's emergency functions that the generators are able to function so RNZ can continue to provide services in the event of an emergency where electricity has failed. | Retain as notified |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P5 | S288.035 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | The submitter strongly supports the maintenance of rural character and amenity as rural activities are compatible with the operation of RNZ's Facilities. The direction to avoid, remedy or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects is supported. However, as outlined in the submitter's preliminary feedback, the submitter considers that reverse sensitivity is not given appropriate weight as a single item in the list of matters in SUB-P5. The submitter's preference is that the direction to avoid reverse sensitivity effects be elevated to a separate policy, and/or included in SUB-P6 to provide stronger policy direction. | Amend to ensure that reverse sensitivity is given an appropriate weight as a single item in the list of matters in SUB-P5 |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P6 | S288.036 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | The submitter supports SUB-P6, particularly the direction to avoid subdivision that is contrary to the purpose of the GRUZ. However, this policy could also provide a direction to avoid reverse sensitivity effects, which is relevant to protecting both primary production activities and network infrastructure. | Insert direction to avoid reverse sensitivity effects. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | | S288.037 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support in part | The submitter supports a specific matter of discretion relating to reverse sensitivity effects on network utilities. The submitter also considers that stronger direction is required in relation to reverse sensitivity effects on network utilities. | Insert: Management of Avoiding potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing land uses such as noise, odour, dust and visual effects, including reverse sensitivity effects relating to network |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | | utilities and significant hazardous facilities |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O1 | S288.038 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | RNZ supports this objective, particularly the direction that provides for activities that have a functional or operational need to be located in the General Rural Zone. | Retain GRUZ-O1 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O4 | S288.039 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | RNZ supports enablement of activities (such as its radiocommunication facilities) that have a functional or operational need to locate in the General Rural Zone. | Retain GRUZ-O4 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O5 | S288.040 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | RNZ supports the direction to locate sensitive activities in locations that avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects. This is particularly important in close proximity to RNZ's Facilities. | Retain GRUZ-O5 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P1 | S288.041 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | RNZ supports provision for activities that have a functional or operational need to locate in the General Rural Zone. | Retain GRUZ-P1 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P2 | S288.042 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | RNZ supports the direction to avoid activities that will result in reverse sensitivity effects on permitted activities, as this includes network utilities. | Retain GRUZ-P2 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P3 | S288.043 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | RNZ supports this policy, particularly the direction to avoid, remedy or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects that can arise from inappropriate land use. | Retain GRUZ-P3 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P6 | S288.044 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | RNZ supports specific policy direction to avoid reverse sensitivity effects in the General Rural Zone. Consistent with the submitter's preliminary feedback, it considers that there should be specific recognition of reverse sensitivity effects on infrastructure, including network utilities, that have a functional or operational need to locate in the zone. | Amend: a. avoiding the establishment of any new sensitive activity near existing intensive primary production, primary production activities, waste management facilities, quarrying activities, network utilities and rural industry in circumstances where the new sensitive activity may compromise the operation of the existing activities; b. managing potential reverse sensitivity effects caused by the establishment of |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | | new sensitive activities near other primary production activities and network utilities , including through the use of setbacks and separation distances |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S1 | S288.045 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | The submitter's concern is that the potential for safety risks arising from the construction of tall structures near RNZ's Facilities. This can be readily addressed with proper construction techniques and safety measures. The submitter supports GRUZ-S1, particularly matter of discretion (6) to address potential electromagnetic effects. However, RNZ notes that the wording proposed for GIZ-S1 differs from that proposed for GRUZ-S1. The submitter considers that more appropriate wording in GIZ-S1 is more appropriate as it will mean that only structures that are taller than 47m will trigger consideration of safety risks. | Amend: RNZ seeks the following amendment: 6 Any potential electromagnetic effects caused by the structure where it is within 1km of a radio transmission mast. 6. Electromagnetic safety risks for any structure higher than 47m within 1000m of Radio New Zealand's facilities at Waingawa. RNZ should be considered an affected person for the purposes of assessing safety risks. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | | S288.046 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | The submitter supports a matter of discretion relating to the safety risks of tall structures in close proximity to RNZ's Facilities. The submitter supports the wording of GIZ-S1 matter of discretion (6) but proposes a minor change to refer to 'electromagnetic' risks, to better identify the nature of the safety risk to Council officers and plan users. The submitter also suggests that it be considered an affected party for the purposes of notification of any breach of (6), or at least that consultation with the submitter is directed. The submitter has the in-house technical expertise and operational knowledge to assist applicants in assessing the risk of EMR coupling. | Amend: 6. Electromagnetic safety risks for any structure higher than 47m within 1000m of Radio New Zealand's facilities at Waingawa. RNZ should be considered an affected person for the purposes of assessing safety risks. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-S7 | S288.047 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support | RNZ supports the current rule structure which applies the height controls in GIZ-S1 and seeks that any specific rules applying within this area should continue to apply the proposed matter of discretion relevant to RNZ's Facilities in GIZ-S1(6). | Retain Standard GIZ-S7 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-S1 | S288.048 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Oppose | RNZ considers that the references to 'all Network Utility Standards' or 'relevant Network Utility Standards' could be confusing and should be replaced with reference to 'all of' or 'relevant standards in'. | Amend Standard NU-S1 'all Network Utility Standards' or 'relevant Network Utility Standards' to be replace with 'all of' or 'relevant standards'. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-S2 | S288.049 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Oppose | RNZ considers that the references to 'all Network Utility Standards' or 'relevant Network Utility Standards' could be confusing and should be replaced with reference to 'all of' or 'relevant standards in'. | Amend Standard NU-S2 'all Network Utility Standards' or 'relevant Network Utility Standards' to be replace with 'all of' or 'relevant standards'. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-S3 | S288.050 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Oppose | RNZ considers that the references to 'all Network Utility Standards' or 'relevant Network Utility Standards' could be confusing and should be replaced with reference to 'all of' or 'relevant standards in'. | Amend Standard NU-S3 'all Network Utility Standards' or 'relevant Network Utility Standards' to be replace with 'all of' or 'relevant standards'. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-S4 | S288.051 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Oppose | RNZ considers that the references to 'all Network Utility Standards' or 'relevant Network Utility Standards' could be confusing and should be replaced with reference to 'all of' or 'relevant standards in'. | Amend Standard NU-S4 'all Network Utility Standards' or 'relevant Network Utility Standards' to be replace with 'all of' or 'relevant standards'. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-S5 | S288.052 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Oppose | RNZ considers that the references to 'all Network Utility Standards' or 'relevant Network Utility Standards' could be confusing and should be replaced with reference to 'all of' or 'relevant standards in'. | Amend Standard NU-S5 'all Network Utility Standards' or 'relevant Network Utility Standards' to be replace with 'all of' or 'relevant standards'. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-S6 | S288.053 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Oppose | RNZ considers that the references to 'all Network Utility Standards' or 'relevant Network Utility Standards' could be confusing and should be replaced with reference to 'all of' or 'relevant standards in'. | Amend Standard NU-S6 'all Network Utility Standards' or 'relevant Network Utility Standards' to be replace with 'all of' or 'relevant standards'. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-S7 | S288.054 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Oppose | RNZ considers that the references to 'all Network Utility Standards' or 'relevant Network Utility Standards' could be confusing and should be replaced with reference to 'all of' or 'relevant standards in'. | Amend Standard NU-S6 'all Network Utility Standards' or 'relevant Network Utility Standards' to be replace with 'all of' or 'relevant standards'. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P6 | S288.055 | Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) | Support in part | RNZ supports this policy, particularly the direction to avoid subdivision that is contrary to the purpose of the General Rural Zone. However, RNZ considers this policy could also provide a direction to avoid reverse sensitivity effects, which is relevant to protecting both primary production activities and network infrastructure. | Insert a direction to avoid reverse sensitivity effects. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S47.001 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Amend | Change 1 to the GWRC Policy Statement (PC1) is still proposed and therefore not required to be given effect to under Section 75 of the RMA. While PC1 is not operative, decisions are likely to be made on the policy statement prior to the district plan becoming operative. It is therefore sensible that the proposed district plan considers PC1. Additionally, PC1 has been proposed to give partial effect to the NPSFM and NPSUD. In its operative state the RPS does not give full effect to these national policy statements. | Amend the District Plan to ensure consistency with national direction (specifically NPSFM, NPSUD, NZCPS) and PC1 of the Wellington RPS. |
| Strategic Direction | HC-O1 | S47.002 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Support in part | This objective provides for recognition, protection and maintenance of heritage values and sites of significance to Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa consistent with requirements in Section 6 (c) and (f) of the RMA. Whānau and hapū are an important part of this and not all hapū are covered under Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa. | Amend HC-O1: The cultural, spiritual, and/or historical values associated with historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Rangitāne o Wairarapa, and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa, whānau, and hapū are recognised, protected and maintained. |
| Strategic Direction | HC-O2 | S47.003 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Amend | As currently worded, this objective only protects those sites that are identified in the district plan. Many sites may not be identified until a resource consent or designation process occurs through engagement with mana whenua/tangata whenua. The objective also uses the terms 'sense of place and identity' to describe mana whenua/tangata whenua connection to sites and features. These are westernised terms and do not reflect the deep-rooted connection that mana whenua/tangata whenua have to sites of significance. | Amend HC-O2: Sites and features that have been identified as having special qualities and values that contribute to whānau, hapū and iwi, Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa sense of place and identity are recognised and protected. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Strategic Direction | NE-O1 | S47.004 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Amend | As currently worded this objective implies that the natural environment must provide something for Wairarapa's sense of place and identity, rather than it having intrinsic value. | Amend NE-O1 to: Wairarapa sense of place and identity is enhanced by the positive contributions from the natural environment. |
| Strategic Direction | NE-O2 | S47.005 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Support in part | The intent of the objective is supported but would be strengthened with an additional directive term to ensure a comprehensive approach. The use of 'protect' would ensure consideration of prevention of harm and ongoing preservation, as well as restoration. | Amend NE-O2 to: The mauri of Wairarapa Moana is actively protected and restored. |
| Strategic Direction | NE-O5 | S47.006 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Amend | The wording of this objective should specify a partnership directive for tangata whenua and engagement for community and other government entities. This would be consistent with the NPSFM and Section 8 of the RMA. | Amend NE-O5: Land and water are managed using an integrated approach, in collaboration partnership with tangata whenua and through engagement with the community, and other government entities. |
| Strategic Direction | TW-O1 | S47.007 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Support in part | Not all whānau and hapū sit within Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Kahungunu ki Wairarapa and should be included within these statements. This objective provides for recognition, protection and whānau, hapū and iwi both Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa values rights and interests. | Amend TW-O1: The values, rights, and interests of Rangitāne o Wairarapa, and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa, whānau, and hapū are recognised and protected. |
| Strategic Direction | TW-O2 | S47.008 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Amend | As currently worded, this puts the onus on mana whenua/tangata whenua to ensure participation in resource management processes, rather than sharing responsibility with local authorities to provide active involvement opportunities for mana whenua/tangata whenua. In addition to listing out the iwi, please include whānau, hapū as not all whānau and hapū are part of the iwi. | Amend TW-O2: Rangitāne o Wairarapa, and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa, whānau, and hapū are actively involved participate in resource management processes. |
| Strategic Direction | TW-O3 | S47.009 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Support in part | Not all whānau, hapū are part of Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Kahungunu ki Wairarapa. | Amend TW-O3: Rangitāne o Wairarapa, and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa, whānau, and hapū can protect, develop, and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | use Māori land to undertake customary activities, and to support their social and economic aspirations. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S47.010 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Amend | Where both iwi are listed, it should also include whānau and hapū as not all whānau and hapū are included within our Iwi. | Inclusion of "Whānau, hapū" within any reference to Tangata Whenua and/or iwi. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S47.011 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Amend | Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the Treaty of Waitangi are used interchangeably throughout the proposed district plan. Consistency is required to ensure clarity as these are not the same documents. | Review the whole plan to ensure that the right terminology and definition is used for Te Tiriti o Waitangi or Treaty of Waitangi. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S47.012 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Amend | Mātauranga Māori is just as important as science and to exclude this within the district plan is inappropriate and only looks at half the problem/solution. | A review of the whole plan to include "Mātauranga Māori in partnership with tangata whenua/mana whenua" in provisions for taiao including but not limited to Climate Change, Climate Resilience, Water Resilience, |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S47.013 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Amend | We support engagement with communities but this is separate to tangata whenua partnership. Partnership is a Treaty Principle as part of Section 8 of RMA. | Review plan in its entirety. All interactions between local authorities and tangata whenua should be a partnership directive. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | New provision request | S47.014 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Amend | Indigenous Biodiversity needs to be led by tangata whenua as we are indigenous. | To include a provision that engages with Tangata Whenua, whānau, hapū and iwi of the area for any Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity work. |
| Strategic Direction | TW-O4 | S47.015 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Support in part | This objective is supported as consistent with Section 7 (a) of the RMA. However, whānau and hapū need to be included as not all hapū sit within the two iwi. | Amend TW-O4: Rangitāne o Wairarapa, and Ngāti Kahungūnu ki Wairarapa, whānau, and hapū can exercise kaitiakitanga and engage with their culture, traditions, ancestral lands, waterbodies, sites, areas, and landscapes and other taonga |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | | of significance to Māori. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O1 | S47.016 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Amend | This is already true of the Wairarapa urban form and therefore not an objective. If the intent is that this urban form is maintained, this needs to be specified. This is not necessarily a specific goal of Rangitāne o Wairarapa, however, amendment to this wording provides general clarity. | Amend UFD-O1: Maintain Wairarapa's urban form as a series of connected urban areas located along the main transport routes which each support a local community. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | Introduction | S47.017 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Amend | <p>Engagement with mana whenua is used throughout this introductory section. Tangata whenua require sovereignty to share this data how and where they want to - this needs to be done in partnership between Council and mana whenua/tangata whenua, not just through engagement. This is consistent with Section 8 of the RMA.</p> <p>The section also specifies that it is only sites that have been identified which are protected by the provisions of the district plan. Section 6(e) of the RMA requires the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga is recognised and provided for. There is no qualifier in Section 6(e) for waahi tapu and other taonga to be identified in a document in order to be protected.</p> | Amend Introductory text in SASM Chapter to replace the word "engagement" with "partnership", and delete the following text: Accordingly, it is only those sites that have been identified which are protected by the provisions of the District Plan. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-O1 | S47.018 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Support | This objective provides for recognition, protection and maintenance of sites and areas of significance to Māori. | Retain as notified. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-O2 | S47.019 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Support | This objective provides for the exercise of kaitiakitanga in line with Section 7 (a) of the RMA. | Retain as notified |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of | SASM-O3 | S47.020 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Support | This objective provides protection of sites and areas of significance to Māori from | Retain as notified |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Significance to Māori | | | | | inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. | |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P1 | S47.021 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Support in part | Partnership is a well-established principle under Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi. Amendment of this objective to refer to partnering with tangata whenua/mana whenua rather than working with provides more certainty of the requirements. The inclusion of whānau and hapū is necessary as not all engagements with whānau and hapū will be through the iwi (nor should it). | Amend SASM-P1: Work Partner with whānau, hapū and both iwi Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa in accordance with tikanga Māori to identify and schedule sites and areas of significance to Māori, and their cultural and spiritual values. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P4 | S47.022 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Amend | Management of sites of significance to Māori should occur through engagement with mana whenua/tangata whenua to ensure use of mātauranga, tikanga and kaitiakitanga is Māori-led. | Amend SASM-P4 to require to engagement with tangata whenua when activities occur in proximity of sites and areas of significance to Māori. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P5 | S47.023 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Amend | Management of sites of significance to Māori should occur through engagement with mana whenua/tangata whenua to ensure use of mātauranga, tikanga and kaitiakitanga is Māori-led. Tikanga, kaitiakitanga and mātauranga is knowledge held by mana whenua/tangata whenua and should only occur through engagement. | Amend SASM P5: ... b) outcomes articulated by tangata whenua through engagement with mana whenua/tangata whenua , an assessment of environmental effects, cultural impact assessment, or iwi planning documents; ... d) how values of significance to tangata whenua, including tikanga, kaitiakitanga, and mātauranga Māori may be incorporated through engagement with mana whenua/tangata whenua ; and... |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P7 | S47.024 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Support | Engagement with tangata whenua and use of mātauranga Māori is consistent with recognising and providing for Section (c) of the RMA | Retain as notified. |
| ASW - Activities | ASW-P2 | S47.025 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Support | This objective enables customary activities by tangata whenua on the surface of the water. | Retain as notified |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| on the Surface of Water | | | | | | |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P8 | S47.026 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Support in part | Ongoing relationships have built the best outcomes. Not just engaging with tangata whenua for adversely affected mahi. | Amend SASM-P8 to encourage ongoing relationships with tangata whenua, not just engagement when activities have the potential to adversely affect sites or areas of significance. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O4 | S47.027 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Amend | The intent of this objective is supported, however, a minor amendment to include 'and provided for' is recommended. "recognised" without "and provided for" means that the matters is acknowledge but does not require action. | Amend CE-O4: Tangata whenua values, mātauranga, and tikanga are recognised and provided for in resource management processes for the coastal environment. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-O3 | S47.028 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Support | These objectives provides for tangata whenua values in relation to open spaces for recreational and cultural uses. | Retain as notified |
| OSZ - Open Space Zone | OSZ-O3 | S47.029 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Support | These objectives provides for tangata whenua values in relation to open spaces for recreational and cultural uses. | Retain as notified |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S47.030 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Support in part | While we support a Māori Purpose Zone in concept, there is some communications and decisions that still need to go through a process. We believe an opt out process is intrusive and a better process needs to occur for educating and informing our whānau about this zone prior to shutting off changes. The process on how our whānau could opt in should be looked at and well thought out, rather than rushed. Communications and moving to an opt in process should be reviewed. | Amend MPZ zoning to only include areas where whānau have opted into the MPZ. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P5 | S47.031 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Amend | Multiple quarries have impacted hugely on kai sovereignty and soil sovereignty of tangata whenua and have only engaged with tangata whenua after the fact. | Amend GRUZ-P5: vii. The applicant has engaged with tangata whenua to understand the impacts of such activities" or alternative wording that |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|---|------------------|-----------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | | provides similar relief. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S47.032 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Amend | The definition of Primary Production includes quarrying then later excludes it. We recommend that quarrying is removed from the primary production definition for clarity. | Amend definition of "Primary Production": a) any aquaculture, agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, mining, quarrying , or forestry activities; and... |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S47.033 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Amend | Provisions for legislation documents that have been produced and will be embedded into the RPS Proposed Change 1. | Amend the District Plan to ensure it includes the provisions within the NPS-FM, especially including the Te Mana o te Wai plans for Rangitāne o Wairarapa. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S47.034 | Rangitāne o Wairarapa | Amend | Rangitāne o Wairarapa has a Māori Data Sovereignty strategy that is developed in our Mana Mātauranga-a-hapū Strategy. This document should be taken into account when reviewing any data that is generated, collected, stored, removed or modified. | Amend the District Plan to refer to and be consistent with the Mana Mātauranga-a-hapū strategy. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-O1 | S73.001 | Regan Potangaroa | Oppose | Submitter sees no advantage to the change. Opposes the change of title of land. | Delete Maori Purpose Zone from the titles listed in appended document. |
| ENG - Energy | | S281.001 | Richard Schofield | Oppose | Supports the submission made by the South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group (SWWAG). | Amend provisions as requested in the submission by SWWAG (Submission number 207). |
| Tangata Whenua | Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi | S206.001 | Richard Taylor | Oppose | Despite the fact that consultation hui were held (thank you) the information provided on how lands owned or administered by individuals, whānau, marae, land trusts etc, the process of opt-in and opt-out was very contentious and speculative. The involvement of the Māori Land Court (MLC) in relation to opting in of all lands under their jurisdiction was not made clear until the last consultation hui held on 10 December 2023. Representatives of MLC should have been involved with the series of consultation and more so, needed to seek permission direct with Māori o Wairarapa in regard to the Māori Purpose Zone opt -in or out, kaupapa. The combined Wairarapa Councils breached Te | To afford tangatawhenua o Wairapapa time to consult wider with their whānau and beneficiaries that reside within and outside of Wairarapa. To enable this process to occur, extending the submission date for tangata whenua and to engage with both the Māori Land Court o Takitimu and Combined Wairarapa District Council representatives is requested. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | Tiriti i.e. Article 2 - not enabling tangata whenua to participate in decision making and solely relying on advice of MLC & Article 3 equitable opportunity to opt-in or out of Māori Purpose Zone opposed to determining just the opt-in advice from MLC. | |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S258.001 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Generally supportive of the definition for Biodiversity offsetting, but notes NPS-IB includes an appendix that provides additional explanation that may be useful. | Amend definition for 'biodiversity offset' to references to "Appendix 3 Principals to Biodiversity Offsetting" from the NPS-IB, and GWRC's "Limits to Offsetting - Thresholds of concern for biodiversity", Crisp et al. 2022. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S258.002 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Amend | Customary harvest aligns better with the ECO - Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity provisions of this Plan. "customary activity" as defined by this plan does not relate to indigenous vegetation as is suggested in the ECO provisions, in particular ECO-R1. | Insert new definition for 'customary harvest' as follows: Customary Harvest means harvesting is of indigenous vegetation by mana whenua in accordance with tikanga for traditional uses. These include: a. Kohi Kai (food gathering) b. Whakairo (carving) c. Rāranga (weaving) d. Rongoā (traditional medicine). |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S258.003 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | Opposes compensation as an appropriate tool for significant biodiversity, particularly in the context of an effects management hierarchy that lacks any requirement to avoid particular effects or set environmental limits. Therefore seeks the definition is deleted. In addition, the term and definition "environmental compensation" in this Plan is different to that for "biodiversity compensation" in the NPSIB and does not include bottom lines where compensation is not appropriate. | Delete definition for 'Environmental Compensation' |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| Interpretation | Definitions | S258.004 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | The term "modification does not have a common meaning with respect to vegetation. In addition, the definition is complex and includes a number of activities that may or may not be relevant to specific activities or effects. The Plan also uses the term "vegetation clearance" in NU-17 and the introduction to the ECO chapter when describing loss on indigenous biodiversity. However, that term, which is more easily understood, is not included in the definition of "modification". | Amend definition for 'Modification': ... d. vegetation clearance. And clarify use of the term "vegetation clearance" rather than modification in provisions throughout the Plan. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S258.005 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | States that the proposed definition is overly complicated. Opposed to the maximum radius of 15m as trees are so variable. Some tall trees like the emergent rata and Norfolk pines will have a root protection area far greater than 15m. Therefore, suggests that a clearer definition that is determined tree by tree and accompanied by a diagram to make it clear for Plan users. | Amend definition for 'root protection area': means for a tree with a spreading canopy, the area beneath the canopy spread of the tree, measured at ground level from the surface of the trunk, with a radius to the outer most extent of the spread of the tree's branches, and for a columnar tree, means the area beneath the canopy extending to a radius half the height of the tree (whichever is greater). [refer to original submission for diagram] Means the circular area of ground surrounding a notable tree, for a distance of 12 times the diameter of the tree 1.4 meters above ground level, up to a maximum radius of 15m. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S258.006 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | States that this definition is too narrow and is out of step with the RPS and the NPSIB. Relying on this definition will not protect s6(c) matters or give effect to the the RPS. This definition should also include areas of significant biodiversity values that meet Policy | Amend definition for 'Significant natural area': Means an area considered significant due to ecological attributes as of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna that meets |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | 23 RPS criteria, but that are not yet on SCHED5, for example where they are discovered as part of a consenting process or the yet-to-be-conducted district-wide assessment. | any of the criteria in Policy 23 of the Wellington Regional Policy Statement, whether identified in SCHED5 - Schedule of Significant Natural Areas, or as part of a consenting process. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S258.007 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | The definition is unclear and circular. The introduction in the CE chapter provides a better explanation which would improve the definition. | Amend definition for 'Coastal environment': Means, in relation to district council functions, the area where the extent and characteristics of land with natural character, where coastal processes (including coastal erosion), influences or qualities are significant in accordance with Policy 1 of the NZCPS and Policy 4 of the Wellington Regional Policy Statement, as identified on the planning maps as being located within the inland extent of the coastal environment. |
| Strategic Direction | Introduction | S258.008 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Forest & Bird supports the Introductory section of Strategic Direction in part. However, opposes the sentence that "All other objectives and policies in the District Plan should be read and achieved in a manner consistent with the objectives in the Strategic Direction Chapter". Considers it is inappropriate to require other plan provisions are achieved in accordance with SD objectives as these objectives do not give effect to higher order documents in themselves and do not capture all of councils' responsibilities and functions, or resolves potential conflicting outcomes. | Amend Introduction for Strategic Direction chapter: The objectives in the Strategic Direction Chapter outline the key strategic matters for the districts and guide decision making at a strategic level. The objectives in the Strategic Direction Chapter are to be read together and there is no hierarchy between them. All other objectives and policies in the District Plan should be read and achieved in a manner consistent with the objectives in the Strategic Direction Chapter... |
| Strategic Direction | CCR-O1 | S258.009 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection | Support | Forest & Bird supports the objective of transition to a low-carbon future. | Retain Objective CCR-O1 as proposed. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | Society of New Zealand Inc | | | |
| Strategic Direction | CCR-O2 | S258.010 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Forest & Bird is generally supportive of Objective CRR-O2. However, it is uncertain whether the objective includes scope for the adaption of indigenous biodiversity. For example, through provision for inland migration of coastal margins affected by sea level rise for bird breeding and feeding habitat. | Amend Objective CCR-O2 to capture adaption outcomes for indigenous biodiversity (or insert a new objective to this effect) |
| Strategic Direction | CCR-O3 | S258.011 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Forest & Bird is generally supportive of the objective. However, it is not clear whether resilience is achieved through nature-based solutions, and it is uncertain whether the objective includes scope for the resilience of indigenous biodiversity. For example, through provision for inland migration of coastal margins affected by sea level rise for bird breeding and feeding habitat. | Amend Objective CCR-O3 to capture resilience outcomes for indigenous biodiversity and for building resilience through nature-based solutions (or add a new objective to this effect) |
| Strategic Direction | CCR-O4 | S258.012 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | Water resilience is not defined. It is unclear if the objective is intended to protect life supporting capacity or rather a quantity issue for drinking water supply as suggested by the use of this term in GRZ-P8. Forest & Bird is also concerned with the use of terms "enhance" and "adaptive management" in this objective. Restoration is a better term where freshwater is degraded. Enhance is often used in offsetting, and compensation measures where adverse effects are not avoided, remedied or mitigated. While adaptive management may be appropriate in some situations, it may not be in others such as where adverse effects are to be avoided under the NZCPS. | Delete Objective CRR-O4 - Water resilience. |
| Strategic Direction | NE-O1 | S258.013 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | As worded the objective seems to be setting an outcome for the natural environment to achieve rather than something the community can achieve. | Amend Objective NE-O1 as follows: 'The natural environment is respected and recognised to contributes positively to the Wairarapa's sense of place and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | identity.' |
| Strategic Direction | NE-O2 | S258.014 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | The Wairarapa Moana is of international importance as the largest wetland complex in the lower North Island. It is recognised as a RAMSAR site. | Retain Objective NE-O2. |
| Strategic Direction | NE-O3 | S258.015 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | "Open space" should not be the only place where natural, ecological, and landscape values, and sites of significance to tangata whenua are protected. The term "open space" could be interpreted in different ways, i.e. based on zoning or a feeling of openness. | Retain NE-O3 as notified, subject to adding an additional strategic objective regarding natural values (separate submission point) |
| Strategic Direction | NE-O4 | S258.016 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | The proposed words "inappropriate subdivision, use and development" in a strategic objective is not supported. This is because of how protection is achieved is better set out in the coastal chapter provisions where policy can provide direction on what is inappropriate, i.e. by avoiding adverse effects on Outstanding Natural Character in accordance with Policy 13 of the NZCPS. As per the King Salmon decision what is inappropriate/ appropriate is to be determined on what is to be protected. This means provision direction to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects, to protect. That level of direction sits within subsequent chapters. | Amend Objective NE-O4 as follows: 'NE-O4: Coastal environment The special qualities of the Wairarapa coastal environment are recognised and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. ' |
| Strategic Direction | NE-O5 | S258.017 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Forest and Bird acknowledges the need to work in collaboration with others but this objective should also recognise the need to consider activities and effects holistically across the district. | Amend Objective NE-O5 as follows: Land and water are managed using an integrated and holistic approach, in collaboration with tangata whenua, the community, and other government entities. |
| Strategic Direction | NE-O6 | S258.018 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Concerned with the use of terms "enhance" in this objective. Restoration is a better term where freshwater is degraded. Enhance is often used in offsetting, and compensation measures where adverse effects are not avoided, remedied or mitigated. | Amend Objective NE-O6 as follows: The biological diversity of indigenous species and habitats within the Wairarapa are maintained and enhanced , and restored |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | where degraded. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O1 | S258.019 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | The rural environment is where much of our indigenous biodiversity thrives. These areas are also important to cultural well-being. | Amend Objective RE-O1 as follows: 'The Wairarapa's rural environment contributes positively to the region's economic, cultural and social wellbeing and to maintaining indigenous biodiversity. ' |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O2 | S258.020 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | The objective should also be clarified that "available" does not mean primary production should occur where natural values are to be protected. Rather this is about a preference for one activity over others. Further it is not clear why "protection" is to be afforded rural zoned land capacity. A preferable word would be to maintain. There are SNA's and potential for identification for further SNA's within the rural zone. The objective wording could conflict with the protection of SNA's where this is seen as a loss in "productive capacity". | Amend Objective RE-O2 as follows: 'The General Rural Zone remains available for primary production activities, over other activities and productive capacity is maintained protected. ' |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O3 | S258.021 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | It is not clear that "Highly productive land" is defined and shown on the planning maps. The objective should also be clarified that "protected for use" does not mean primary production should occur where other natural values are to be protected. Rather this is about a preference for one activity over others. Forest & Bird's Fensham reserve, which is zoned NOSZ but not yet identified as SNA, is overlain in part by the "Highly productive land" maps. | Amend Objective RE-O3 and italicise 'highly productive land': Highly productive land is protected, from adverse effects of other activities , for use in land-based primary production, both now and for future generations.' |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O4 | S258.022 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | There is no specific RMA requirement to maintain rural character. As drafted this objective could be read to conflict with protection of S6 matters. Forest & Bird considers this objective needs to be clarified in terms of managing land use activities to maintain rural character. In addition, the | Amend Objective RE-O4 as follows: Use and development contributes positively to maintain t The rural character of the rural environment is maintained and enhanced . |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | definition of rural character needs to include indigenous biodiversity with the rural environment. | |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O5 | S258.023 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | There are other considerations too e.g. protecting biodiversity and the natural character of the coastal environment. | Amend Objective RE-O5 as follows: 'RE-O5 Rural lifestyle opportunities for Rural lifestyle subdivision and development are only provided in parts of the rural environment where they does not conflict with enabling primary production and protecting maintaining the productive capacity of the land. ' |
| Strategic Direction | TW-O4 | S258.024 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | Forest & Bird supports the objective and considers that Mātātāuranga Māori should also be provided for in the plan. | Retain TW-O4 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O2 | S258.025 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Character and amenity of urban areas should be described to include indigenous biodiversity. | Amend Objective UFD-O2 to recognise indigenous biodiversity within the character and amenity of urban areas. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O3 | S258.026 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | The outcomes for urban land supply should include provision for indigenous biodiversity, recognising the importance of that to economic, cultural, and social wellbeing. | Amend Objective UFD-O3: There is sufficient developmental capacity, in the right locations to meet the Wairarapa's housing, commercial, industrial, educational, and recreational, cultural and social needs including through the maintenance of and provision for indigenous biodiversity values. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O4 | S258.027 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | The Objective should capture the outcomes that integrate with provision for indigenous biodiversity. | Amend Objective UFD-O4: Urban growth and development is integrated with the efficient provision, including the timing and funding, of infrastructure, schools, and open spaces and incorporate space |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | for indigenous biodiversity. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O5 | S258.028 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Town centres should not be devoid of open space or nature. Recognise the importance of indigenous biodiversity to vibrant communities. | Amend Objective UFD-O5 'Vibrant town centres' as follows: 'The Wairarapa contains vibrant and viable town centres that are in the location for shopping, leisure, cultural, entertainment, and social interaction experiences and connection with indigenous fauna and flora and provide for the community's employment and economic needs.' |
| Strategic Direction | INF-O1 | S258.029 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | It is not clear what "well managed" means S5 of the RMA sets out that adverse effects in the environment are to be avoided, remedied or mitigated. The NZCPS includes specific direction on adverse effects affecting indigenous biodiversity, natural character and natural features and landscapes in the coastal environment. | Amend Objective INF-O1 as follows: 'The benefits of infrastructure are recognised, while ensuring its adverse effects are well managed avoided, remedied or mitigated , and infrastructure is protected from incompatible land use, subdivision and development, including reverse sensitivity effects. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S258.030 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | This submission specifically relates to ENG-Energy, NU-Network Utilities, and TR-Transport Chapters. Forest and bird states that it is not clear whether all infrastructure activities are addressed by the following chapters. All chapters appear to be subsets of infrastructure. Nor is there any clear consideration of Regionally Significant Infrastructure (RSI). | Amend ENG - Energy Chapter, NU - Network Utilities Chapter and TR - Transport Chapter so that each introduction explains the aspects of "Infrastructure" and where appropriate "RSI" that are considered within the chapters. Ensure that all infrastructure relevant to the council's functions is addressed. Consider changing the same of the NU chapter to Infrastructure and Network Utilities. |
| ENG - Energy | Introduction | S258.031 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Concerned the ECO and CE chapters rules may not apply to ENG activities. Notes sentence in the last paragraph of the introduction refers to "renewable energy generation", and unclear whether coastal provisions apply as they may not be considered an 'overlay'. Considers wording | Amend ENG-Energy Chapter Introduction: ... The objectives, and policies, and rules in district-wide overlay matters chapter and the objectives, policies and rules of the subdivision chapter apply to renewable electricity generation where |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>appears to exclude rules in ECO, NFL, and NATC chapters from applying. Notes these chapters should give effect to the NZCPS. Considers it is unclear whether different chapters apply to energy activities that are not "renewable energy generation".</p> <p>Highlights confusion as the introduction considers energy broadly, but then states the ENG chapter has been developed to give effect to NPSREG, and then proceeds to consider renewable energy sources, supply, wind and solar generation, and transmission facilities. Refers to renewable energy generation but not renewable electricity generation, the latter being provided for under NPSREG. Unclear whether the chapter addresses energy generation such as passive heat and non-renewables for heat or electricity.</p> <p>Other energy generation including non-renewables can have adverse effects on the environment that the Plan needs to manage. Notes no specific recognition of potential adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity.</p> <p>Agrees with second to last paragraph that proposals need to be considered on a case by case basis.</p> | <p>applicable.AND Clarify the ENG-Energy introduction with respect to activities for electricity generation versus activities for energy generation and the scope of this chapter. AND Clarify to what extent and for what activities the chapter addresses beyond giving effect to the NPSREG.</p> |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-O1 | S258.032 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | Supports as it reflects NPSREG Policy A and, on the basis of amendments to ENG-O2, is acceptable. | Retain Objective ENG-O1 as proposed. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-O2 | S258.033 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | The NPSREG does not limit consideration of adverse effects. The current wording is inconsistent with S5 of the RMA and the NZCPS. It would not be appropriate to try and address adverse effects from reliance on non-renewable by enabling renewable in a way that only creates other adverse effects on the environment. | Amend Objective ENG-O2 as follows: "Renewable electricity generation activities are designed and located to minimise avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on communities and the environment while recognising their |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | operational or locational constraints." |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-O3 | S258.034 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | The objective is consistent with reducing effects that would otherwise contribute to climate change. | Retain Objective ENG-O3 as proposed. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P1 | S258.035 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | NPSREG policy G sets direction for plans to provide for activities associated with the investigation, identification and assessment of potential sites and energy sources for renewable electricity generation by existing and prospective generators. "Enable" is a directive term that could be interpreted to apply over the avoidance, remediation or mitigation of adverse effects. | Amend Policy ENG-P1 as follows: " Enable Provide for site..." " Enable Provide for activities associated with investigating site suitability for renewable electricity generation that avoids, remedies, or mitigates its adverse effects. " |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P2 | S258.036 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | NPSREG policy F is to "provide for". Location is also an important consideration in managing adverse effects. | Amend Policy ENG-P2 as follows: " Enable Provide for small..." " Enable Provide for small-scale renewable electricity generation where it is in a location and of a form and scale that avoids, remedies, or mitigates its adverse effects." |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P3 | S258.037 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | The matters set out in this policy are not the only considerations and should not be of more importance than other policy direction on effects management. For example, the requirements of Policies 11, 13, and 15 of the NZCPS which are addressed in other district wide matter chapters. | Amend Policy ENG-P3 as follows: "Encourage community-scale renewable electricity generation in the General Rural Zone where the effects are appropriately managed , avoided, remedied or mitigated in accordance with the district wide matters chapters, and by having regards to: ..." |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P4 | S258.038 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | It is not entirely clear what is "large-scale" other than that as defined these activities include earthworks and vegetation clearance. The matters set out in this policy are not the only considerations and should not be of | Amend Policy ENG-P4 as follows: "Provide for large-scale renewable electricity generation activities where effects are appropriately managed , avoided, |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | more importance than other policy direction on effect management. For example, the requirements of Policies 11, 13, and 15 of the NPCPS which are addressed in other district wide matter chapters. | remedied or mitigated in accordance with the district wide matters chapters, and by having regard to: ...' |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P6 | S258.039 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | The NPSREG sets out that plans are to include provisions to "provide for". It is not clear what "appropriately managed means. It is not clear whether "appropriately managed" would give effect to the NZCPS. Effects should be managed in accordance with other chapters. | Amend Policy ENG-P6 as follows: 'Enable Provide for the operation, maintenance, repair and removal of existing renewable electricity generation and provide for the upgrade of renewable electricity generation where the effects are appropriately managed in accordance with the district wide matters chapters." |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R1 | S258.040 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Forest & Bird understands this rule is intended to give effect to Policy G of the NSPREG providing for investigation of potential sites and energy sources for renewable electricity generation. The rule does not set limits to manage potential adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity or natural character, features and landscape, including in the coastal environment. It is not clear what "new utility equipment" is or at what point it may no longer be considered "new". | Amend Rule ENG-R1 as follows: ENG-R1: New site investigation, including the Installation, maintenance, repair, upgrade, and removal of new utility equipment for investigating a assessment of potential site for suitability for a renewable electricity generation activity. 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The activity is not within: i. areas of Outstanding Natural Character;ii. Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes;iii. Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori; or iv. Significant Natural Areas;b. there is no indigenous vegetation clearance;c. 10m of a waterbodyd. compliance is achieved with: i. ENG-S1 |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | <p>2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. compliance is not achieved with ENG-R1 (1)(c) or (d).</p> <p>Matters of discretion:</p> <p>...8. Effects on indigenous biodiversity.3. Activity status: Non-complying Wherea. compliance is not achieved with ENG-R1 (1)(a).</p> |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R2 | S258.041 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | These activities could have significant adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity. Particularly due to noise and disturbance during bird breeding periods and for bat roosting. | <p>Amend Rule ENG-R2 to add the following standards/ conditions:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:... c. No new access requirementsd. No indigenous vegetation clearance</p> <p>2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary</p> <p>... Matters of discretion:... 3. Effects on indigenous biodiversity.</p> |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R3 | S258.042 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Forest and Bird states that there should be a limit on the area for solar so that small scale is not larger than community scale at the permitted activity level. The scale of effect will also depend on the location and on construction activities. Forest & Bird is concerned with the potential for bird strike effects of a wind turbine. Applications should identify where potential at risk bird or bats are present within (including above) the site. This should assist in identifying locations within a | <p>Amend Rule ENG-R3 as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>... b. Compliance is achieved with:... iv. ENG-S2c. The activity is not within:i. areas of Outstanding Natural Character;ii. Outstanding Natural Features;iii. Significant Natural Areas;d. there is no indigenous vegetation clearance.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|---|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>site away from flight paths of bats and to reduce potential effects on birds. There also seems to be a minor error in ENG-R3(2) referring to ENG-S2 rather than ENG-S3 for wind turbine requirements.</p> | <p>2. Activity status: Controlled Where: ... b. compliance is achieved with: i. ENG-S23; ... 5. Effects on indigenous biodiversity, including potential for bird or bat strike. ... 3. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. compliance is not achieved with ENG-R3(1)(a), (b) or (d) or ENG-R3(2). b. electricity generation is from a maximum of 2 wind turbines only. Matters of discretion: ... 5. effects on indigenous biodiversity, including potential for bird or bat strike.</p> <p>4. Activity status: Non-complying Where: a. compliance is not achieved with ENG-R3(1)(c) 5. Rule ENG-R6 applies where compliance is not achieved with ENG-R3(3)(b).</p> |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R4 | S258.043 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | <p>It is not clear if the rule is limited to "solar" this does not ensure protection of areas that may meet significance criteria but are not mapped in the plan. Does not manage adverse effects on indigenous species such as disturbance of birds and bats. Nor would the matters of</p> | <p>Amend Rule ENG-R4 as follows: 1. Activity status: Controlled Restricted discretionary Where: ... c. The activity is for solar renewable</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>control enable conditions to be set to manage adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity within the site of the proposal. ENG-R4(2) and ENG-R4(3), the matters of restriction of discretion are inadequate. Solar panels can have an attraction effect on aquatic insects that can and may increase the risk of bird strikes, resulting in a decline in aquatic insects, and as a result a decline in food source for bats and birds.</p> | <p>electricity generationd. the proposal will not involve the clearance of indigenous vegetation, including for access or transmission line connections.</p> <p>Matters of control:</p> <p>... 8. Effects in indigenous fauna, including bird breeding.9. Whether the activity is within an area meeting the significance criteria for indigenous biodiversity.10. Effects on indigenous biodiversity.</p> <p>2. Activity status:Restricted discretionary</p> <p>3. Activity status: Restricted discretionary</p> <p>4. Activity status: Discretionary Non-complying</p> <p>a. The activity is located in:</p> <p>... viii. An outstanding natural features or landscapeix. A special amenity landscapex. An area of outstanding, very high, or high natural characterxi. The coastal environment.</p> |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R5 | S258.044 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection | Support in part | <p>Forest and Bird is concerned with the potential for bird and bat strike effects of wind turbines. Birds and bats do not always look</p> | <p>Amend Rule ENG-R5:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Controlled Restricted Discretionary</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | Society of New Zealand Inc | | <p>ahead when they fly. There are early indications from studies overseas of marine birds, that painting stripes on the blades of turbines may help reduce bird strike. Applications should identify where potential at-risk bird species are present within (including above) the site. This should assist in identifying locations within a site away from flight paths and to reduce potential effects on birds.</p> | <p>Where:</p> <p>... c. The activity is for wind renewable electricity generation.d. The proposal will not involve the clearance of indigenous vegetation, including for access or transmission line connections.</p> <p>Matters of control:</p> <p>... 9. Effects in indigenous fauna, including bird breeding"10. Whether the activity is within an area meeting the significance criteria for indigenous biodiversity11. Effects in indigenous biodiversity12. Whether the proposal is within habitat for of bird concern or bat habitat including forage or roost flight paths.</p> <p>Delete ENG-R5(2) all and reallocate non-compliance with ENG-R5(1)(b) to be considered under ENG-R6(1).</p> <p>3. Activity status: Discretionary Non-complying</p> <p>4. Activity status: DiscretionaryWhere:a. the activity is not located in:i. moderate hazard areas;ii. high hazard areas;iii. areas of Outstanding Natural Character;iv. areas of High and Very High Natural Character, v. Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, vi. Coastal Environment;vii. sites and areas of significance to Māori, viii. Significant Natural Areas; or ix. Highly productive land.</p> <p>5. Activity status: Non-complyingWhere: Compliance is not</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | achieved with ENG-R5(4)(a) |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R6 | S258.045 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | These activities are unlikely to be appropriate in significant, outstanding or coastal environment areas. Policies 11, 13 and 14 are directive to avoidance and avoidance of significant adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity, natural character, features and landscapes. A non-complying activity status is appropriate. | Amend Rule ENG-R6 as follows: 1. Activity status: Discretionary Where: a. The activity is not located within: i. areas of Outstanding Natural Character;ii. areas of High and Very High Natural Character;iii. Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes;iv. Coastal Environment;v. Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori;vi. Significant Natural Areas. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R7 | S258.046 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | Non-complying status is appropriate. There may be some areas where non-renewable electricity would never be appropriate that could be identified for greater certainty in a prohibited activity rule. | Retain ENG-R7(1) as notified. 2. Activity status: Prohibited Where: a. The activity is located within: i. an area of Outstanding Natural Character ii. an area of High and Very High Natural Characteriii. an Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscapeiv. the Coastal Environmentv. a site and area of significance to Māori; or vi. a Significant Natural Area. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R8 | S258.047 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | Agrees that non-renewable electricity generation should not be anticipated within any zones. | Retain Rule ENG-R8(1) as notified 2. Activity status: Prohibited Where: a. The activity is located within an urban area or an open space zone. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|----------------|--|--|
| ENG - Energy | New provision request | S258.048 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Not Stated | It is not clear where or how energy generation activities that are not "electricity generation" are addressed. The ENG chapter interdiction recognises that energy activities include energy generation beyond electricity generation, e.g. for solar water heating. | Insert new rule for "energy activities" that are not specifically captured. Where these activities are within or on a lawfully established house or structure and they do not increase the footprint, they could be permitted on the basis that they meet the noise and lighting standards. In other cases they should generally be discretionary. |
| NU - Network Utilities | Introduction | S258.049 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | The inclusion of "other operators" creates uncertainty and conflicts with the definitions for "Network utility" and "Network Utility Operator". It is unclear what or who "other operators" would be given the broad definition of network utility operator in the RMA. Most if not all network utilities have potential to have adverse effects on the environment. In addition, potential adverse effects include effects on indigenous biodiversity, natural character and cultural values. Forest & Bird is concerned that the statement "in general the effects of network utilities can be managed through development and performance standards, whether through Codes of Practice or regulatory controls" does not reflect the importance of location and scale of activities in terms of avoiding adverse effects. | Amend NU - Network Utilities Introduction: ... A network utility operator, as defined by the Act, or other operators may provide these utilities. ... Some n Network utilities are critical important for the ongoing functioning of the Wairarapa. They... and social wellbeing. The Wellington Regional Policy Statement identifies regionally significant infrastructure, which as it relates to this chapter includes:- pipelines for the distribution or transmission of natural or manufactured gas or petroleum; - strategic telecommunications facilities, as defined in section 5 of the Telecommunications Act 2001;- strategic radio communications facilities, as defined in section 2(1) of the Radio Communications Act 1989;- the national electricity grid, as defined by the Electricity Governance Rules 2003;- the local authority water supply network and water treatment plants;- the local authority wastewater and stormwater networks, systems and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------|---|
| | | | | | | <p>wastewater treatment plants.</p> <p>The benefits of these regionally significant network utilities to the efficient functioning of modern society are therefore, substantial. Some Network utilities have the potential to have adverse effects on the environment. These effects may result from activities involved in establishing the facility, be generated by the facility itself, or be associated with the maintenance and operation of the facility.</p> <p>Potential adverse effects can include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - disturbance or degradation of indigenous biodiversity; - impacts on the natural character and landscapes; - conflicts with cultural values; - the visual impacts of structures; - risks to public health and safety; and - noise and odour. <p>... In general many cases, the adverse effects of network utilities can be managed addressed through location and scale or managed through development and performance standards, whether through Codes of Practice or regulatory controls.</p> <p>... The objectives policies, and rules in district-wide overlay matters chapters to apply to network utilities.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O1 | S258.050 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | The Wellington RPS sets out direction for plans to recognise benefits of RSI. However, the term "provide for" is more in the nature of policy direction. NU-P2 provides appropriate direction in terms of network utilities generally (i.e. capturing those that are not RSI). | Amend Objective NU-O1 as follows: NU-O1 - Benefits of regionally significant network utilities The benefits of effective, efficient, resilient, and safe regionally significant network utilities are recognised and provided for . |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O2 | S258.051 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Forest & Bird has two concerns with this policy Firstly, the consideration of adverse effects in the context of positive effects/ benefits and secondly the consideration of positive effects and functional need extending beyond RSI. Provisions in objectives or policy for functional/ operational needs or positive effects should only be given where there is high order direction. It is not appropriate or necessary in other respects and only increases potential for conflicts with other provisions. Forest & Bird considers that these matters should be addressed in policy as they are relevant to implementing NU-O1 as amended above. | Amend Objective NU-O2 as follows: The adverse effects of network utilities on the environment are avoided, remedied, or mitigated, while recognising: a. the functional need and operational need of network utilities; and b. that positive effects of network utilities may be realised locally, regionally, or nationally. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P1 | S258.052 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | The policy does not recognise benefits. It is therefore, not clear on what basis proposals would be enabled or provided for, for network utilities. This policy direction, solely on the basis that this would recognise benefits also fails to consider adverse effects that are to be avoided, remedied, or mitigated under s5 of the Act and as set out in NU-O2 and other chapter provisions in the plan. The directive term "enable" is not generally supported. The only exception may be for the reasonable operation, maintenance and minor upgrade of the national grid but even then in the context of what is "reasonable" must be in the context of avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects. | Delete NU-P1 and replace with a policy recognising the benefits of regionally significant network utilities and the national grid reflecting the benefits identified in Policy 7 of the RPS and Policy 6 of the NPSET respectively. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P2 | S258.053 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | To protect significant and outstanding areas. | Amend Policy NU-P2 as follows: "Encourage the coordination of network utilities planning and delivery with land use, subdivision, development, and urban growth so that future land use and network utilities are integrated, safe, efficient, and aligned and located to reduce potential for adverse effects on significant indigenous biodiversity and outstanding areas. " |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P3 | S258.054 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | For the reasons discussed at ECO-O1 below, "enhancement" is uncertain in terms of protection of indigenous biodiversity values and restoration is the appropriate term. | Amend Policy NU-P3 as follows: ... d. result in environmental benefits and restoration of indigenous biodiversity enhancements ; or e. promote environmentally sustainable outcomes including green infrastructure, nature based solutions and the increased utilisation of renewable resources.' |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P4 | S258.055 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | The measures set out are not sufficient to ensure adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated. | Amend Policy NU-P4 as follows: 'Avoid, remedy, or mitigate Manage the adverse effects of network utilities, including effects on natural and physical resources, amenity values, sensitive activities, and the health, safety, and wellbeing of people and communities by: ...' |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P5 | S258.056 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | There are specific considerations for the National Grid under the NPSET and for RIS, including with respect to essential services under RPS that do not apply to utility networks generally. As proposed the Policy | Amend Policy NU-P5 as follows: Ensure that network utilities avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects on the environment, while recognising the functional need and operational need of the network utility, and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>does not give effect to the RPPS, NPSIB or the NZCPS and could result in adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity that are not appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p> | <p>having regard to:A. in relation to the National Grid:a. recognising the functional need and operational need of the network utility; andb. having regard to:a.the extent to which adverse effects have been addressed through site, route, or method selection. and/or the extent to which the network utility is constrained by functional need or operational need;Bb: In relation to existing transmissions, distribution lines and water supply, stormwater and sewage distribution services, the necessity of the network utility for essential services including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the need to quickly repair and restore disrupted services; and b. the impact of not operating, repairing, maintaining, upgrading, removing, or developing the network utility; <p>C. In relation to all Network Utilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the time, duration, or frequency of adverse effects; b. the location of existing network utilities, including: c. the complexity and connectedness of the networks and services; and d. the potential for co-location and shared use of network utility corridors; and e. the anticipated outcomes for the receiving environment, including the role, function, and predominant planned |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | character of the underlying zone. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P6 | S258.057 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | Forest & Bird supports as the Policy generally aligns with the NPSET. | Retain Policy NU-P6 as proposed. |
| NU - Network Utilities | | S258.058 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Forest & Bird supports the approach that indigenous vegetation clearance/ modification is addressed in the ECO chapter rules for these activities. However, the NU rules fail to consider potential for adverse effects on adjacent areas of significant indigenous biodiversity, or adverse effects on fauna and their habitat which may include in areas of exotic generation. It is also unclear whether the potential for adverse effects from earthworks associated with these activities is addressed. Disturbance from earthworks could adversely affect fauna such as lizards. The scope of some rules is unclear and does not seem to match the NU-standards that are identified in the rule. Given the lack of thorough or recent survey, for new network utility infrastructure there should be an assessment of whether the activity would effect vegetation or the habitat of fauna meeting significance criteria. | Retain Rules in the Network Utilities chapter where the approach that vegetation clearance/ modification associated by these activities is addressed by rules in the ECO chapter. This means that where modification is not specifically permitted under those rules as a discretionary/ restricted discretionary activity, including those for network utilities. Add matters of control and restriction of discretion to enable decision makers to consider adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity, including on fauna within the proposal area and on adjacent indigenous biodiversity. Include a matter for control/ discretion into all controlled and restricted discretionary NU Rules as to: - whether the activity would adversely affect indigenous biodiversity meeting the significance criteria in the RPS; and - adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity. Alternatively change controlled and RD rules to discretionary. Add a standard/ condition to all permitted activity rules excluding or limiting earthworks associated with the activities of the rule, as "not more than 50m3 of earthworks" . |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R1 | S258.059 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | It is not clear whether the rule allows for an increase in the scale or size of a structure. Nor, is the potential for access requirements to have adverse effects addressed. The matters of discretion are inadequate for the reasons on NU rules set out above. | Amend Rule NU-R1: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: ...c. The activity does not change the footprint of structures and use exciting |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | access. 2. Activity status:Restricted discretionary |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R2 | S258.060 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | It is not clear if the rule provides for network utilities beyond telecommunications and electricity underground services. For example, stormwater drains. Nor are NU-S4 and NU-S5 adequate to address adverse effects of earthworks. | Amend Rule NU-R2(1) to add a limit to the extent/ scale of activities and to limit earthworks. Ensure the activity is not within 10m of a waterbody or an SNA. Amend NU-R2(2) to add a discretionary activity classification where the activity does not comply with the scale limits. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R3 | S258.061 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | It is not clear what activities would be considered "upgrading" or at what scale the activity could be under NU-R3(2). It is therefore, unclear if the standards or matters of discretion are adequate, For example, S1 and S2 addresses structure heights and setbacks, but do not capture setbacks in terms of earthworks activities of effects associated access requirements, on the coastal environment or on the habitats of indigenous fauna. | Amend Rule NU-R3(2) to add limits to the extent/ scale of upgrading activities to limit earthworks. Add matters of discretion to capture: - adverse effects of earthworks - adverse effects of access requirements including any new access - adverse effects on the coastal environment, including on natural character, natural features and landscapes. - adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R5 | S258.062 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | It is not clear whether the activity must cease permanently after 12 months or over what period the 12 months could occur. Nor is it clear if the activity could include earthworks. | Amend Rule NU-R5 to include a requirement that there are no earthworks. Clarify that the requirements of b. are to occur on completion or after 12 months, whichever occurs first. Add requirement that the site will be returned to a reasonable state. I.e. planted to avoid erosion of bare soil. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R6 | S258.063 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | If NU-R6 is intended to apply to renewable energy and whether this is adequate considering the amount of earthworks required for solar as numerous boxes are required on site in addition to the main substation or battery storage. | Amend Rule NU-R6 to clarify whether NU-R6 applies to renewable electricity generation. Include standards to limit earthworks at the permitted activity level. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R7 | S258.064 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | It would be clearer to use the term "Lawfully established" rather than existing. Also for consistency with the use of this term in TR-P5, ECO-R1, NFL-S2 AND CE-S2. | Amend Rule NU-R7 as follows: NU-R7 New network utilities in existing lawfully established buildings... |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | Make consequential changes throughout the Plan. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R8 | S258.065 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | It is not clear whether the matters covered by this rule are "network utilities". Or if the rule could extend provision for these activities beyond network utility purposes. This is also the case for number of other rules. If the extent is to capture infrastructure, beyond that which is a "network utility" the chapter scope is not clear on this. | Amend Rule NU-R8: Add a condition/ standard requiring that the activity is a network utility activity. Consequential amendments to NU-R9, NU-R10, NU-R11, NU-R17 and NU-R18. Consider adding a separate chapter for infrastructure that is not captured within the definition of network utility or in the ENG and TR chapters. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R10 | S258.066 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | The rule is not clear as to what is "minor". If the limits on structures under a. are intended to apply to all matters listed in the rule heading that is not clear. | Amend Rule NU-R10 to clarify what is a "minor" for all matters identified in the Rule heading. Add additional limits for kiosks, cabinets, and electric vehicle charging stations. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R11 | S258.067 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | It is not clear if this rule would provide of activities beyond those listed in (1)(a) to (1)(h). For example as written the rule does not limit activities such as for accessways or undertaking earthworks. | Amend Rule NU-R11 to clarify that the activities permitted are only those under (1)(a) to (1)(h) and do not include earthworks. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R12 | S258.068 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | It is not appropriate to provide for these structures in an SNA. | Amend Rule NU-R12 as follows: 1. Activity status: Controlled Where: ... e. The site and any access requirements are not within an SNA listed in SCHED5 or an area meeting the RPS significance criteria for SNAs.' |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R14 | S258.069 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | It is not appropriate to provide for these structures in a Significant Natural Area. | Amend Rule NU-R14 as follows: 1. Activity status: controlled Where: ... c. The site and any access |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | requirements are not within a Significant Natural Area listed in SCHED5 or an area meeting the Regional Policy Statement significance criteria for Significant Natural Areas.' |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R15 | S258.070 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | For the reasons set out in NU-Rules generally. | Amend Rule NU-R15 as sought for NU-Rules generally above. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R16 | S258.071 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | For the reasons set out on NU-Rules generally. | Amend Rule NU-R16 as sought for NU-Rules generally above. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R18 | S258.072 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | These activities could significantly adverse effects and are unlikely to be appropriate in Significant or Outstanding Natural Areas. | Amend Rule NU-R18 to include a restriction that the activities are not within significant or outstanding natural areas. Where this is not complied with the activity is considered a non-complying activity. |
| TR - Transport | TR-O2 | S258.073 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Forest & Bird is generally supportive of the objective but considers it should be clarified so that the adverse effects which are to be avoided, remedied or mitigated are those "on the environment". Forest & Bird are concerned that there is no clear policy direction of measures within rules in this chapter implementing this objective. While the ECO chapter rules may be able to be relied on in terms of indigenous vegetation clearance/ modification associated with TR activities, this does not necessarily address effects on indigenous fauna from TR activities. Forest & Bird also has concerns with respect to provision for earthworks as discussed in key issues above. | Amend Objective TR-O2 as follows: "TR-O2 Adverse effects of the transport network. Adverse effects on the environment from the construction, operation, maintenance, and development of the transport network are avoided, remedied, or mitigated." Furthermore, add: - policy direction to implement this objective or amend Policy TR-P6 as sought below. - measures to rules to avoid, remedy and mitigate adverse effects on the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | environment. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P6 | S258.074 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | As worded the management of adverse effects is only to be considered in terms of effects on adjacent activities. To achieve Objective TR-O2 and for integrated management, adverse effects on the environment are to be avoided, remedied or mitigated. With respect to adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity this needs to be in accordance with the ECO chapter provisions. | Amend Policy TR-P6 as follows: 'TR-P6 Managing effects of the transport network Provide for the development and safe operation of the transport network, including the state highway network and rail network, while managing the avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the environment, in accordance with other district wide matters chapters. of the development and use of roads, including state highways, on adjacent activities.' |
| TR - Transport | TR-P11 | S258.075 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | It is not clear what exactly is to be enabled. Particularly as information online indicates that some parts of the trail are only indicative at this stage. The policy direction to "enable" could conflict with ECO or CE chapter provisions. While this may be unlikely it would be helpful to provide greater certainty. This could be done by including planning maps of the network to which this provision applies or including direction to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects in accordance with other chapters of the plan. | Amend Policy TR-P11 as follows: Enable and encourage the establishment and operation of the Wairarapa Five Towns Trail Network as shown on Map XX. OR Enable Provide for and encourage the establishment and operation of the Wairarapa Five Towns Trail Network while avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the environment, in accordance with other district wide matters chapters. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R1 | S258.076 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | Forest & Bird is concerned that rule TR-R1, TR-R2 and TR-R3 for the construction of new accessways, transport networks and roads do not include limits on earthworks, restriction from Significant Natural Areas and Outstanding Landscapes, Features, Character and Waterbodies etc. or discretionary matter to consider effects on indigenous biodiversity. The construction and | Amend Rule TR-R1 as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. compliance is achieved with... iii. a maximum of 50m2 earthworks,iv. removal of mature trees shall only be undertaken:1. outside the bird breeding |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|---|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | the operation of the new activities can have adverse effects on habitat values that may not be protected by simply relying on ECO indigenous vegetation clearance/ modification rules. For example, noise and lighting effects on bats and birds or the removal of habitat for lizards, invertebrates, bats and birds. | <p>period (1 September until March 1); and</p> <p>2. Shall any tree used or of potential use for bat roostv. no indigenous vegetation clearance within 100m of any SNA or NOSZ.</p> <p>2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary</p> <p>... Matters of discretion:</p> <p>... 7. Effects of earthworks</p> <p>8. Effects on indigenous biodiversity.</p> |
| TR - Transport | TR-R2 | S258.077 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | Forest & Bird is concerned that rule TR-R1, TR-R2 and TR-R3 for the construction of new accessways, transport networks and roads do not include limits on earthworks, restriction from Significant Natural Areas and Outstanding Landscapes, Features, Character and Waterbodies etc. or discretionary matter to consider effects on indigenous biodiversity. The construction and the operation of the new activities can have adverse effects on habitat values that may not be protected by simply relying on ECO indigenous vegetation clearance/ modification rules. For example, noise and lighting effects on bats and birds or the removal of habitat for lizards, invertebrates, bats and birds. | <p>Amend Rule TR-R2 as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>... c. a maximum of 50m2 earthworks</p> <p>d. removal of mature trees shall only be undertaken:</p> <p>1. outside the bird breeding period (1 September until March 1); and</p> <p>2. Shall any tree used or of potential use for bat roost.</p> <p>e. no indigenous vegetation clearance within 100m of any SNA or NOSZ.</p> <p>2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary</p> <p>... Matters of discretion:</p> <p>... 5. Effects of earthworks6. Effects on indigenous biodiversity.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| TR - Transport | TR-R3 | S258.078 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | Forest & Bird is concerned that rule TR-R1, TR-R2 and TR-R3 for the construction of new accessways, transport networks and roads do not include limits on earthworks, restriction from Significant Natural Areas and Outstanding Landscapes, Features, Character and Waterbodies etc. or discretionary matter to consider effects on indigenous biodiversity. The construction and the operation of the new activities can have adverse effects on habitat values that may not be protected by simply relying on ECO indigenous vegetation clearance/ modification rules. For example, noise and lighting effects on bats and birds or the removal of habitat for lizards, invertebrates, bats and birds. | Amend Rule TR-R3 as follows: Matters of discretion: ... 4. Effects of earthworks 5. Effects on indigenous biodiversity. |
| TR - Transport | TR-R6 | S258.079 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Forest & Bird owns Fensham Reserve which is identified as NOSZ within the Aerodrome Obstacle Limitation Surface. While it seems unlikely that trees within the reserve would be affected by the limits in TR-R6(1)a this is not clear. They also note that there is an NOSZ identified closer to the Aerodrome near the Waingawa River which presumably includes trees and should not be subject to TR-R6. | Amend Rule TR-R6 to exclude the NOSZ so that trees within the NOSZ are not subject to any limitations in the Aerodrome Obstacle Limitation Surface or limit any restriction on tree height to within 50m of the perimeter of the aerodrome. |
| TR - Transport | New provision request | S258.080 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | It is not clear if "any activity" is limited to transport activities or would include buildings or other activities not directly associated with Transport Infrastructure. Forest & Bird has some concern on the uncertainty of what Transport Infrastructure activities could be captured under rule as permitted activities and generally considers that identifiable activities should be specifically addressed. However, Forest & Bird considers that this rule, if limited to "transport Infrastructure activities not otherwise specifically addressed in the rules of the TR chapter" is acceptable because all other rules in the plan also apply as relevant to activities addressed in the TR Chapter - as | Amend Rule TR-R7 as follows: TR-R7 Any transport infrastructure activity not otherwise listed in this addressed in the rules of the TR - Transport chapter |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | explained in the TR - Transport Chapter Introduction. | |
| TREE - Notable Trees | Introduction | S258.081 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Historic heritage when it comes to Notable Trees, has been interpreted with a very Eurocentric view. Notable Trees provide visual amenity, act as landmarks or connect communities to the past. Heritage includes indigenous natural heritage and a connection to landcover that has long since been destroyed in the Wairarapa. This needs to be reflected in the introduction. | Amend Introduction for Notable Trees Chapter as follows: Notable trees act as landmarks or connect communities to the past. Wairarapa's notable trees are those that have been identified and assessed as being of significant value for botanical, ecological, natural heritage and/ or historic, cultural, spiritual, landmark, or other community reasons. Heritage include indigenous natural heritage and a connection to landcover that has long since been destroyed in the Wairarapa. Trees may be identified as an individual stand-alone tree or a small group of trees where each tree within the group is protected. Notable trees include both exotic and indigenous species and have significance to the community... |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-O1 | S258.082 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Forest and Bird suggest this Objective should go further to ensure that Notable Trees are not only protected, but also retained. | Amend Objective TREE-O1 as follows: Notable trees that contribute to amenity, landscape, historical, cultural, or botanical, ecological and natural heritage values are recognised, identified, and-protected and retained for their natural life. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-O2 | S258.083 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | Supports the Objective as it is appropriate. | Retain Objective TREE-O2 as proposed. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|----------------|--|--|
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-P1 | S258.084 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Forest and Bird seeks a thorough district-wide survey undertaken to protect the trees that represent vestiges of habitat that were once present in abundance across the Wairarapa. They suggest a STEM threshold should be included and used in favour of native trees over exotic. Furthermore, they oppose the consideration of clause c. regarding ongoing management and proximity to surrounding structures and infrastructure. By definition notable trees are old, and in most cases pre-date the existence of surrounding structures and infrastructure. Therefore, it is the structures that should be managed to not affect the trees, not the other way around. | Amend Policy TREE-P1 as follows: ... a. botanical, and ecological, and natural heritage values; b. cultural, landscape, amenity, and heritage (including tangata whenua) values; and ongoing management of the tree and proximity to surrounding structures and infrastructure; and cd. appearance and health of the tree. Where the STEM threshold for trees native to the Wairarapa is 100 and for the trees not native to the Wairarapa a STEM threshold of 120 applies.' |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-P2 | S258.085 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Forest and Bird questions why it's necessary to have two policies that are providing for activities that are exactly the same. They opposes clause c. in TREE-P2 because it does not give effect to TREE-O1. | Amend Policy TREE-P2 as follows: ... e. enable installation of a minor nature using methods that avoid adverse effects on the notable tree.' |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-P3 | S258.086 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | This Policy is used as matters of discretion in TREE-R1. As per submission point above. This Policy provides unnecessary duplication. Seek deletion and the matters listed in matters of discretion in TREE-R1. | Delete Policy TREE-P3. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-P4 | S258.087 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | Forest and Bird state that none of the matters for consideration are relevant to the effect management hierarchy. They oppose consideration of a. because if the tree is Notable, then it has achieved the required significance criteria, therefore, specific significance of the trees has already been considered. oppose b. as written because it would be much simpler to require subdivision to have a setback from all Notable Trees. Forest and bird opposes clause c. because Network Utilities are not a consideration under | Amend Policy TREE-P4 as follows: Manage subdivision of sites containing a notable tree to ensure any adverse effects on the tree are avoided, remedied, or mitigated, considering by requiring a 10m setback from the root protection area of all Notable Trees. a. the specific significance and values of the tree(s); b. the extent that the subdivision provides for protection of the tree(s) including |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | s6(f). Finally, as s6(f) requires the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development, therefore, consideration of d. is also not a matter of relevance. | consideration of the lot size, configuration, and layout and the location of potential building platforms and accessways; c. the location of any necessary network utilities; and d. the likelihood of any serious threat to people or property from the tree(s). |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-P5 | S258.088 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | This Policy does not give effect to s6(f). Discourage does not mean the tree is protected. | Amend Policy TREE-P5 as follows: Discourage Prohibit the removal, partial removal, or destruction of a notable tree, unless... |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-P6 | S258.089 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | The definition of a Street Tree is: any tree where the trunk is located within legal road reserve. As stated in the s32 report: Council manages street trees, which are located on road reserve. So, therefore, all works associated with Street Trees is the responsibility of each respective council. Therefore, it is not appropriate for others to conduct trimming, pruning, removal or works in the root protection area without the express permission of council. | Delete Policy TREE-P6 |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-P7 | S258.090 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | The definition of a Street Tree is: any tree where the trunk is located within legal road reserve. As stated in the s32 report: Council manages street trees, which are located on road reserve. So, therefore, all works associated with Street Trees is the responsibility of each respective council. Therefore, it is not appropriate for others to conduct trimming, pruning, removal or works in the root protection area without the express permission of council. | Delete Policy TREE-P7 |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-P8 | S258.091 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | The definition of a Street Tree is: any tree where the trunk is located within legal road reserve. As stated in the s32 report: Council manages street trees, which are located on road reserve. So, therefore, all works associated with Street Trees is the responsibility of each respective council. Therefore, it is not appropriate for others to conduct trimming, pruning, removal or works in the root protection area without the express permission of council. | Delete Policy TREE-P8. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-P9 | S258.092 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | This is a suitable provision applicable to all Street Trees as they are the property of the councils. Allow works on street trees where they are undertaken by or supervised by Council using best arboricultural practices. | Retain Policy TREE-P9 as notified. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-R1 | S258.093 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | It is not appropriate to refer to a policy as a matter of discretion. The matters need to be listed in the rule to make it clearer for plan users. | Amend Rule TREE-R1 as follows: 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary ... Matters of discretion: 1. The matters in TREE-P3. Trimming will not compromise the long term health or reduce the natural life of the notable tree; 2. trimming will not compromise the notable values of the tree listed in SCHED3 Notable Trees; 3. Trimming will not increase the risk of the notable tree or nearby trees being subject to wind damage; 4. trimming will not impact the natural shape and form of the notable tree; 5. the extent to which the trimming follows accepted arboriculture best practice; 6. whether the activity has a functional need or operational need to occur; 2- 7. disposal of removed vegetation. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|----------------|---|---|
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-R2 | S258.094 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | <p>It is not appropriate to allow earthworks of any form as a permitted activity as this does not give effect to s6(f). Nor does it give effect to TREE-O1.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to refer to a Policy as a matter of discretion. The matters need to be listed in the rule to make it clearer for plan users.</p> | <p>Amend Rule TREE-R2 as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>... ii. earthworks, except for: a. earthworks, for the purpose of installing underground network utilities, including customer connections, provided these are: i. no shallower than 1m below ground level; ii. installed by hand digging or trenchless means (such as air spade, hydro vac or directional drilling methods); and iii. have an entry point either outside of the root protection area or that has an area of less than 1m²;</p> <p>... 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary</p> <p>... Matters of discretion:</p> <p>1. The matters in TREE-P3. The extent to which the activity is likely to damage the tree or endanger its health; 2. The functional or operational need of the activity to occur within the root zone; 3. Any alternative methods available to undertake the activity; 4. Best arboricultural practice relevant to the activity 2. Options for the tree's management, including protection. 3. Replacement planting in the event the</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | | works result in loss of the tree. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | New provision request | S258.095 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | There are far too many rules regarding street trees. As per Forest and Birds submissions above. These trees are the responsibility of each respective council. These rules are unnecessary and should be reduced to just one. See Hutt City Council's approach to Notable Trees in their draft district plan. They don't have street tree provisions but their approach is much simpler and clearer than what is provided here. | Delete TREE-R3 and replace with the following rule to consolidate provisions for street trees into one rule: TREE-R3 Trimming, removal or any activity in the road reserve within the root protection area of any street tree.1. Activity status: PermittedWhere:a. The work is undertaken by the Council to safeguard life or property, including for the maintenance of existing network utilities; andb. the work is undertaken in accordance with best arboriculture practice.2. Activity status: Restricted discretionaryWhere:a. compliance is not achieved with TREE-R3(1).Matters of discretion:1. works do not compromise the long-term health of the street tree;2. do not reduce the natural life of the street tree;3. do not impact the natural shape and amenity of the street tree.4. the tree is dead or is in terminal decline as assessed and certified by a qualified arborist; or 5. options for the tree's management, including protection or relocation.6. Disposal of removed vegetation.7. Replacement planting. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-R4 | S258.096 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | See submission point above. | Seek merging of street tree rules to align management with that of council. See suggested rule above. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-R5 | S258.097 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | See submission point above. | Seek merging of street tree rules to align management with that of council. See suggested rule above. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-R6 | S258.098 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | See submission point above. | Seek merging of street tree rules to align management with that of council. See suggested rule above. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-R7 | S258.099 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | See submission point above. | Seek merging of street tree rules to align management with that of council. See suggested rule above. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | Introduction | S258.100 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | The introduction provides a reasonable explanation of the historical loss and current pressures on indigenous biodiversity. However, it fails to recognise the important role of the District Plan in "protecting" significant natural areas, including areas meeting significant criteria that are not identified in the Plan, including that this chapter is intended to give effect to Policy 11 of the NZCPS. | Amend Introduction to ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity as follows: ... These pressures mean it is important to protect the remaining areas of significant indigenous vegetation and fauna on a long-term sustainable basis where indigenous species can regenerate naturally and through restoration . Areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitat of indigenous fauna are identified as those meeting the significance criteria in Policy 23 of the RPS, referred to as significant natural areas. A comprehensive survey has not yet been undertaken in the Wairarapa. However, the plan includes areas previously identified as significant in SCHED5 Significant Natural Areas and includes requirements for applying the significance criteria in consenting processes to assess potential for adverse effects of activities on other areas meet those criteria. While a number of these SCHED5 Significant Natural Areas in the Wairarapa are |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------|---|
| | | | | | | <p>already in public ownership and legally protected (e.g. Lake Wairarapa and wetlands, and the Tararua, Remutaka, and Aorangi Forest Parks), outside these there are many remaining areas of remnant indigenous forest and natural inland wetlands have no legal protection, other than through rules in this plan, although pockets of remnant indigenous forest and natural inland wetland are increasingly being protected by landowner initiatives such as QEII covenants. SCHED6 Recommended Areas of Protection is provided for informational purposes. This schedule reflects the areas identified in Department of Conservation publication: Eastern Wairarapa Ecological District, 2004. The Recommended Areas for Protection (RAP) are areas that have not been formally assessed against the significance criteria of the RPS and are therefore, not identified as Significant Natural Areas in SCHE5, but as they were identified as containing indigenous biodiversity values of significance by DOC, the RAP have been included to assist in the management of land use activities to achieve the objectives and policy of the ECO chapter. There are no objectives, policies, or rules that relate to the RAP, but they are included in the District Plan to ensure visibility to the</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------|--|
| | | | | | | <p>community and landowners of their conservation value.</p> <p>... A number of activities have the potential to adversely affect remaining indigenous vegetation and fauna habitats. Such activities and their effects include uncontrolled stock grazing that can damage indigenous forest understorey and limit regeneration, and the fragmentation of remnant indigenous forest and natural inland wetland areas through clearance for pasture and exotic forestry, subdivision and intensive or large-scale developments such as mining, electricity generation or new roading infrastructure.</p> <p>... However, the costs of fully actively protecting and maintaining such areas long-term can be large, and support, both in terms of expertise and resources, is often required to ensure effective ongoing management.</p> <p>... The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (NZCPS) includes specific direction for the protection of indigenous biodiversity in the coastal environment. These matters are identified from protection in accordance with ECO-P4 within the coastal environment overlay, in addition to the protection of significant natural areas.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | And amend to clarify the CE and ECO introduction whether the ECO and/ or CE rules address modification of indigenous vegetation and that where more than one rule applies, all requirements must be achieved and the more stringent activity classification applies. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-O1 | S258.101 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | The objective appears to generally align with Council's obligation to maintain biodiversity under s31(1)(b)(iii). Forest and Bird opposes the use of 'enhance' as it is uncertain what outcome is to be achieved. Restoration is a more appropriate term. | Amend Objective ECO-O1 as follows: 'The biological diversity and ecosystems of indigenous species and habitats within the Wairarapa are maintained and enhanced , or restored where degraded.' |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-O2 | S258.102 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Section 6(c) does not include reference to 'inappropriate subdivision, use and development' and nor does Policy 11 of the NZCPS. As the Objective also applies within the coastal environment it needs to be consistent with Policy 11 of the NZCPS. Referring to "areas" is uncertain because the councils have not done a survey of the combined districts so they do not know where the 'areas' are. On this, the objective should also be to identify significant indigenous biodiversity. | Amend Objective ECO-O2 as follows: ' Areas of Significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna within the Wairarapa are identified and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. ' |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | New provision request | S258.103 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Neutral | It is not clear that the plan adequately provides for the protection of wetlands. In relation to wetlands, district councils have responsibilities in terms of integrated management and the maintenance of biodiversity. This includes responsibilities under the RMA and NPSFM. GWRC is clearly responsible for controlling the use of land within wetlands to maintain and enhance ecosystems in waterbodies (paragraph (b)). However, according to paragraph (c), the Council's retain responsibility for controlling the use of land for the maintenance of | Amend ECO chapter (or whole Plan) to include a suite of specific wetland provisions. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | indigenous biodiversity. Neither wetlands, nor their margins, are excluded from that responsibility. Forest and Bird seek objectives, policies and rules protecting wetlands and their margins as far as its possible within the district councils' (these provisions may need to be located throughout the plan (e.g. in the subdivision chapter)). | |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P1 | S258.104 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Policy needs specific actions to make it clearer as to what needs to be undertaken to achieve this policy. There are not rules that implement this policy so it's unclear what the intention is. | Amend ECO-P1 to clarify what actions need to be taken to implement this policy. ... including through developing a biodiversity strategy, surveying and assessing indigenous biodiversity to identify Significant Natural Areas throughout the Wairarapa districts and adding these to the Plan maps by way of plan change. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P2 | S258.105 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | It is uncertain how this Policy will achieve the Objectives of this chapter. | Amend to Policy ECO-P2 as follows: "Including through, a subsidy or funding for:a. fencing SNAs off from farm animals;b. weed and pest control to assist with protection, maintenance or restoration of indigenous biodiversity." |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P3 | S258.106 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | The Plan should include a policy aimed at identification of specific SNAs. This is important for assessing the potential for adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity as part of the consenting process. The policy needs to be more specific and better reflect the RPS and meets the criteria for significance as identified in Policy 23 of the RPS. | Amend Policy ECO-P3 as follows: "Identify these areas that are habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna in the Wairarapa as significant natural areas by applying the significance criteria in Policy 23 of the RPS, including through resource consent processes." |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P4 | S258.107 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Supports the requirement to ensure areas of significance are not removed. However, it is not clear how this will be achieved given the provision for activities and the lack of any clear effects management hierarchy or environmental bottom lines. Setting limits on adverse effects and direction on the management of effects is the clearest way to provide for protection. Forest & Bird suggests combining Policy ECO-P4 clause a. matters into ECO-P5 and moving the effect management requirements from ECO-P6 into ECO-P4. | Amend Policy ECO-P4 as follows: Protect those areas that are habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna in the Wairarapa from inappropriate subdivision, land use, and development by: 1. Managing effects of subdivision, use and development: a. only providing for activities that demonstrate an operational need or functional need to be located in this area; a.b. ensuring SCHED5 areas are not removed in whole or part b. avoiding: i. the loss of habitat that supports of provides a key life function for Threatened or At Risk indigenous species; and ii. Loss of ecosystem representation and extent;iii. Disruption to sequences, mosaics or ecosystem function; and iv. Fragmentation or loss of buffering or connectivity within the SNA and between other indigenous habitats and ecosystems; and c. avoiding the loss or degradation of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna in preference to remediation or mitigation; and d. avoiding significant adverse effects on significant natural areas meeting the criteria in Policy 23 of the RPS; and e. avoiding other adverse effects as far as practicable; then f. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------|---|
| | | | | | | <p>where other adverse effects cannot be avoided, they are remedied where practicable; then g. where adverse effects cannot be remedied, they are mitigated where practicable; thenh. outside the coastal environment, where more than minor residual effects cannot be avoided, remedied, or mitigated in accordance with (e), (f) and (g), biodiversity offsetting is provided where possible; theni. if biodiversity offsetting is not possible, the activity itself is avoided. 2.e- requiring activities within or directly adjacent to these areas to avoid, remedy, or mitigate the adverse effects on the values of the area; andd. managing effects of vegetation modification within the margins of any natural inland wetlands and rely upon Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Freshwater) Regulations 2020 in all other cases:3. In the coastal environment:a. Avoid adverse effects on the matters in Policy 11(a) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010;;b. Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of activities on the matters in Policy 11(b) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010; and c. Otherwise protect and maintain indigenous biodiversity values in</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>accordance with ECO-P4(1) and ECO-P8 and [new policy sought by Forest & Bird to maintain biodiversity].</p> <p>Add reference to the the offsetting principles of Appendix 3 of the NPSIB 2023.</p> |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P5 | S258.108 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | "Enable" is not an appropriate word as to whether an activity should occur. The policy needs rewording so that the consideration of adverse effects can occur in accordance with other policies (including ECO-P4 and ECO-P8 as amended above and below). | <p>Amend Policy ECO-P5 as follows:Enable</p> <p>Only consider providing for the following activities relating to habitats comprising of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna in the Wairarapa, where;1. the activity can demonstrate an operational need or functional need to be located in this area; or 2. the activity is for the following purposes and they contribute to the protection, maintenance, and enhancement restoration of indigenous biodiversity in the areas:...</p> |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P6 | S258.109 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | <p>Forest & Bird is supportive of some aspects of this Policy but is concerned that the management approach set out does not include a clear effects management framework and that the requirements in clauses (a), (b), and (c), are able to be considers for offsetting and compensation, making the direction to "avoid" null.</p> <p>Considers an effects management framework, including the avoidance and requirements set out , would fit better under Policy ECO-P4 as necessary to protect significant indigenous biodiversity. Additionally has concerns regarding the approach to including</p> | Delete Policy ECO-P6. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | compensation and the extent to which the policy gives effect to Policy 11 of the NZCPS. Does not support providing for compensation, as it is not an effective tool to "protect" or adequately manage adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity. | |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P7 | S258.110 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Opposes the provision for modification of specific vegetation types (kanuka, manuka, tauhinu) as these species are habitat in their own right and provide important food for native invertebrates as well as habitat for invertebrates and native lizards. The Policy should be worded to provide guidance on considering activities that may adversely affect fauna and their habitat within areas of little or no indigenous vegetation. Concerns around the use of 'minimise' as it is uncertain. Questions the relevance of (d.) as that Act was written when logging of indigenous timber was still actively undertaken. The provision for the removal of "planted" vegetation in relation to Plantation Forestry is inappropriate. | Amend Policy ECO-P7 as follows: Provide for Consider providing for activities that may adversely affect indigenous biodiversity the modification of vegetation outside of habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna, where adverse effects are managed in accordance with ECO-P8 and where: a. the indigenous vegetation is kanuka, manuka, or tauhinu; a. b. other indigenous vegetation where loss of mature indigenous vegetation is minimised; ... f. the plantation lawfully established forestry or woodlot or and other vegetation has been planted and managed for horticulture or agriculture purposes; ... |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P8 | S258.111 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Concerned that the management approach set out does not include a clear effects management framework. The provisions are inadequate to meet the obligation to maintain indigenous biodiversity. Support for collaboration and co-ordination of non-regulatory indigenous biodiversity initiatives by way of ECO-P1 & ECO-P2 is not sufficient. Given the extent of amendments needed to the Policy it is recommended to replace it in | Delete ECO-P8 and replace with: ECO-P8 Maintenance of indigenous biodiversity Manage the effects of subdivision, use and development on to maintain indigenous biodiversity outside of SCHED5 significant indigenous biodiversity outside of SCHED5 significant natural areas and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>its entirety rather than show specific amendments.</p> <p>This submission point links to others including amending the definition of biodiversity offsetting, and inserting a new earthworks chapter that also includes rules for vegetation clearance.</p> | <p>outside areas meeting the significance criteria in Policy 23 of the RPS, by:</p> <p>1. avoiding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. fragmentation or disruption of connections and linkages between ecosystems or habitats of indigenous fauna; and b. loss or reduction of rare or threatened indigenous species' populations or habitats, including occupancy within a significant natural area. <p>2. managing activities to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. avoiding significant adverse effects where practicable; b. where adverse effects cannot be avoided, they are minimized where practicable; c. where adverse effects cannot be minimised, they are remedied where practicable; d. where more than minor residual adverse effects cannot be avoided, minimised, or remedied, biodiversity offsetting is provided; 3. if biodiversity offsetting is not possible, the activity itself is avoided. <p>3. Having regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the loss of ecosystem representation and extent; b. disruption to sequences, mosaics, or ecosystem function; and c. Loss of, or damage to, buffering of ecosystems or habitats of indigenous fauna. <p>Add reference to Appendix 3 of the NPSIB 2023.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| Interpretation | Definitions | S258.112 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | This definition is appropriate. | Retain definition 'Keeping of goats' as notified. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P9 | S258.113 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | Supports providing support to landowners as this helps to implement Council's responsibilities under s6(c) of the RMA. However, considers the Policy needs greater certainty on the actions/ measures to be undertaken needs to be set out in the policy. | Amend Policy ECO-P9 as follows: "Support and encourage the protection of natural habitats on private land, including restoring and protecting linkages and ecological corridors. Including through, a subsidy of funding for: a. fencing SNAs off from farm animals;b. weed and pest control to assist with protection, maintenance or restoration of indigenous biodiversity." |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P10 | S258.114 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Generally supportive of the Council increasing awareness and support. However, it is unclear how the Policy is to be implemented. Forest & Bird considers greater certainty on the actions/ measures to be undertaken needs to be set out in the Policy. | Amend Policy ECO-P10 to clarify what actions need to be taken to implement this Policy. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P11 | S258.115 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | The Policy is appropriate. | Retain Policy ECO-P11 as notified. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P12 | S258.116 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | Questions the efficacy of the Policy in protecting areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. This policy needs greater consideration of the implications for biodiversity. | Retain Policy ECO-P12 with amendment to give clearer direction to plan users regarding the creation of conservation lots in subdivisions. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-R1 | S258.117 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Forest and Bird is concerned that relying on covenants that may or may not include effects management measures or on other legal agreements is uncertain and does not fulfill councils' responsibilities and functions under the RMA. If activities within those areas are not for the specific purposes and within limits | Amend Rule ECO-R1 as follows: "Modification of indigenous vegetation within a SCHED5 Significant Natural Area 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. the modification of indigenous |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>set out, then a consent process is appropriate. The RMA make specific provision for emergencies. As such a permitted activity is not required to ensure these actions occur in a timely manner. Fire management e.g. constructing fire breaks, could lead to significant clearance of indigenous vegetation and needs to be a consented activity in order for the effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated and where retrospective, for appropriate restoration to be undertaken. The definition of "customary activity" does not align with the modification of indigenous vegetation as it relates to land use and buildings. Suggests that this needs to refer to "customary harvest" and a definition added. Forest and Bird also has concerns with the term "modification" and whether this captures vegetation clearance or provides for distinction where vegetation clearance is of specific concern rather than other types of "modification", i.e. pruning. Forest and Bird has sought amendment to the definitions above in this respect.</p> | <p>vegetation is for one of more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. associated with a conservation activity or a customary activity harvest; ... iii. carried out subject to and in accordance with any specific covenants or other legal agreements entered into with the District Council, or Greater Wellington Regional Council, or Department of Conservation, or QEII Trust; ... v. required to remove or trim branches of vegetation to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the extent necessary to avoid them interfering with lawfully established structures, buildings, and any vegetation clearance is within 6m of the structure or building; or 2. maintain lawfully established fence lines, network utilities, existing roads or access tracks and clearance is within 3m of the fence, utility road or access track; ... vii. the modification is required in accordance with Section 43 and 64 of the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017; or ... b. any vegetation clearance for the purposes in a. above is of no more than 50m², other than for removal for maintenance of fences and network utilities within the limits in (a) above. <p>2. Activity status: ControlledWhere:a. the modification is required in</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>accordance with Section 43 and 64 of the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017. Matters of control: a. measures to avoid or remedy or mitigate adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity; b. measures to avoid or remedy or mitigate adverse effects on natural character within the coastal environment; and c. Restoration measures with respect to adverse effects that cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated under (a) and (b) above. 3. Activity status: Discretionary Where:</p> <p>a. the modification is for the purposes set out in ECO-R1(1), and b. compliance is not achieved with ECO-R1(1). 4. Activity status: Non-complying Where: a. the modification not for the purposes set out in ECO-R1(1).</p> |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-R2 | S258.118 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | <p>Forest and Bird accepts that certainty is required for permitted activities and for that reason it is not practicable to set a permitted activity rule for significant natural areas that are not identified in SCHED5. However, to fulfil Councils' functions and responsibilities with respect to protecting significant natural areas not identified in the schedule but that none the less meet the significance criteria in Policy 23 of the RPS, appropriate limits need to be set as if the rule may apply to a significant natural area. Forest and Bird considers the rule should include limits to capture changes in land use or increases in intensification that could result in loss of</p> | <p>Amend Rule ECO-R2 as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where one or more of the following applies:</p> <p>a. The modification of indigenous vegetation is for the purposes and within the limits of ECO-R1(1) associated with conservation activities or customary activities; or b. compliance is achieved with ECO-S1; c. no more than 50m³ of timber harvested for reasonable personal use over any 10 year period; d. The harvesting of indigenous timber undertaken in accordance with an approval under Part</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>indigenous biodiversity values. Forest and Bird has sought to identify these matters of issue however, there may be more and a Discretionary status may be more appropriate.</p> | <p>III A of the Forests Act 1949; e. b. The modification of indigenous vegetation is for operation and/ or maintenance and repair of existing pasture, fences, drains, within land currently used for farming or horticulture, and the modification is not to facilitate a more intensive land use; or c. The modification of indigenous vegetation is for the operation, maintenance and establishment of new; fences, structures, network utilities , infrastructure, firebreaks, including existing roads or tracks (including walking or cycling tracks); and i. is not within 20m of a natural inland wetland; ii. does not include an area of indigenous vegetation larger than 20m²; iii. does not include any indigenous tree over 3m high with a trunk diameter 30cm or greater as measured 1.4m above the ground; iv. does not occur during bird breeding period; and v. is not within 50m of a SCHED5 area or a waterbody; or f. trimming that is required to comply with the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003; g. Activities carried out subject to and in accordance with any specific covenants or other legal agreements entered into with the District Council, or Greater Wellington Regional Council, or Department of</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>Conservation, or QEII Trust;h.d. The trimming or removal of indigenous vegetation that has been planted and managed specifically for commercial horticulture, plantation forestry, or agricultural purposes, and the vegetation is not within 20m of a natural inland wetland; or i.e. For the avoidance of loss of life, injury, or serious damage to property;j. The modification is required in accordance with Section 43 and 64 of the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017;k.f. The modification is required to remove vegetation infected organism under the Biosecurity Act 1993.</p> <p>2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary</p> <p>... Matters of discretion:1. the need for an assessment in accordance with the significance criteria of Policy 23 of the RPS;2. effects on indigenous biodiversity;3. effects on natural character, natural features and landscapes;4. effects on SASM;5. potential for erosion or exacerbation of natural hazards.The matters identified in Policy ECO-P8.</p> |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous | ECO-R3 | S258.119 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | This rule does not give effect to ECO-P11. The rule needs to include SNAs to ensure goats are effectively managed near areas of significant indigenous vegetation. Furthermore, goats are significant pests to the | Amend Rule ECO-R3 as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. the site(s) on which the goats are kept is not located within 2km of the Natural Open |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|-----------------------|------------------|---|----------|--|---|
| Biodiversity | | | | | region and a significant browser of indigenous vegetation. Therefore a rule needs to achieve compliance with additional standards to ensure impacts on indigenous vegetation are avoided. | Space Zone, identified SNAs in SCHED5 or in the coastal environment; and b. compliance is achieved with ECO-S1 and ECO-S2; and c. The site on which the goats are kepti. does not include an area of mature vegetation larger than 20m2;ii. is not within 50m of a wetland or natural wetland... |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-S1 | S258.120 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | Oppose the statement allowing any clearance of manuka, kanuka or tauhinu. These species are habitat in their own right and provide important food for native invertebrates as well as native lizards. This standard does not provide adequate protection in the coastal environment. Opposes a height limit to apply in the coastal environment because by nature of the coastal environment mature vegetation is inherently low growing due to the harsh environment. | Amend Standard ECO-S1 as follows: ... 2. The indigenous vegetation is kanuka, manuka, or tauhinu; and ... Matters of discretion: 1. The matters identified in Policy ECO-P8. Effects on indigenous biodiversity. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-S2 | S258.121 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | Policy is supported. | Retain Standard ECO-S2 as notified. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | APPENDIX ECO-1 | S258.122 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | Forest and Bird opposes the inclusion of fixed lists based on statutory documents because of uncertainty created when the document is amended or reviewed. | Delete the list and instead refer to the RPMP and other relevant weed lists such as MPI's pest plant accord. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | New provision request | S258.123 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Neutral | Just a definition of biodiversity offsetting is insufficient to meet the Councils' obligations under the RMA to ensure resource consents achieve no net loss. A framework is necessary to give clear guidance about how no net loss can be achieved. See Wellington's | Insert a new Appendix that outlines a framework for biodiversity offsetting, such as including Appendix 3 from the NPS-IB. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | Proposed District Plan for how they included a framework. | |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P3 | S258.124 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Forest & Bird is concerned that there is a conflict between NATC-P3 and P4. The word "enabling" is inappropriate. Forest & Bird is concerned that NATC-P6 is inappropriate as it fails to include protection of indigenous biodiversity values in accordance with the ECO provisions. The word "allow" is inappropriate. The rules fail to include adequate matters of discretion. NATC-R2 could potentially permit quarrying or mining as being within the definition of "primary productions" however, those activities are inappropriate within 25m of a significant waterbody. | Amend NATC-P3 to resolve the concerns set out in this submission point. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P4 | S258.125 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Forest & Bird is concerned that there is a conflict between NATC-P3 and P4. The word "enabling" is inappropriate. Forest & Bird is concerned that NATC-P6 is inappropriate as it fails to include protection of indigenous biodiversity values in accordance with the ECO provisions. The word "allow" is inappropriate. The rules fail to include adequate matters of discretion. NATC-R2 could potentially permit quarrying or mining as being within the definition of "primary productions" however, those activities are inappropriate within 25m of a significant waterbody. | Amend NATC-P4 to resolve the concerns set out in this submission point. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | | S258.126 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Forest and Bird supports any provisions in the Plan that would ensure the values of ONFLs are maintained and enhanced and would not enable modification of their outstanding values. Also supports the identification and protection of Special Amenity Landscapes and seek to ensure provisions in the NFL chapter adequately protect the ONFLs and SALs in the Wairarapa and are well integrated in the ECO chapter to ensure no-net-loss of biodiversity. However, it is unclear how this chapter gives effect to the NZCPS, | Amend to clarify the scope of the NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes chapter. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | specifically Policy 15 (b). Forest and Bird is concerned with the use of uncertain in terms of the values protected in landscapes under Policy 15 (b). Forest and Bird seeks clarity regarding this point. | |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-O1 | S258.127 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | This Objective could be better aligned with s6(b) of the RMA and Policy 26 of the RPS. Seek deletion of 'identified' because this is not appropriate for an objective. The policy direction requires identification which is enough to give effect to the objective. | Amend Objective NFL-O1 as follows: The identified Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes are protected from the adverse effects of inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-O2 | S258.128 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | As written, this objective doesn't give effect to s7(c) of the RMA. Seek deletion of 'identified' as per submission point on NFL-O1 above. | Amend Objective NFL-O2 as follows: The identified Special Amenity Landscapes within the Wairarapa are maintained and where practicable enhanced. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P1 | S258.129 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | This Policy is giving effect to the RPS. However, the language used is not immediately clear without the context of the policy direction of the RPS. It would be easier to understand this policy if read alongside the RPS, therefore reference to the explicit policy is necessary to make it clearer for plan users. | Amend Policy NFL-P1 as follows: ... While taking into account the following criteria from Policy 25 of the RPS: ... |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P2 | S258.130 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | If SALs are to be identified using the same criteria as NFL-P1 then it makes sense to merge this Policy with NFL-P1. | Delete Policy NFL-P2 or integrate into NFL-P1 above. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P3 | S258.131 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Forest and Bird supports the intent of this policy but have concerns regarding "only allow" wording in ONLs. Allowing activities in ONLs outside of the coastal environment should not be solely on the basis of this policy. Other considerations should also apply, such as policies from the ECO chapter. | Amend Policy NFL-P3 as follows: Only consider allowing subdivision, use, and development within an identified Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape where it: ... b. the activity is designed to protect |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>This Policy needs to be worded to ensure the considerations (significant biodiversity values) are also taken into account.</p> <p>Forest and Bird also opposes the list in b. because they do not give effect to s6(b).</p> | <p>the identified landscape values and characteristics. b. is identified it is appropriate by: i. having an operational need or functional need to be located in this area; ii. minimising earthworks and changes to the landform; iii. reducing the scale and prominence of any buildings or structures, including any proposed building platforms, and integrating landform and context into the design and through the use of naturally occurring building platforms and sympathetic materials; iv. avoiding or minimising the removal of any indigenous vegetation; v. enabling the repair, maintenance, and removal of existing infrastructure; and vi. enabling the continuation, or enhancing, of tangata whenua cultural and spiritual values and customary activities.</p> |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P4 | S258.132 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | <p>This Policy does not give effect to the NZCPS Policy 15. This Policy either needs to be amended or there needs to be amendment to the CE chapter to give adequate effect to Policy 15 of the NZCPS, specifically Policy 15 (b).</p> | <p>Amend Policy NFL-P4 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of activities from subdivision, use, and development on the identified characteristics and values of the Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes located within the Coastal Environment.</p> |
| NFL - Natural Features and | NFL-P5 | S258.133 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | <p>Needs to be cross reference with the ECO provisions to ensure biodiversity values are also considered when assessing appropriate activities.</p> | <p>Amend Policy NFL-P5 as follows: ... d. the activity is consistent with Policies NFL-P3 and NFL-P4 and ECO-P4 and ECO-</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|---|----------------|--|---|
| Landscape s | | | | | | P8." |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscape s | NFL-P6 | S258.134 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | Forest & Bird supports the intent of this Policy but it is unclear how this Policy will be implemented by Councils. | Retain Policy NFL-P6 as notified. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscape s | NFL-P7 | S258.135 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | Forest & Bird supports the intent of this Policy but it is unclear how this Policy will be implemented by Councils. | Retain Policy NFL-P7 as notified. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscape s | NFL-R1 | S258.136 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Forest & Bird is concerned that earthworks are not consistently managed by this Plan. They are also concerned that there is no consistency with the Standards to ensure that permitted activity does not lead to loss of biodiversity or landscape values as per the requirement under Policy 15 of the NZCPS and to achieve s6(b) and s7(c) of the RMA. Forest and Bird seeks better integration with the ECO provisions and opposes provision for 500m2 of earthworks as this will not enable protection of landscapes over the long-term. | Amend Rule NFL-R1 to ensure earthworks and effects on indigenous biodiversity are effectively managed throughout the Plan. Including by reducing the permitted earthworks in ONFLs to 200m2 rather than 500m2 and limiting the modification of "indigenous vegetation" to 50m2. Include another or other explanation that the ECO chapter provisions including rules also applies. Make other amendments consistent with that sought for CE rules. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscape s | NFL-R2 | S258.137 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | Rule is appropriate. | Retain Rule NFL-R2 as notified. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscape s | NFL-S1 | S258.138 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | As per Forest & Birds concerns regarding earthworks, it is not clear how these standards are consistent with expectation regarding earthworks elsewhere in the Plan. | Amend Standard NFL-S1 to be consistent with earthworks throughout the Plan and the ECO chapter to ensure biodiversity is protected. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-S2 | S258.139 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | As per Forest & Birds concerns about earthworks it is not clear how this standard is consistent with expectation regarding earthworks elsewhere in the Plan. NFL-S2 is not consistent with ECO provisions and does not give effect to s6 of the RMA. | Amend Standard NFL-S2 to be consistent with earthworks throughout the Plan and the ECO chapter to ensure biodiversity is protected. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-S3 | S258.140 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | As per Forest & Birds concerns about earthworks it is not clear how this standard is consistent with expectation regarding earthworks elsewhere in the Plan. | Amend Standard NFL-S3 to be consistent with earthworks throughout the Plan and the ECO chapter to ensure biodiversity is protected. |
| PA - Public Access | | S258.141 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | It is not clear whether provisions are adequate to protect indigenous biodiversity and natural character from adverse effects on vehicles and beaches, including where people bring dogs to remove areas where birds are breeding. | Amend PA chapter to control the access of vehicles to beaches and protect indigenous biodiversity and natural character. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R7 | S258.142 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Forest & Bird is concerned with the provision for Conservation Lot(s), allowing additional lots on the basis of protection of SNAs. It is not certain that protection would avoid the fragmentation effects of fencing if the SNA is spread over more than one allotment. Currently this method of protection does not appear to extend beyond SCHED5 areas. Nor is it clear whether other subdivision requirements include assessment of indigenous vegetation against the significance criteria of the RPS. As proposed protection appears limited to SCHED5 areas and subdivision could result in the loss of indigenous biodiversity. Forest and Bird also has concerns with subdivision including additional lot subdivision in the coastal environment which is more vulnerable. Subdivision brings with it significant land use change including the potential for loss and fragmentation of indigenous biodiversity and habitat for indigenous species. This includes from physical changes such as earthworks, vegetation clearance, and the placement of | Amend SUB-R7 as follows: Insert standards and matters of discretion to assess whether land proposed for subdivision includes areas of vegetation or of habitat value meeting the significance criteria of the RPS. Amend rules to ensure fragmentation of significant natural areas, including new areas not yet in SCHED5, does not occur. Include setbacks from significant natural areas and from wetlands. Change the activity status from controlled to restricted discretionary Include requirements to control/restrict household pets in new subdivisions near areas of significant indigenous biodiversity. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | structures/ hard surfaces as well as the disturbance and impacts of people, pets and pests. | |
| CE - Coastal Environment | Introduction | S258.143 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | The introduction is not clear or consistent with the NZCPS in terms of protection for indigenous biodiversity or natural features and landscapes in the coastal environment. Nor is the explanation in paragraph 5, that "The coastal environment also includes... "accurate in terms of protection of SNAs which is also achieved through ECO-R2 and ECO-R3 which apply beyond specific SCHED5 overlay areas. | Amend paragraph 5 of CE - Introduction to more clearly explain how the plan gives effect to Policy 11 and Policy 15 of the NZCPS. Amend to clarify the CE and ECO introduction whether the ECO and/ or CE rules address modification of indigenous vegetation and that where more than one rule applies, all requirements must be achieved and the more stringent activity classification applies. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O1 | S258.144 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | It is not clear if the Plan gives effect to the NZCPS. | Amend CE-O1 to include protection of indigenous biodiversity in the coastal environment. Similarly if the SD or NFL objectives do not include protection/ preservation of natural features and landscapes of the coastal environment, amend CE-O1 to include this. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O2 | S258.145 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | It is not clear as to why clause a. is specific to qualities, characteristics, and values, or why clause b. is to maintain rather than protect in accordance with Policy 13 of the NZCPS. The term enhance is not consistent with Policy 14 which is for restoration. In addition the qualification "in the landward extent of the coastal environment" is not consistent with an integrated management approach where by council should be considering the effects of subdivision, use and development on receiving environments. For example, the effect of allowing vehicles to access beaches or effects of subdivision on outstanding natural character in the CMA. | Amend Objective CE-O2 as follows: ... a. protecting the qualities, characteristics, and values of identified areas of Outstanding Natural Character and Very High Natural Character in the landward extent and outside those areas, the natural character of the coastal environment; and b. maintaining and where appropriate enhancing natural character in all other areas of the coastal environment and the restoration and rehabilitation of natural character and restoring natural character within the coastal environment where it has been |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | degraded. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P2 | S258.146 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | The Policy includes terms that do not align with matters on which ONC's are identified in CE-P1. In addition the Policy is not consistent with Policy 13(1)(a). | Amend Policy CE-P2 to be consistent with Policy 13(1) of the NZCPS. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P3 | S258.147 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | Forest & Bird supports the identification of very high and high natural character in the plan. However, the Policy approach of managing subdivision, use, and development within these areas is uncertain to achieving Policy 13 of the NZCPS, as there may be circumstances where those activities are inappropriate. For example, where adverse effects would not protect in accordance with Policy 13(b) of the NZCPS. | Amend Policy CE-P3 as follows: "Manage the subdivision, use, and development within Protect areas identified as Very High and High Natural Character by only considering allowing activities in these areas , that:..." |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P4 | S258.148 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | The policy direction on rehabilitating and minimising are uncertain in terms of restoration of natural character and the protection of indigenous biodiversity. The policy direction in clause (b)(iii) on "avoiding significant adverse effects" is inconsistent with Policy 11 of the NZCPS and Policy ECO-P4 as amended by Forest & Bird. The Policy fails to include direction on the use of hard protection structures including avoiding new hard protection structures and where practicable removing hard protection structures to allow for landward migration of habitat for indigenous species. | Delete C-P4 or amend to address concerns regarding natural character and indigenous biodiversity. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P5 | S258.149 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Forest & Bird supports some aspects of this Policy, for example: CE-P5(c) and (d) However, the policy direction to "provide for" has potential to conflict with CE-P3, on adverse effects". The policy is also uncertain in terms of consistency with Policy 11 and 15 or the NZCPS, including through consistency with ECO and NFL provisions. | Amend CE-P5 as follows: Retain Clauses (c) and (d) as notified. Delete clauses (a) and (b) or Amend to ensure adverse effects are addressed in accordance with CE-P3 and to avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects on natural character in other areas of the coastal environment. Amend to recognise that adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity and on natural features and landscapes will also need to be |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | addressed in accordance with ECO, NFL, and other CE provisions. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P6 | S258.150 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Forest & Bird is concerned that clause (a) fails to implement Policy 11 or have regard to other adverse effects on the environment. Forest & Bird is concerned that the word "allow" would suggest that where infrastructure meets the requirements in (i) to (iii) it is to be allowed without consideration of other factors. This creates potential for inconsistency with NFL, and ECO provisions giving effect to Policy 11 and 15 of the NZCPS. | Amend Policy CE-P6 as follows: a. provide for the maintenance, repair, and removal of existing infrastructure in areas identified as Very High and High Natural Character, where adverse effects are managed in accordance with CE-P3 and other adverse effects are avoided, remedied, or mitigated in accordance with district wide matters chapter provisions; and b. Only consider allow new infrastructure and the upgrade of existing infrastructure within areas identified as Very High and High Natural Character where: ... ii. it is designed to maintain the Very High and High Natural Character values; and ... iv. other adverse effect are avoided, remedied or mitigated in accordance with district wide matters chapter provisions. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P7 | S258.151 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Forest & Bird is concerned that relying on Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 is uncertain in terms of s6(f) of the RMA and does not set out whether the council intends to use accidental discovery protocols. | Amend CE-P7 to clarify use of accidental discovery and to protect in accordance with s6(f) of the RMA |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P8 | S258.152 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | The Policy does not implement and is potentially inconsistent with Policy 3 of the NZCPS. | Amend CE-P8 as follows: Insert Policy 3 from the NZCPS Amend so that measures include identifying the Foreshore Protection Area, but are not limited to that area. Amend clause (a) to read |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | "only consider" rather than provide for. Amend clause (c) so that other considerations such as protection in accordance with Policies 11, 13, and 15 of the NZCPS is achieved. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P9 | S258.153 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | Supports the Policy. | Retain Policy CE-P9 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | New provision request | S258.154 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Neutral | The chapter does not include policy direction to fully give effect to Policy 13(1)(b) of the NZCPS. | Insert a new policy to avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy, or mitigate any other adverse effects on natural character outside areas identified as Outstanding, Very High or High Natural Character. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-R1 | S258.155 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Forest & Bird is concerned that earthworks within the coastal environment could have adverse effects on habitat of indigenous species. Limiting discretion to effect of non-compliance is uncertain and could be subjective. There are potential adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity which may not be considered or able to be considered. The matters to which discretion is to be limited should all be set out in RD rules. Given the scope of potential effects in the CE that activity classification should be Discretionary. | Amend Rule CE-R1 as follows: Delete (1)(b) Earthworks or buildings and structures associated with Temporary Military Training Activities, conservation activities or customary activities. Include that Earthworks or buildings and structures are not within SCHED5 areas or ONFLs. Amend CE-R1(2) to a Discretionary activity except for where the activity is within SCHED5 area and it is not for the purposes in ECO-R1, in which case the activity is to be Non-complying. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-R2 | S258.156 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | It is not clear why modification of indigenous vegetation is addressed here rather than through ECO rules or if the intent is that both apply. Forest & Bird is concerned that earthworks, modification of vegetation, buildings and structures within the coastal environment could have adverse effects on habitat of indigenous species. Limiting discretion to effect of non-compliance is uncertain and could be subjective. There are potential adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity which may not be considered or | Amend CR-R2(1) as follows: Include that earthworks, modification of indigenous vegetation or buildings and structures vegetation or buildings and structures are not within SCHED5 areas or ONFLs. Amend CE-R1(2) to a discretionary activity except for where the activity is within a SCHED5 area and it is not for the purposes in ECO-R1, in which case the activity is to be Non-complying. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | able to be considered. The matters to which discretion is to be limited should all be set out in RD rules. Given the scope of potential effects in the CE the activity classification should be Discretionary. | |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-R3 | S258.157 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | As written the rule appears to allow for activities other than conservation and customary to be considered as restricted discretionary activity. Other than operational or maintenance associated with lawfully established activities should not be anticipated within Outstanding Natural Character. | Retain CE-R3(1) Amend CE-R3(2) to: - clarify the purposes/ lawfully established activities to which the rule applies. - include effects on indigenous biodiversity as a matter of discretion. - add a Non-complying activity status where the requirements of the RD rule are not met. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-R4 | S258.158 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | A non-complying activity status is appropriate as these activities are unlikely to be appropriate. | Retain Rule CE-R4 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-R5 | S258.159 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | A non-complying activity status is appropriate as these activities are unlikely to be appropriate. | Retain Rule CE-R5 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-R6 | S258.160 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support | Other than as provide for in CE-R1, R2 or R3 these activities are unlikely to be appropriate. | Retain Rule CE-R6 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | New provision request | S258.161 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Neutral | The rules do not appear to clearly capture effects of network utilities or infrastructure activities. There may be activities beyond those in CE-R1, R2 and R3 that would have adverse effects on the CE. | Insert a new rule for any activities not specifically provided for in CE-R1, R2, or R3, outside Outstanding Natural Character overlays as a Discretionary activity and within an Outstanding Natural Character overlay as Non-complying activity status. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-S1 | S258.162 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | There is potential for earthworks to have adverse effects on the habitat or indigenous fauna. The coastal environment is a sensitive environment. | Amend CE-S1: ... b. a maximum area of 5100m ² per site. ... Matters of discretion: ... x. Adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity and on natural features and landscapes. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-S2 | S258.163 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Forest & Bird is generally supportive of this standard in terms of protecting natural character outside ONC. However, allowing for 50m2 clearance on a 12 monthly basis could result in significant adverse effects over the life of the Plan and does not necessarily protect indigenous biodiversity or natural features and landscapes in accordance with Policies 11 and 15 of the NZCPS. | Amend CE-S2: 1. Modification of indigenous vegetation must not exceed, in total area, 50m2 in any 12 month period. ... Matters of discretion: ... x. adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity and on natural features and landscapes. Note: the rules and standards of the ECO chapter also apply to the modification of vegetation in the coastal environment. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | | S258.164 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | It is not clear that indigenous biodiversity is recognised as important to the character of the zone. | Amend GRZ chapter to ensure provisions recognise the importance of indigenous biodiversity to the character of the zone. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | | S258.165 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | It is not clear that indigenous biodiversity is recognised as important to the character of the zone. | Amend SETZ chapter to ensure provisions recognise the importance of indigenous biodiversity to the character of the zone. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | | S258.166 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | It is not clear that indigenous biodiversity is recognised as important to the character of the zone. | Amend GRUZ chapter to ensure provisions recognise the importance of indigenous biodiversity to the character of the zone. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | | S258.167 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | It is not clear that indigenous biodiversity is recognised as important to the character of the zone. | Amend RLZ chapter to ensure provisions recognise the importance of indigenous biodiversity to the character of the zone. |
| NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone | | S258.168 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | It is not clear that indigenous biodiversity is recognised as important to the character of the zone. | Amend NCZ chapter to ensure provisions recognise the importance of indigenous biodiversity to the character of the zone. |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | | S258.169 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | It is not clear that indigenous biodiversity is recognised as important to the character of the zone. | Amend MUZ chapter to ensure provisions recognise the importance of indigenous biodiversity to the character of the zone. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|---------------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | | S258.170 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | It is not clear that indigenous biodiversity is recognised as important to the character of the zone. | Amend TCZ chapter to ensure the provisions recognise the importance of indigenous biodiversity to the character of the zone. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | | S258.171 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Forest and Bird states that it is unclear how the assessment was undertaken to identify NOSZ across the districts. For, transparency the Council's should include the technical advice commissions so that Plan users are able to understand how decisions were come to. Additionally Forest and Bird are concerned that relying on the protections under NOSZ to protect significant values will be inadequate when applied to places that haven't been assessed yet. | Prioritise NOSZ for identification of Significant Natural areas. Ensure permitted activities within these zones are undertaken in ways and within limits to protect indigenous biodiversity values and that consented activities include an assessment against the Policy 23 significance criteria of the RPS. Any other amendments to address Forest & Birds submission. |
| OSZ - Open Space Zone | | S258.172 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | It is not clear that indigenous biodiversity is recognised as important to the character of the zone. | Amend OSZ chapter and ensure that provisions recognise the importance of indigenous biodiversity to the character of the zone. |
| SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone | | S258.173 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | It is not clear that indigenous biodiversity is recognised as important to the character of the zone. | Amend SARZ chapter to ensure that provisions recognise the importance of indigenous biodiversity to the character of the zone. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | | S258.174 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | It is not clear that indigenous biodiversity is recognised as important to the character of the zone. Given the anticipated land use change within these zones, ensure provisions require identification and protection of SNAs, including retaining connectivity and ecosystem function. | Amend FUZ chapter to ensure permitted activities within this zone are undertaken in ways and within limits to protect indigenous biodiversity values and that consented activities include an assessment against the Policy 23 significance criteria of the RPS. |
| SCHED5 - Schedule of Significant Natural Areas | Significant Natural Areas | S258.175 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | This schedule is inadequate as the SNAs were not identified in accordance with Policy 23 of the RPS. Furthermore, the information on this SCHED is insufficient for users of the plan. There needs to be some kind of coding so these SNAs can be found on the planning maps, otherwise it is impossible to find these SNAs to understand their location and extent. | Amend SCHED5 to add further areas meeting the significance criteria in Policy 23 of the RPS to this schedule. |
| SCHED6 - Schedule | Recommended Areas | S258.176 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection | Support in part | SCHED6 is provided for informational purposes. This schedule reflects areas | Amend SCHED6 to include further explanation of how these areas will be |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|---------------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| of Recommended Areas for Protection | for Protection | | Society of New Zealand Inc | | identified in Department of Conservation publication: Eastern Wairarapa Ecological District, 2004. There are no provisions that relate to the RAP, but they are included in the District Plan to ensure visibility to the community and landowners of their conservation value. | considered. Consider including standards/ conditions and matters of discretion to specifically consider this schedule and assess whether areas meet the significance criteria of the RPS. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R17 | S258.177 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | These activities could cause significant adverse effects and are unlikely to be appropriate in Significant or Outstanding areas. Forest and Bird also has concerns as set out on NU-Rules generally above. | Amend Rule NU-R17 to include a standard/ condition that the activities are not within significant or outstanding areas. Where this standard is not complied with the activity is considered as a non-complying activity. Amend as sought for NU-Rules generally above. Retain matter of discretion 4. |
| SCHED5 - Schedule of Significant Natural Areas | Significant Natural Areas | S258.178 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Seeks a comprehensive assessment is conducted to identify all significant natural areas in the district. | Amend SCHED5 - Significant Natural Areas to update and add any new areas identified in a comprehensive review of the districts |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | New provision request | S258.179 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Amend | Consider referring to areas meeting significance criteria in Policy 23 of the Wellington Regional Policy Statement but not identified in SCHED5 - Significant Natural Areas as 'significant indigenous biodiversity'. | Insert provisions to protect areas meeting significance criteria in Policy 23 of the Wellington Regional Policy Statement but not identified as significant natural areas as 'significant indigenous biodiversity'. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S258.180 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Amend | Notes earthworks can result in the loss of indigenous biodiversity and degradation of ecosystem functions, including habitat destruction (including vegetation removal), and should therefore be managed accordingly to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity. Considers earthworks are not consistently managed under the plan, e.g. ENG-P4 considers earthworks effects but the chapter makes no further mention of earthworks. NU-R2 and NU-R17 includes earthworks as a matter of discretion but there are no supporting policies. SASM and NFL chapters | Insert a new EW-Earthworks chapter with objectives, policies, rules, and standards to identify and manage effects of earthworks (including limiting earthworks to ensure mature exotic trees are not removed prior to determining whether they provide bat roosting habitat, and applying earthworks limits to new primary production activities) |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>manage comprehensively. CE chapter permits earthworks for temporary military training activities without limits on scale outside natural character overlays. Considers it is unclear how or whether earthworks are managed outside coastal and natural environment overlays, and how earthworks will be controlled to manage effects on indigenous biodiversity.</p> <p>Considers that where limits do exist, they may not be enough to protect habitat. Where matters of discretion mention earthworks, considers it is not clear how the effects of earthworks need to be considered with respect to indigenous biodiversity.</p> | |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R12 | S258.181 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Considers management of mining and quarrying is inadequate as the chapter deals with the appropriateness of those activities in the zones, but does not deal with scale or effects of associated earthworks on natural environment values, and do not distinguish mining from primary production. | Amend GRUZ-R12 to separate mining activities from quarrying activities and make mining a Discretionary activity, and add supporting policy direction to recognise quarrying and mining may not be appropriate where it has adverse effects on indigenous fauna habitat. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | RLZ-R14 | S258.182 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Considers management of mining and quarrying is inadequate as the chapter deals with the appropriateness of those activities in the zones, but does not deal with scale or effects of associated earthworks on natural environment values, and do not distinguish mining from primary production. | Amend RLZ-R14 to separate mining activities from quarrying activities and make mining a Non-complying activity, and add supporting policy direction to recognise quarrying and mining may not be appropriate where it has adverse effects on indigenous fauna habitat. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | FUZ-R9 | S258.183 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Considers management of mining and quarrying is inadequate as the chapter deals with the appropriateness of those activities in the zones, but does not deal with scale or effects of associated earthworks on natural environment values, and do not distinguish mining from primary production. | Amend FUZ-R9 to separate mining activities from quarrying activities and make mining a Non-complying activity, and add supporting policy direction to recognise quarrying and mining may not be appropriate where it has adverse effects on indigenous fauna habitat. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R15 | S258.184 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Considers management of mining and quarrying is inadequate as the chapter deals with the appropriateness of those activities in the zones, but does not deal with scale or | Amend MPZ-R15 to separate mining activities from quarrying activities and make mining a Non-complying activity, and add supporting policy direction to recognise quarrying and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|-----------------------|------------------|---|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | effects of associated earthworks on natural environment values, and do not distinguish mining from primary production. | mining may not be appropriate where it has adverse effects on indigenous fauna habitat. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | New provision request | S258.185 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Considers quarrying and mining are not restricted at all in the zone, which is inappropriate. | Insert a new provision to make quarrying and mining a Prohibited activity in the Natural Open Space Zone. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | New provision request | S258.186 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Considers quarrying and mining are not restricted at all in the zone, which is inappropriate. | Insert a new provision to make quarrying and mining a Non-complying activity in the General Residential Zone. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | New provision request | S258.187 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Considers quarrying and mining are not restricted at all in the zone, which is inappropriate. | Insert a new provision to make quarrying and mining a Non-complying activity in the Settlement Zone. |
| NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone | New provision request | S258.188 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Considers quarrying and mining are not restricted at all in the zone, which is inappropriate. | Insert a new provision to make quarrying and mining a Non-complying activity in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone. |
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | New provision request | S258.189 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Considers quarrying and mining are not restricted at all in the zone, which is inappropriate. | Insert a new provision to make quarrying and mining a Non-complying activity in the Mixed Use Zone. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | New provision request | S258.190 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Considers quarrying and mining are not restricted at all in the zone, which is inappropriate. | Insert a new provision to make quarrying and mining a Non-complying activity in the Town Centre Zone. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | New provision request | S258.191 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Considers quarrying and mining are not restricted at all in the zone, which is inappropriate. | Insert a new provision to make quarrying and mining a Non-complying activity in the General Industrial Zone. |
| OSZ - Open Space Zone | New provision request | S258.192 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Considers quarrying and mining are not restricted at all in the zone, which is inappropriate. | Insert a new provision to make quarrying and mining a Non-complying activity in the Open Space Zone. |
| SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone | New provision request | S258.193 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Considers quarrying and mining are not restricted at all in the zone, which is inappropriate. | Insert a new provision to make quarrying and mining a Non-complying activity in the Sport and Active Recreation Zone. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|---|----------|--|---|
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S258.194 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Amend | Considers the terms "overlays" and "overlay chapters" are used inconsistently, resulting in uncertainty that may affect loss of biodiversity and other values. Supports "overlays" being used to spatially identify values and risks, but considers the guidance on how a proposed activity within an overlay is to be considered is inaccurate (set out in the table under Relationships between spatial layers (page 11 in How the Plan Works)) because the term "overlay rule" is not explained or used elsewhere in the plan. In the situation where specific overlay rules do not apply, considers there may still be Permitted activity standards to be met by the activity within other rules of the same or different chapters. Examples given include NATC, SUB, ECO, SCHED5, CE, GRUZ (Martinborough Soils Overlay), chapters. | Amend the term "overlay chapters" to "district-wide matters chapters". |
| How the Plan Works | Relationships between spatial layers | S258.195 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Amend | Considers the terms "overlays" and "overlay chapters" are used inconsistently, resulting in uncertainty that may affect loss of biodiversity and other values. Supports "overlays" being used to spatially identify values and risks, but considers the guidance on how a proposed activity within an overlay is to be considered is inaccurate (set out in the table under Relationships between spatial layers (page 11 in How the Plan Works)) because the term "overlay rule" is not explained or used elsewhere in the plan. In the situation where specific overlay rules do not apply, considers there may still be Permitted activity standards to be met by the activity within other rules of the same or different chapters. Examples given include NATC, SUB, ECO, SCHED5, CE, GRUZ (Martinborough Soils Overlay), chapters. | Amend 'How the Plan Works' to include a list of all the different overlays in the Plan. |
| Strategic Direction | New provision request | S258.197 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Amend | Regarding NE-O3, considers "Open space" should not be the only place where natural, ecological, and landscape values, and sites of significance to tangata whenua are protected. | Insert new strategic direction objective: NE-OX: Natural Areas Significant natural areas, natural character of the coastal |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | The term "open space" could be interpreted in different ways, i.e. based on zoning or a feeling of openness. | environment and waterbodies, outstanding features and landscape, and sites of significance to tangata whenua are protected.' |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S258.198 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Amend | There is no specific RMA requirement to maintain rural character. As drafted this objective could be read to conflict with protection of S6 matters. Forest & Bird considers this objective needs to be clarified in terms of managing land use activities to maintain rural character. In addition, the definition of rural character needs to include indigenous biodiversity with the rural environment (links to submission point on RE-O4) | Insert a new definition of 'rural character' that includes indigenous biodiversity within the rural environment. |
| Strategic Direction | New provision request | S258.199 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Amend | Considers that Mātatauranga Māori should also be provided for in the plan. | Insert a new strategic direction objective to provide for and incorporate Mātatauranga Māori in decision making under this Plan. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-S2 | S258.200 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | It is not clear if the rule is limited to "solar" this does not ensure protection of areas that may meet significance criteria but are not mapped in the plan. Does not manage adverse effects on indigenous species such as disturbance of birds and bats. Nor would the matters of control enable conditions to be set to manage adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity within the site of the proposal. ENG-R4(2) and ENG-R4(3), the matters of restriction of discretion are inadequate. Solar panels can have an attraction effect on aquatic insects that can and may increase the risk of bird strikes, resulting in a decline in aquatic insects, and as a result a decline in food source for bats and birds. | Amend ENG-S2: ... 3. Solar panels are set back 20m from any waterbodies and screened with vegetation plantings along adjacent boundaries to avoid aquatic insect attraction. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-S3 | S258.201 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | Concerned with the potential for bird and bat strike effects of wind turbines. Birds and bats do not always look ahead when they fly. There are early indications from studies overseas of marine birds, that painting stripes | Amend ENG-S3: ... 4. Within the habitat of bird species of concern for potential bird strike, including the habitat of falcons, |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | on the blades of turbines may help reduce bird strike. Applications should identify where potential at-risk bird species are present within (including above) the site. This should assist in identifying locations within a site away from flight paths and to reduce potential effects on birds. | bitterns, migratory birds and hawks, add stripes on turbines to reduce risk of bird strike. |
| NU - Network Utilities | New provision request | S258.202 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose | The policy direction in NU-P1 fails to consider adverse effects that are to be avoided, remedied, or mitigated under s5 of the Act and as set out in NU-O2 and other chapter provisions in the plan. The directive term "enable" is not generally supported. The only exception may be for the reasonable operation, maintenance and minor upgrade of the national grid but even then in the context of what is "reasonable" must be in the context of avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects. | Insert a policy providing for regionally significant infrastructure and National Grid activities and considering other network utilities, in all cases where adverse effects are appropriately managed in accordance with the district wide matters chapters. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P6 | S258.203 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Forest & Bird is concerned that there is a conflict between NATC-P3 and P4. The word "enabling" is inappropriate. Forest & Bird is concerned that NATC-P6 is inappropriate as it fails to include protection of indigenous biodiversity values in accordance with the ECO provisions. The word "allow" is inappropriate. The rules fail to include adequate matters of discretion. NATC-R2 could potentially permit quarrying or mining as being within the definition of "primary productions" however, those activities are inappropriate within 25m of a significant waterbody. | Amend NATC-P6 to resolve the concerns set out in this submission point. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-R2 | S258.204 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Oppose in part | Forest & Bird is concerned that there is a conflict between NATC-P3 and P4. The word "enabling" is inappropriate. Forest & Bird is concerned that NATC-P6 is inappropriate as it fails to include protection of indigenous biodiversity values in accordance with the ECO provisions. The word "allow" is inappropriate. The rules fail to include adequate matters of discretion. NATC-R2 | Amend NATC-R2 to resolve the concerns set out in this submission point. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | could potentially permit quarrying or mining as being within the definition of "primary productions" however, those activities are inappropriate within 25m of a significant waterbody. | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R12 | S258.205 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc | Support in part | <p>Forest & Bird is concerned with the provision for Conservation Lot(s), allowing additional lots on the basis of protection of SNAs. It is not certain that protection would avoid the fragmentation effects of fencing if the SNA is spread over more than one allotment. Currently this method of protection does not appear to extend beyond SCHED5 areas. Nor is it clear whether other subdivision requirements include assessment of indigenous vegetation against the significance criteria of the RPS. As proposed protection appears limited to SCHED5 areas and subdivision could result in the loss of indigenous biodiversity. Forest and Bird also has concerns with subdivision including additional lot subdivision in the coastal environment which is more vulnerable. Subdivision brings with it significant land use change including the potential for loss and fragmentation of indigenous biodiversity and habitat for indigenous species. This includes from physical changes such as earthworks, vegetation clearance, and the placement of structures/ hard surfaces as well as the disturbance and impacts of people, pets and pests.</p> | <p>Amend SUB-R12 as follows: Insert standards and matters of discretion to assess whether land proposed for subdivision includes areas of vegetation or of habitat value meeting the significance criteria of the RPS. Amend rules to ensure fragmentation of significant natural areas, including new areas not yet in SCHED5, does not occur. Include setbacks from significant natural areas and from wetlands. Include requirements to control/restrict household pets in new subdivisions in the coastal environment</p> |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S237.001 | Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ) | Amend | <p>Consistent with other District Plans, RCNZ is seeking a new rule in the General Rural Zone permitting small-scale rural contractor depots (so is seeking a consequential amendment to Rule GRUZ-R16 so it does not apply to rural contractor depots). To assist with implementation of the proposed new rule, RCNZ seek a definition for "rural contractor depot".</p> | <p>Insert new definition for "Rural contractor depot" as follows: "The land and buildings used for the purpose of storing or maintaining machinery, equipment and associated goods and supplies associated with a rural contracting business that directly supports, services or is dependent on primary</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | production". |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O1 | S237.002 | Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ) | Support | RCNZ supports Objective GRUZ-O1 on the basis that rural contractor depots are an activity that supports primary production and have a functional and operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone. | Retain Objective GRUZ-O1 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O2 | S237.003 | Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ) | Support in part | <p>Objective GRUZ-O2 (d) only refers to "existing rural industry" so does not recognise the possibility of the establishment of "new rural industry" within the General Rural Zone.</p> <p>In addition, the way Objective GRUZ-O2 is worded implies that the only rural industry activities anticipated with the General Rural Zone are "intensive primary production, quarrying activities, and cleanfills" which is incorrect. The Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan definition for "rural industry" refers to the National Planning Standards definition for "rural industry" which is "...an industry or business undertaken in a rural environment that directly supports, services, or is dependent on primary production" so includes a much broader range of activities than "intensive primary production, quarrying activities, and cleanfills". In fact "intensive primary production, quarrying activities, and cleanfills" are distinct activities from rural industry with their own respective rules.</p> | <p>Amend Objective GRUZ-O2 as follows: "The predominant character of the General Rural Zone are maintained and enhanced, which include... ... d. interspersed existing rural industry facilities, associated with the use of land for intensive primary production, quarrying activities, and cleanfills; and ..."</p> |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O4 | S237.004 | Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ) | Support | Supports Objective GRUZ-O4 on the basis that rural contractor depots have a functional and operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone and are compatible with primary production activities. | Retain Objective GRUZ-O4 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O5 | S237.005 | Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ) | Support | Supports GRUZ-O5 on the basis that rural contractor depots are susceptible to reverse sensitivity effects as a result of sensitive activities (e.g. residential dwellings) establishing in close proximity. | Retain Objective GRUZ-O5 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P1 | S237.006 | Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ) | Support | Supports Policy GRUZ-P1 on the basis that rural contractor depots have a functional and operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone and are compatible with primary production activities. | Retain Policy GRUZ-P1 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P2 | S237.007 | Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ) | Support in part | In terms of Policy GRUZ-P2(c), it is not only permitted activities in the General Rural Zone that require protection from reverse sensitivity effects and/or conflict. Some appropriate activities within the General Rural Zone may require resource consent but are still susceptible to reverse sensitivity effects from incompatible activities. | Amend Policy GRUZ-P2 as follows: "Avoid activities and development that: a. are incompatible with the purpose, character, and amenity of the General Rural Zone; b. will result in fragmentation of land and the productive potential of land; or c. will result in reverse sensitivity effects and/or conflict with permitted existing activities in the General Rural Zone including primary production and ancillary activities (and other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone) ". |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P6 | S237.008 | Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ) | Support | Supports Policy GRUZ-P6 on the basis that a rural contractor depot would fall within the ambit of National Planning Standards definition for "rural industry", and it is appropriate to ensure there are adequate separation distances between such activities and sensitive activities. | Retain Policy GRUZ-P6 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R1 | S237.009 | Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ) | Support | Supports that "buildings and structures, including construction, additions, and alterations" are provided for as a permitted activity in the General Rural Zone (subject to compliance with performance standards GRUZ-S1, GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3 and GRUZ-S7). | Retain Rule GRUZ-R1 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R16 | S237.010 | Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ) | Oppose in part | A rural contractor depot would fall within the ambit of the National Planning Standards definition for "rural industry". RCNZ considers it is unreasonably restrictive for a rural contractor depot to be a discretionary activity | Amend the heading of Rule GRUZ-R16 as follows: "GRUZ-R16 - Rural Industry (excluding |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>throughout the General Rural Zone regardless of scale and location.</p> <p>Rural contractors are a long-established essential and appropriate supporting rural service for primary production activities, and rural contractor depots typically establish within rural areas to be in close proximity to their core market of primary production. This reduces travel time and associated costs (and decreases the frequency of the undesirable situation of large agricultural machinery needing to regularly travel through urban areas (e.g. if a rural contractor depot was established within an Industrial Zone within a town)).</p> | rural contractor depots)" |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | New provision request | S237.011 | Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ) | Amend | <p>RCNZ is seeking the inclusion of a new rule permitting small-scale rural contractor depots throughout the General Rural Zone (in recognition of the functional need to locate in proximity to primary production activities as an essential and appropriate supporting rural service). Performance standards are proposed limiting the size of any building to 3000m², the number of staff to 10 and requiring a 50m setback from any side or rear boundary and a 100m setback from any existing residential unit on another property (plus cross-referencing to other relevant performance standards). Given the importance of rural contractor services for the rural sector and the need to locate in rural areas of close proximity to primary production activities, a restricted discretionary activity status is proposed if any of the permitted performance standards cannot be complied with. As a result we are seeking a consequential amendment to GRUZ-R16 (so it does not apply to rural contractor depots). To assist with implementation of the proposed new rules, we are seeking an additional</p> | <p>Insert the following new permitted activity rule in the Rules section of the GRUZ - General Rural Zone chapter:"GRUZ-R13A - Rural Contractor Depots1. Activity status: PermittedWhere:a. Compliance is achieved with:i. GRUZ-S1;ii. GRUZ-S2;iii. GRUZ-S3(a), (c), (d), and (e).iv. GRUZ-S7; andv. GRUZ-S8. b. The rural contractor depot (including associated vehicle access, parking and manoeuvring areas) must not be located within 50m of any side or rear boundary located within 100m of any existing residential unit on another property. c. The gross floor area of any rural contractor depot building does not exceed 3000m²; and d. There are no more than 10 staff.2. Activity Status: Restricted discretionary Where:a. compliance is not achieved with GRUZ-R13A(1).Matters of discretion:1. The effect of non-</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | definition for "rural contractor depot" (in the Definitions section). | compliance with any relevant standard and the matters of discretion of any standard that is not met." |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S3 | S237.012 | Rural Contractors New Zealand Incorporated (RCNZ) | Support in part | RCNZ seek that Standard GRUZ-S3(2) is amended to require the same 100m setback requirement for any new residential unit that establishes in the vicinity of an existing rural contractor depot. | Amend Standard GRUZ-S3(2) as follows: "Residential units must also not be located within: a. 40m of the edge of a plantation forest under separate ownership; b. 300m of a boundary with untreated agricultural effluent disposal areas; c. 300m of an effluent holding pond; and d. 500m of an intensive primary production activity under separate ownership; and e. 100m of a rural contractor depot (including associated vehicle access, parking and manoeuvring areas) under separate ownership." |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-S3 | S259.001 | Russell Hooper | Oppose | Considers the cost of complying with these requirements is significant. Considers there isn't any evidence that reverse sensitivity issues are arising from the use of the State Highway in the Wairarapa. Considers the State Highway Noise Boundary provisions further increase regulation and the cost of housing at a time when housing is already unaffordable. Considers people who live next to a State Highway will expect traffic noise. | Delete NOISE-S3. |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-R13 | S259.002 | Russell Hooper | Oppose | Considers the cost of complying with these requirements is significant. Considers there isn't any evidence that reverse sensitivity issues are arising from the use of the State Highway in the Wairarapa. Considers the State Highway Noise Boundary provisions further increase regulation and the cost of housing at a time when housing is already unaffordable. Considers people who live next to a State Highway will expect traffic noise. | Delete NOISE-R13. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--|---|
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P4 | S259.003 | Russell Hooper | Oppose | Considers the cost of complying with these requirements is significant. Considers there isn't any evidence that reverse sensitivity issues are arising from the use of the State Highway in the Wairarapa. Considers the State Highway Noise Boundary provisions further increase regulation and the cost of housing at a time when housing is already unaffordable. Considers people who live next to a State Highway will expect traffic noise. | Delete NOISE-P4. |
| Planning Maps | General District-Wide Matters | S259.004 | Russell Hooper | Oppose | Considers the cost of complying with these requirements is significant. Considers there isn't any evidence that reverse sensitivity issues are arising from the use of the State Highway in the Wairarapa. Considers the State Highway Noise Boundary provisions further increase regulation and the cost of housing at a time when housing is already unaffordable. Considers people who live next to a State Highway will expect traffic noise. | Amend the planning maps to delete the State Highway Noise Boundary. |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S27.001 | Ryan and Nadine Smock | Oppose | Council stated to the submitters that their home would only be listed if they agreed, and they didn't agree, the listing could very well be an error. Therefore the submitters request the error is rectified and the submitters home removed from the heritage schedule. If the listing is not an error, the submitters oppose their home being listed due to flawed process, restriction of property rights, economic implications, and the heritage value not being great enough to justify listing the building against landowners wishes. | Remove Hs160 from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings and Items |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R3 | S240.001 | Ryan Malone | Oppose in part | Given the concerns raised about the evidential basis for the new liquefaction and earthquake risks assigned to a wide range of Woodside properties (as detailed in submissions from other local residents), it seems prudent that these levels of risks not be assigned at this point until such time as a broader consensus can be reached on the accuracy and interpretation of the data. | Amend Rule NH-R3 to improve the accuracy and interpretation of the data that underpins risk levels assigned to Woodside properties. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|---|------------------|-------------------------|----------------|---|---|
| Planning Maps | Zones | S61.001 | Sally Whitehead | Oppose | Submitter notes residential activities are the predominant usage of the land presently. The size of the existing lots makes commercial farming or other commercial agricultural usage uneconomic. The lots are highly suited for rural lifestyle usage. | Amend Proposed zoning of properties located at Boundary Road, Donald's Road and the lower portion of Ngaumutawa Road from General Rural Zone to Rural Lifestyle Zone. |
| Planning Maps | Hazards and Risks | S69.001 | Sam Edridge | Oppose | Considers the consultation process has been lacking given the potential negative impacts for property owners. Submitter is in an apparent 'moderate' liquefaction zone but have had testing done by a geotechnical engineer showing there is no risk. Considers there is too much doubt with regards to the proposed fault line mapping and it should be verified on ground before being added to the DP. | Delete liquefaction and fault hazard overlays until they have been validated on ground. |
| Designations | SWDC - South Wairarapa District Council | S137.001 | Sarah and John Monaghan | Oppose | The submission raises concerns with the process notification, health risks associated with the new area, property values, and health and safety matters. | Amend the designation SWDC-S-26 (Martinborough Wastewater Plant) to not include Pain Farm. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S216.001 | Sara Hiranni O'Donnell | Oppose | Opposes the District Plan applying to Maori land, and seeks that Maori land is left to Ahii Kii Ora Whanau Patu Trust to administrate. | Amend the District Plan so it does not apply to Maori Land. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-O4 | S35.001 | Scilla Askew | Oppose in part | Character and amenity of Low-Density Residential Precinct does not refer to Featherston; only refers to Greytown and Martinborough. Clarify why Featherston is not listed in the objective and how the heritage value of Featherston will be recognised. | No specific decision requested. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S233.001 | Scott Anstis | Amend | Considers definition is internally inconsistent as the highly productive land shown on the planning maps may be different to what is defined in the NPS-HPL. Notes that it would create ambiguity where land is within the mapped extent of highly productive land but does not meet the NPS-HPL definition. | Delete definition of 'highly productive land' or amend it to align with the definition in the NPS-HPL. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S233.002 | Scott Anstis | Oppose | The submission states the engineering standards should be the same for all Councils in this region. | Amend Council's Engineering Development Standard to be consistent across the region. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O2 | S233.003 | Scott Anstis | Oppose | Considers the objective is too broad and notes not all rural land needs to be protected | Delete RE-O2. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | for productive capacity. Considers areas with low productive capacity do not need to remain available for primary production. Considers this objective is unnecessary given RE-O3. | |
| TR - Transport | TR-S8 | S233.004 | Scott Anstis | Oppose | Considers a 10m minimum distance from the edge of the road carriageway is sufficient and reduces tracking from metal accessways onto public roads. Considers the proposed requirement of 30m is unnecessary and costly. | Amend TR-S8: ... 2. Any vehicle crossing to a sealed road shall be formed, surfaced with concrete, chip seal, or asphaltic concrete, and drained for a minimum distance of 10m 30m from the edge of the road carriageway. ... 4. All crossings to a state highway shall be sealed from the edge of the carriageway for a minimum distance of 10m 30m . |
| TR - Transport | TR-S10 | S233.005 | Scott Anstis | Oppose | Considers a 9m radius plus 6m widening is excessive for a single vehicle crossing. | Amend TR-S10(1) to reduce the 9m radius plus 6m widening required for a single vehicle crossing (Figures TR-7 and TR-8 Low and Moderate Volume Accessways). |
| TR - Transport | | S233.006 | Scott Anstis | Oppose | Notes Transport chapter contains figures and diagrams that are inconsistent with similar diagrams in the Engineering Development Standards (for example, Table TR-5 and Figure TR-3 sight line measurements). Considers all figures and tables should be in one document - either the Plan or the Engineering Development Standards to avoid inconsistencies. | Delete TR tables and figures from the District Plan OR Delete Engineering Development Standards document. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P6 | S233.007 | Scott Anstis | Oppose in part | Considers the policy is too broad, particularly point (a). Supports protection of highly productive land (particularly LUC 1 and 2), but notes there are areas in GRUZ that are not fragmented that are appropriate for small lot subdivision, particularly those areas with low productive capacity. | Delete SUB-P6 or amend to enable small lot subdivision in the General Rural Zone in areas with low productive capacity. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R1 | S233.008 | Scott Anstis | Amend | The submission notes the rule should be reformatted for clarity and provides an example layout. | Amend SUB-R1(2) so numbering is as follows: a. The minimum lot size of any lot created by the boundary adjustment is 0.5ha; and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>i. The boundary adjustment complies with, or does not increase any existing or previously approved non-compliance with: ii. a. SUB-S2 iii. b. SUB-S3...</p> <p>... ix. i. SUB-S10; and</p> <p>b. The boundary adjustment complies with...</p> |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S1 | S233.009 | Scott Anstis | Support in part | Supports minimum lot sizes but does not support average lot size requirements. | Amend SUB-S1 (and SUB-Table 1) to remove average lot size requirements when creating 3 or more lots in a residential zone. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S1 | S233.010 | Scott Anstis | Oppose in part | Does not support lot size standard in the General Rural Zone. Supports protecting highly productive land but considers 40ha minimum lot size is too small for conventional farming but too large for intensive horticultural development and use. Considers there should be more provision for small lot subdivision on land not identified as highly productive. Considers using a 0.5ha minimum lot size with a date provision to limit subdivision of new titles, and setting a minimum lot size for balance lots to protect and maintain rural character and amenity. Considers that enabling some smaller lot subdivision in the rural zone encourages economic and social well-being of rural communities. Considers small lot subdivision is integral to the further development of farms providing capital for the operative farms for development, succession planning, and housing family members while enabling individual family members to have the security of a title without compromising the operation of the farm. | Amend SUB-S1 (and SUB-Table 1) to provide for small lot subdivision in the General Rural Zone via SUB-R2(2). |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R2 | S233.011 | Scott Anstis | Oppose in part | Considers rule should be worded to refer to highly productive land, and only trigger non-complying status where the land is highly productive and does not meet the provisions of the NPS-HPL. | Amend SUB-R2(10): Activity Status: Discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with SUB-S1; and b. The subdivision is directly related |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | to land-based primary production; and c. Evidence is provided that the subdivision will meet clause 3.8 or 3.10 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. Where the subdivision is located on highly productive land, the subdivision shall be directly related to land based primary production and evidence should be provided that the subdivision will meet clause 3.8 or 3.10 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land; or c. Where the subdivision is not located on Highly Productive Land, two additional allotments are created and the balance area remaining from the record of title subject to subdivision is no less than 40ha. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S233.012 | Scott Anstis | Oppose in part | The submission states that Masterton should be included in point (a) given the characteristics of rural zones are the same across all three districts, and therefore the approach should be the same. Notes the exclusion of Masterton from this rule means there is no provision for lots less than 40ha in Masterton. Considers this is overly restrictive and will affect property values for rural ratepayers. | Amend SUB-R4: ... a. The allotment subject to subdivision is located within either the South Wairarapa or Carterton District; ... |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R5 | S233.013 | Scott Anstis | Oppose | Considers the term 'vacant' is not clear regarding point (e). Given the rule addresses surplus residential units, questions whether a lot that contains any building is considered to meet this rule, or whether the term 'vacant' is used in reference to any lot that doesn't contain a residential unit. Considers there should be provision to subdivide an existing | Amend SUB-S5 to enable subdivision of a house from the rest of a farm, and clarify the term 'vacant'. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|--------------------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | house from a farm even if the balance lot is vacant. Notes many farms do not need a house, and subdividing this of releases capital and allows it to be re-invested into the farm. | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R10 | S233.014 | Scott Anstis | Amend | Considers that given appropriate performance standards are met and subject to matters of control, creating new vested roads should be a Controlled activity. | Amend SUB-R10: Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Controlled Matters of discretion -control: |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R12 | S233.015 | Scott Anstis | Oppose in part | Does not support 40ha minimum lot size for subdivision in the coastal environment, and non-complying activity status for not achieving restricted discretionary status. Supports limited small lot subdivision with larger balance lots but with additional matters of consideration around design/development in the coastal environment. Notes the matters of discretion don't recognise the Wairarapa Coastal Strategy or the 'Caring for your Coast' guidelines which are existing non-statutory documents that guide development in the Coastal environment. Alternatively, a Coastal Design Guide should be developed and referenced in this rule. | Amend SUB-R12(1) to allow for small lot subdivision within the Coastal Environment AND Amend SUB-R12(2) to downgrade the non-complying activity status AND Amend the matters of discretion to refer to the Wairarapa Coastal Strategy and the 'Caring for your Coast' guidelines OR Insert a new Coastal Design Guide and amend the matters of discretion to refer to the Coastal Design Guide |
| Appendix 4 - Residential Design Guide | Residential Design Guide | S233.016 | Scott Anstis | Support | The submission supports the multi-unit design guide as it will improve outcomes for multi-unit developments | Retain the Residential Design Guide as notified. |
| Appendix 3 - Centres Design Guide | Centres Design Guide | S233.017 | Scott Anstis | Support | The submission supports the Centres Design Guide as it will improve design outcomes for multi-unit developments | Retain the Centres Design Guide as notified. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S233.018 | Scott Anstis | Amend | Concerned about whether stormwater and wastewater can be adequately disposed of in the identified Rural Lifestyle Zone as there are existing infrastructure capacity issues in this area. Queries whether investigations have been undertaken to ensure sufficient infrastructure capacity is available and seeks clarification around the use of this zone for | Amend the spatial extent of the Rural Lifestyle Zone subject to further infrastructure servicing investigations. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | the Districts. Queries whether the Rural Lifestyle Zone was considered for Carterton and South Wairarapa District. | |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S233.019 | Scott Anstis | Amend | Insert definition for 'planning maps', as it is unclear whether this refers to this District Plan or other planning maps in other statutory and non-statutory documents. | Insert definition for 'planning maps'. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P1 | S255.001 | Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch | Amend | The proposed rules and standards make it harder for people to live in the rural zone, harder for businesses to be established in the rural zone, and harder for alternative means of primary production to be established in the rural zone. Rural areas should foster rural communities, which includes a combination of smaller lot holders, education and business providers, dwellings, as well as larger rural properties. | Amend GRUZ-P1 to provide for the development and cohesion of rural communities, including opportunities for additional housing and employment opportunities in appropriate areas. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R9 | S255.002 | Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch | Support | Intensive farming should come with some applicable controls as a controlled activity. It's redundant to have a culture that talks so actively of climate mitigation, biodiversity restoration and regenerative agriculture to then have resource management instruments not apply any kind of good practice around land management and the impact on soils, waterways and other natural resources that are associated with intensive farming practices. | Amend GRUZ-R9 to make intensive primary production a controlled activity (Inferred the submitter's reference to "intensive farming" relates to "intensive primary production". In this case, the relevant rule is GRUZ-R9 as "intensive primary production" is excluded from GRUZ-R5 (referred to in Original Submission). |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P6 | S255.003 | Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch | Oppose in part | <p>These restrictions are imposed on landowners despite the councils' own advice showing that primary production on properties less than 46 hectares at a minimum should be considered uneconomic.</p> <p>While the councils place much emphasis on preventing fragmentation of primary production land, no focus is placed on the land already fragmented and why this should be subject to the same rural zone standards as viable primary production areas when advice to the councils show that this land is</p> | Amend SUB-P6 so properties less than 40 hectares should retain their ability under the operative district plan to subdivide, and the number of dwellings provided for in the operative district plan, as the analysis provided by the councils' does not support this restriction on smaller rural properties. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | no longer economically viable for primary production. | |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R14 | S255.004 | Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch | Oppose | This activity should be non-complying if within 2km of three or more dwellings given its impact on the quiet enjoyment of others in the area, and discretionary if away from dwellings with clearly defined standards in the plan around hours of operation, frequency, noise, traffic and location set out. It's also a very specific activity to identify in the plan, and non-sensical to allow this as restricted discretionary ahead of other, less invasive and environmentally damaging activities that are treated as discretionary. Motorised outdoor recreation activities are in no way coherent with primary production as the purpose of the general rural zone. | Amend GRUZ-R14 from restricted discretionary to non-complying activity (Inferred submission relates to GRUZ-R14 as discusses "motorised outdoor recreation activities", rather than relating to GRUZ-R13 as referred to Original Submission. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S4 | S255.005 | Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch | Oppose | <p>The existing provisions allow for an additional residential dwelling if on land between 4ha and 100ha, and the submitter can't see the case for why this needs to be so significantly increased. Most properties at 4ha or slightly larger can comfortably have two residential units including on-site services for each property. The new rules proposed will allow for a second dwelling on properties of more than 40ha, however as noted above it is only at this land area that councils consider rural production is economically viable so there is no compelling reason as to why properties over 40ha are considered suitable for a second dwelling, but not those.</p> <p>Given housing shortages across the region (identified by the councils in their s32 report) it is counterintuitive to limit the ability of properties to have additional housing sites, particularly as there is no effect greater than minor on the productive capacity of most land from a second dwelling (and noting the uneconomic nature of sites less than 40ha for primary production).</p> | Amend SUB-R4 to revert to the existing rules allowing a second dwelling on properties of more than 4ha. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>The councils have also not undertaken sufficient analysis of this particular rule to justify the proposed changes, or the need for this to have come into force with immediate effect on notification of the plan. The s32 reports for the rural zone and for subdivision, as well as the consultant report from AgFirst, application to the Environment Court and Environment Court decision itself, are all predominantly focused on the impact of rural small-lot subdivision on primary production and protection of productive land. Additional dwellings are not subdivision. The standards in the operative district plan regarding additional dwellings on rural properties help increase housing stock in a region where there is a shortage, provides desirable rural lifestyle opportunities while minimising the infrastructure demands of establishing new small-lot properties, and helps to maximise the value of rural property with minor impact on the remaining land available for primary production.</p> | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S255.006 | Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch | Oppose | <p>It is counter-intuitive to have a plan which opposes small lots in rural areas, and then to facilitate the smallest lots in rural areas becoming even smaller. This seems to be an arbitrary limitation imposed with no sufficient evidence of why a 3.9ha property should be treated differently to a 4.1ha property; what inherent characteristics related to land use on properties of this scale justify their different treatment; or the many factors that can be in play as to why a slightly larger land area may not be suitable for primary production and a good candidate for subdivision.</p> <p>As a theme of much of this submission, councils should be supporting opportunities for rural community development and establishment of good quality rural housing</p> | Amend SUB-R4 to apply to lots no greater than 10ha. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | options and this is an unnecessary and unreasonable limitation. Given that advice to councils from AgFirst considers properties less than 40ha to be uneconomic for primary production, there is no rationale for why councils are protecting lots sized 4-40ha from further subdivision, but are prepared to allow further subdivision for lots less than 4ha. | |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P4 | S255.007 | Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch | Oppose in part | <p>These restrictions are imposed on landowners despite the councils' own advice showing that primary production on properties less than 46 hectares at a minimum should be considered uneconomic.</p> <p>While the councils place much emphasis on preventing fragmentation of primary production land, no focus is placed on the land already fragmented and why this should be subject to the same rural zone standards as viable primary production areas when advice to the councils show that this land is no longer economically viable for primary production.</p> | Amend GRUZ-P4 so properties less than 40 hectares should retain their ability under the operative district plan, as the analysis provided by the Councils' does not support this restriction on smaller rural properties. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | New provision request | S255.008 | Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch | Amend | The proposed district plan needs to provide a more accessible pathway for other shared community living that doesn't require subdivision or individual ownership models. Responses to housing crisis and need to support access of young people and families to safe, comfortable homes that meet their needs and facilitate community and connection to land and nature shouldn't be an urban paradigm. | Insert in General Rural Zone "eco-village activities" as a discretionary activity with defined standards. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | New provision request | S255.009 | Scott Summerfield and Ross Lynch | Amend | The district plan should provide for, as a controlled activity, hospitality and other secondary commercial businesses associated with primary production and subject to appropriate controls. This might be providing for cellar doors, café and restaurant options, in addition to rural produce and other rural home business options. | Insert in the General Rural Zone for "hospitality and other secondary commercial businesses associated with primary production" as a controlled activity subject to controls. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|---|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Planning Maps | Zones | S246.001 | Shane Gray and David Allen | Oppose in part | Please refer to maps in submission to show area proposed to be rezoned from General Rural Zone, to Industrial Zone. The Industrial Zone will compliment the additional land zoned for Industrial use by the proposed District Plan and squares up the industrial zoning - providing a logical extension of the zone and facilitating additional business activity. The extent of the Waingawa Structure Plan area would be increased to capture this additional area. The submission site is Class 4 land and therefore not defined as highly productive in the NPS-HPL. The NPS-HPL is not an impediment to the requested zoning change. | Amend planning maps to extend Industrial Zoning at Waingawa as per plan attached to submission. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | Appendix GIZ-1 | S246.005 | Shane Gray and David Allen | Support in part | The submitters appreciate the fact that there is rural residential housing along David Lowes Lane and do not intend any access via this road. Instead access to the land will be through Shane Gray's land at 67 Norfolk Road - in line with the access set out in the Waingawa Structure Plan. Although it is noted that 97 Norfolk Road, unless purchased by Shane Gray, would need to access David Lowes Lane | Amend Appendix 1 GIZ-1, inferred that the submitter seeks that the Structure Plan shows no intended access along David Lowes Lane. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | Appendix GIZ-1 | S246.006 | Shane Gray and David Allen | Support in part | The site is relatively well buffered from surrounding use. Norfolk Road and David Lowes Lane buffer the site from properties on the opposite side of these roads. The rear of the four properties fronting Norfolk Road (No's 103, 107, 113, and 125 Norfolk Road) on the western side of David Lowes Lane are buffered by a rural site owned by Kiwi Lumber. To the west is farmland with no dwellings or other sensitive activities. | Amend Appendix 1 GIZ-1, inferred that the submitter seeks 10m planted buffer to the edge of the extended Industrial zone in the Structure Plan. |
| SCHED7 - Schedule of Outstanding Natural Landscape | Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes | S63.001 | Shaun Draper | Oppose in part | The mapping of ONFL9 has included a very large buffer zone that spills over the boundary onto surrounding property. Visually and by perception only, the area known as the three canoes northern most point is some 950 meters from the boundary. Only the canoes | Amend the area of ONFL9 back to the specific visual known as the three canoes or include a smaller buffer zone within only the land titles that the three canoes are on. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|---|------------------|--------------|----------|---|---|
| s and Features | | | | | should be recognized as an ONFL, without such a large buffer zone. | |
| Planning Maps | General District-Wide Matters | S63.002 | Shaun Draper | Oppose | Oppose the mapping of highly productive land and the proposed regulation associated with this. Large portions of this proposal are steep inaccessible bush clad unproductive land. Associated with this is the proposal to limit areas of rural subdivision to be no less than 40 hectares. This proposal would only lead to unforeseen undesirable results for landowners and council alike. | Amend mapping of highly productive land. |
| National Direction Instruments | National policy statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement | S119.001 | simon byrne | Oppose | The Future Development Strategy (FDS) seeks to ensure Masterton has sufficient "plan-enabled" new housing capacity. The Housing and Business Capacity Assessment (HBA) states Masterton needs approximately 8000 new homes over 30 years. Considers that the Plan only enables about half of this. Considers there are errors in the HBA regarding new housing capacity calculations, particularly in Upper Plains Area, Westbush, Chamberlain Road, Lansdowne East and West, and Opaki. Considers housing yield estimated for these areas are not achievable and there is a shortfall. | Submitter requests that Masterton District Council write to the Ministry of the Environment stating the Council have not allowed for sufficient new housing capacity in either the operative or proposed district plan. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S119.002 | simon byrne | Oppose | Opposes proposed GRUZ encompassing the lot at 47 Oak Street Masterton and seeks for it to be changed to GRZ. States that the property is connected to network utilities and would provide for 40 to 80 sections for new housing to help with the housing need as the PDP has not allocated sufficient space for urban growth over the next 30 years. | Amend GRUZ zoning at 47 Oak Street to GRZ. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S119.003 | simon byrne | Oppose | The FUZ located at Chamberlain Road is located on LUC-2. This FUZ should be removed and located elsewhere in areas that have LUC-3 or lower. The FUZ should only be placed on the Chamberlain road development when all LUC-3 or lower land is used first. The new government has plans to only protect | Amend to FUZ zoning at the corner of Chamberlain and Westbush Road to GRUZ. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | LUC-2 land from urban development which reinforces the submitters point. | |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S30.001 | Simon Byrne | Oppose | Considers that the PDP does not provide enough area for housing over the next 30 years. Urges PDP to allocate more space for residential/ urban development. Reconsider expanding the FUZ located at the Westbush development at the end of Chamberlain Road. | Amend zoning surrounding the Masterton Urban area to allow for more housing development. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S4 | S132.001 | Simon Casey | Amend | Considers the 30m distance rule can provide significant restriction and may not be practical on all sites. Factors such as topography, services, privacy, and access may limit available build areas. | Amend GRUZ-S4 to delete the requirement for minor residential units to be located within 30m of the primary dwelling. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O6 | S132.002 | Simon Casey | Oppose | Considers issues around location of commercial business and the need to allow for expansion. Town centres are restricted by land availability and therefore may limit further development of the commercial centres. Considers UFD-06 may prevent commercial area developing outside of the current town centres. | Delete UFD-06. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S60.001 | Simon Coffey | Oppose | Submitter notes that residential activities are the predominant usage of the land in these areas presently. The size of the existing lots makes commercial farming or other commercial agricultural usage uneconomic. The lots are suitable for rural lifestyle use. | Amend proposed zoning of properties located at Boundary Road, Donald's Road and the lower portion of Ngaumutawa Road from General Rural Zone to Rural Lifestyle Zone. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R4 | S207.003 | South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group Incorporated (SWWAG) | Support | Concerns regarding rural land becoming HAIL sites as a result of solar development. Particularly in regard to batteries. Concerns regarding the gross floor area of the solar panels. Concerns regarding the setback from unsealed roads, which results in huge effects. | Amend ENG-R4 so that solar installations are a non-complying activity. |
| ENG - Energy | | S207.004 | South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group Incorporated (SWWAG) | Amend | The introduction of LIM reports will address concerns regarding contamination of groundwater used by people and stock, the composition of soil, proximity to water races, amenity values of tourist destinations, electromagnetic concentrations, earthquake fault lines, and impacts on weather extremes. | Insert provision which requires LIM reports to state that land adjoining electricity substations may be sought by developers of solar farms. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|----------|--|--|
| ENG - Energy | | S207.005 | South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group Incorporated (SWWAG) | Amend | The relief sought will address concerns regarding contamination of groundwater used by people and stock, the composition of soil, proximity to water races, amenity values of tourist destinations, electromagnetic concentrations, earthquake fault lines, and impacts on weather extremes. | Insert provisions which allows councils to have retrospective consideration of solar farm applications. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R4 | S207.006 | South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group Incorporated (SWWAG) | Amend | Concerns regarding access to and disposal of water during the construction and operation of solar farms, and increase in fire risk | No decision requested. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R4 | S207.007 | South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group Incorporated (SWWAG) | Oppose | Concerns regarding the visual impact of solar farms. | Amend ENG-R4 to include a provision requiring emergency and remediation procedures for the visual effects of solar farms |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R4 | S207.008 | South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group Incorporated (SWWAG) | Amend | No reasoning provided. | Amend to include provision that granted resource consent applications for solar farms must remain with the original parties, and can not be transferred to another. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-R4 | S207.009 | South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group Incorporated (SWWAG) | Amend | The costs of such development became evident in the latter part of 2022. | Amend to include a provision which requires solar farm applications to put aside the money required for the disestablishment and disposal of their buildings, structures, and equipment at the end of their stated lifespan, and emergency remediation procedures if required |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | | S207.010 | South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group Incorporated (SWWAG) | Support | Reinforce specification of high value and low lying dairy category pastures as protected soils | Retain provisions relating to the protection of highly productive land (inferred). |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-S6 | S141.001 | Spark, Connexa, One NZ & FortySouth | Amend | Supports a standard requiring new lots in the residential, commercial, mixed use, general industrial and rural zones to connect to a telecommunications network, as this is an essential service. Considers the standard should not be qualified on whether or not telecommunication lines pass within 200m of a site. Considers that there will be an | Amend SUB-S6 in relation to Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, and General Industrial Zone, and Rural Zones: 1. Electricity and telecommunications services shall be provided to the useable area of each new lot where power lines and telecommunications lines pass within 200m of any boundary of any new lot. 2. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>expectation in urban areas to have access to both fixed line and wireless telecommunication networks. Considers it is reasonable to require open access fibre connections to each allotment because of the expensive and disruption to berms, footpaths, trees and other linear network services when laying fibre after development. Considers developers of large subdivisions should be responsible for providing an assessment from the wireless network operator/s to establish what wireless connectivity is available, and should be responsible for providing for a site for a wireless facility in areas where wireless connectivity is difficult or not available. Residents in a new developments will expect to use wireless services in their dwelling, business premises, or outside. Considers rural zone subdivisions should be required to have telecommunication connectivity, either wireless or fixed line. Considers an assessment for how connectivity will be achieved and consultation with telecommunication network utility providers is appropriate.</p> | <p>Telecommunication connection in Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, and General Industrial Zones</p> <p>a. An open access fibre network shall be provided to the useable area of each new lot; and</p> <p>b. Applicant provides an assessment of what and how telecommunications will be provided to each allotment in the subdivision via confirmation in writing from telecommunication network operator/s.</p> <p>i. Contract to construct fibre connections: and</p> <p>ii. If any subdivision in any zone is creating 100 allotments or more shall provide an assessment that sets out the ability i.e., coverage and capacity of the existing mobile/wireless networks to serve the subdivision and potential development capacity. In the situation that the existing wireless networks do not have the capacity to serve the subdivision and potential development, work with the network operators to identify and provide land required to enable the new wireless telecommunications network to serve the subdivision.</p> <p>3. Rural zones telecommunication connection shall be provided to the useable area of each new lot. The applicant shall</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|-------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | | provide an assessment that sets out the ability i.e., coverage and capacity of the existing mobile/wireless networks to serve the subdivision. In the situation that the existing wireless networks do not have the capacity to serve the subdivision, the applicant shall work with the network operators to identify and provide land required to enable the new wireless telecommunications network to serve the subdivision. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S261.001 | Stephen and Judith Brown | Support | <p>278 Ngaumutawa Road, and properties along Ngaumutawa Road, North to West Bush Road, were zoned Mixed Use in the Draft District Plan. The submitter supported this zoning, and does not see any justification for this not being retained.</p> <p>These properties contain a wide variety of uses, including light industrial and commercial. They are located in close proximity to main roads, which can service mixed use development. They are also not connected to reticulated services.</p> <p>It would not negatively affect the character or amenity of the existing environment to change the zoning to Mixed use, as this zoning reflects the activities that already occur within this area.</p> | Amend the zoning at 278 Ngaumutawa Road, and properties along Ngaumutawa Road, North to West Bush Road, from General Rural Zone to Mixed Use Zone. |
| SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies | Significant Waterbodies | S96.001 | Stephen Franks | Oppose | The submission details historical observations and use of this river and seeks clarification on why it has been identified as a significant waterbody. There are some concerns around earthworks, access, and flooding of this river and how the classification may impact the river and adjoining sites. | Delete SW 44 - Cape River from the list of significant water bodies. |
| ENG - Energy | | S278.001 | Steve Hancock | Oppose | Supports the submission made by the South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group (SWWAG). | Amend provisions as requested in the submission by SWWAG (Submission number 207). |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB - Table 1 | S25.001 | Stewart Reid | Oppose | Minimum lot sizes limits ability to subdivide for small - medium size vineyards. Land is already too expensive and this will force prices up further. | Amend SUB-Table 1 to change minimum allotment size of 40 hectares for rural properties to 4 hectares. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-S10 | S151.001 | Storm Robertson | Amend | Currently only rural properties are allowed to install septic tanks. District Plan should adopt the installation of self-storage wastewater on new sections or in a greenfield's development. Later on, the system can be merged into the upgraded existing infrastructure with minimal cost. In the short term the council does not have the cost of wastewater on these sites because that is borne by the developer and the new property owners. | Amend to allow septic tanks systems and alternatives to be used in urban areas. |
| Planning Maps | Hazards and Risks | S71.001 | Stuart Macann | Oppose in part | Submitter states that the incorrect flooding information is having a significant impact on them and their home, as the property has diminished value and is potentially uninsurable. Considers this is not because there is a genuine risk, but rather the flood modelling is out-of-date and does not account for flood diversions and swales. | Delete flood hazard and flood alert maps over 114B Harrison Street East and adjacent properties and replace with up-to-date flood modelling that incorporates the effectiveness of new flood diversion swales. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S203.001 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Support | The submitter supports the definition as it accords with the definition prescribed in the National Planning Standards. | Retain the definition of retirement village as notified |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O2 | S203.002 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Amend | The submitter supports the objective but considers that it could be amended to specifically recognise the strategic importance of retirement villages. | Amend as follows: 1.provides for a variety of housing types, including retirement villages , that respond to a range of community needs, including the growth of ageing populations |
| Strategic Direction | | S203.003 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Support | The submitter supports the balance of the Strategic Direction objectives | Retain the provisions as notified |
| TR - Transport | TR-R5 | S203.004 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Amend | The submission states that it is unclear what is meant by matter (4) in the specified matters of discretion -'strategic frameworks'. | Amend or delete matter (4) of the specified matters of discretion |
| TR - Transport | TR-S16 | S203.005 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Oppose | The submission states that Policy 11 of the National Policy Statement on Urban | Delete standard TR-S16 |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | Development precludes the specification of minimum car parking requirements. The submitter acknowledges that the effects of parking provision remain a valid consideration. | |
| TR - Transport | TR-S23 | S203.006 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Amend | The submitter seeks clarification on how this standard would apply to a retirement village. TR-S23 specifies cycle parking requirements for certain activities. It is assumed that a retirement village would need to provide for cycle parking as per a healthcare facility but this is unclear. | Amend to clarify the applicability of TR-S23 to a retirement village. |
| TR - Transport | TR-O1 | S203.007 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Support | The submitter supports this objective as notified | Support TR-O1. Retain as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P1 | S203.008 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Support | Support TR-P1. | Retain as notified. |
| FC - Financial Contributions | New provision request | S203.009 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Amend | The submitter seeks amendments to recognise the lesser impact of retirement villages. | Amend as follows: 1. Insert specific policy recognition that retirement villages impose a lesser impact on Council reserves and infrastructure. This could be done through the following or equivalent wording: Recognise that the demand for services and reserves associated with retirement villages are expected to be less than those from typical residential development on a per unit basis due to the age and mobility of older residents, onsite amenities, including private reserves, and operational efficiencies. 2. Amend to reflect specific retirement village requirements on a permitted activity basis, to avoid, as far as practicable, a case-by-case assessment. |
| NOISE - Noise | Introduction | S203.010 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Amend | The submitter supports the clarification of activities that are not subject to the District Plan Rules. Matter (g) excludes: The use of generators and mobile equipment for emergency purposes, including testing and maintenance not exceeding 48 hours in duration, where they are operated by emergency services or lifeline utilities. | Amend the exemption, to provide for emergency generators associated with a retirement village or equivalent relief. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | Comprehensive care retirement villages utilise emergency generators to support their care functions including hospital level care. However, the exemption would not cover this scenario, as it is not operated by an emergency service, or lifeline utility. | |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-O2 | S203.011 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Amend | The submitter seeks specific recognition of retirement villages within the General Residential Zone policy framework. This can be achieved through an amendment to GRZ-O2. | Amend the objective as follows: GRZ-O2 Character and amenity values of the General Residential Zone The character and amenity values in the General Residential Zone, including the scale, form, and density of use and development, primarily consists of: 1. a built form comprising a range of residential unit types and sizes, including retirement villages , characterised by predominantly 1-2 story buildings and openness around and between buildings; ... |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | New provision request | S203.012 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Amend | The submitter seeks specific recognition of retirement villages within the General Residential Zone policy framework. The submitter proposes the introduction of a bespoke policy to recognise the specific requirements of retirement villages and to recognise their place as an expected development outcome in the General Residential Zone. | Insert the following policy: Policy GRZ-PX Retirement villages 1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in the General Residential Zone, such as retirement villages. 2. Recognise the particular requirements of retirement villages, including that they; a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services; and b. Have a unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | | requirements of residents as they age. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P2 | S203.013 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Amend | The submitter supports the policy direction but notes that the policy then references the Residential Design Guide. A review of the Residential Design Guide highlights its focus on multi-unit residential housing. Residential design guides are often not appropriate to a retirement village context. | Amend provision so the Residential Design Guide is not applicable to retirement villages |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R11 | S203.014 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Amend | The submitter supports a restricted discretionary activity status for new retirement village development. They consider that the matters of discretion can be further refined and suggests amended wording. The submitter does not support a discretionary activity status for the Low Density Residential Precinct and considers a restricted discretionary activity status across all areas is appropriate. The submitter seeks the introduction of a restriction on notification to provide an appropriate level of certainty in the application of GRZ-R11. | Retain the activity status of Rule GRZ-R11(1) as a restricted discretionary activity. Amend the matters of discretion as follows: 1. The effect of the intensity and scale of the activity, the building design, siting, form, and external appearance is compatible with the planed character and residential amenity for the Zone or precinct. 2. The effect on amenity values of adjoining residential properties and the surrounding neighborhood, including privacy, shading and sense of enclosure. 3. The ability to provide on-site amenity for residents including outdoor living space and landscaping that reflects the nature of and diverse needs of residents of the village. 4. (no change) 5. (no change) 6. The extent of impervious surfaces and landscaping. 7. (no change) 8. The relevant matters contained in the Residential Design Guide. 9. (no change) 3. Amend the activity status of Rule GRZ- |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | | R11 (2) from a discretionary activity to a restricted discretionary activity. ... |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-S6 | S203.015 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Amend | <p>The submitter seeks an exemption to this standard for retirement villages. Retirement villages provide outdoor living space both on a dedicated/unit specific basis and through shared open space. Unit specific outdoor living space will generally be smaller than 20m² at ground level, and communal outdoor living space will be provided through a village and not "in one communally accessible location" as required by the standard.</p> <p>Retirement villages provide a variety of open spaces as an integral part of a village. It is sufficient to consider open space provision as a matter of discretion without reference to a standard that has not been prepared with specific reference to retirement village requirements.</p> | Amend GRZ-S6 by providing an exemption for retirement villages. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-S7 | S203.016 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Amend | <p>The standard limits any area of car parking to no more than 5 contiguous spaces. Retirement villages may include areas of more than 5 contiguous spaces, designed as part of a comprehensive and integrated proposal. The submitter seeks an exemption to this standard for retirement villages, and considers that the matters of discretion proposed will enable appropriate consideration of the internal design and layout of a retirement village, as well as its external effects.</p> | Amend GRZ-S7 by providing an exemption for retirement villages. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-S8 | S203.017 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Amend | <p>The submission discusses that in a retirement village context, the standard will require the proliferation of rainwater tanks for each residential unit, often serving little purpose. Irrigation for landscaping is undertaken on a centralised basis within a retirement village</p> | Amend GRZ-S8 by providing an exemption for retirement villages |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | with residents often maintaining, at best, a small outdoor planting area. | |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | | S203.018 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Support | The submitter is comfortable with the remaining General Residential provisions. | Retain the provisions as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | Precinct 3 | S203.019 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Amend | The submission states that the Precinct 3 provisions were recently introduced through a private plan change. The introductory statement uses the words 'Structure Plan' which is an incorrect reference. In the Operative District Plan, the plan is referenced as an Outline Development Plan. The PDP otherwise references it as an Outline Plan. | Amend as follows: These rules only apply within the Cashmere Oaks Development Precinct as shown on GRZ Schedule 3 Figure 1: Cashmere Oaks Precinct Structure Outline Development Plan. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | Precinct 3 | S203.020 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Amend | The PDP has amendment reference to Outline Development Plan from the ODP, to Outline Plan in the PDP. The submitter considers that the wording from the ODP should be retained. | Amend references to 'Outline Plan' to 'Outline Development Plan' throughout the Precinct 3 provisions. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | PREC3-P1 | S203.021 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Amend | The submission discusses that the PDP has reframed the ODP policy into the Planning Standards format and this is supported. However, the policy heading has added the word subdivision. Subdivision was never controlled by this policy, and nor do the Precinct 3 provisions address subdivision. The title to the policy should therefore be amended. | Amend Policy PREC3-P1 as follows: PREC3-P1 Subdivision and Development in the Cashmere Oaks Development Precinct Provide for the development and operation of a retirement village on the land identified as the Cashmere Oaks Development Precinct in GRZ Schedule 3 Figure 1: Cashmere Oaks Outline Plan, subject to such environmental standards as necessary to avoid, remedy, or mitigate any adverse effects. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | PREC3-R1 | S203.022 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Amend | The PDP has reframed the rule into the Planning Standards format and this is supported. The PDP drafting has however amended the matters of discretion from what is contained in the Operative District Plan. This appears to have been done in an attempt to retain additional operative provisions relating to (a) information requirements, and | 1. Amend the matters of discretion in Rule PREC3-R1 to match those in the Operative District Plan. 2. If necessary, insert the information requirements, and assessment matters from the Operative District Plan in an alternative way. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | (b) assessment criteria. The submitter does not oppose those matters being included in the PDP, but does not support their being merged into the matters of discretion in a manner that was not intended. | |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | PREC1-R1 | S203.023 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Oppose | <p>The submitter discusses that the specific rule in the ODP provides for a retirement village on the land as a restricted discretionary activity subject to standards, or a discretionary activity where applicable standards are not met. This has been correctly transferred into the PDP as rules PREC3-R1(1) and PREC3-R1(2).</p> <p>The PDP has added PREC3- R1(3) which provides for any other activity within the Precinct as a discretionary activity. This was not the position of the ODP, which relied on the underlying zoning for all other activities. There is no reason for the PDP to take a different approach.</p> | <p>Delete Rule PREC3-R1(3):3. Activity status: Discretionary Where:a. The activity is any other activity that is not otherwise listed a Permitted, Controlled, or Restricted Discretionary activity in PREC3 Rules is a Discretionary activity.</p> |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | PREC3-S2 | S203.024 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Oppose | <p>The submission discusses that Standard PREC3-S2(1) does not appear in the Operative District Plan relevant to the retirement village. The standard was for residential development. The effect of the standard as proposed would be to require a retirement village to comply with residential density standards which was never intended.</p> <p>The second strand to the standard was included through the private plan change to prevent residential development without a subdivision occurring.</p> | <p>Delete Standard PREC3-S2(1): PREC3-S2 Maximum density 1. For dwellings associated with a retirement village, the total number of dwellings per site shall be limited to that which enables each dwelling to meet the minimum lot area subdivision requirements for that site under SUB-S1. 2. For dwellings not associated with a retirement village, the total number of dwellings per site is limited to one.</p> |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | Precinct 3 | S203.025 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Support | The submitter supports the balance of the PREC3 provisions as accurately reflecting the equivalent provisions of the Operative District Plan. | Retain the balance of the PREC3 provisions as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|---|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| Planning Maps | Precincts | S203.026 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Amend | The online mapping accompanying the PDP suggests that the Precinct 3 site is within the Highly Productive Land overlay. As a site zoned General Residential Zone, the submitter believes that the overlay does not need to be applied. | Delete the Highly Productive Land overlay from the land identified in Precinct 3. |
| TR - Transport | TR-O2 | S203.027 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Support | The submitter supports the objective as notified. | Retain TR-O2 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-O3 | S203.028 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Support | The submitter supports the objective as notified. | Retain TR-O3 as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P2 | S203.029 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Support | The submitter supports the policy as notified. | Retain TR-P2. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P3 | S203.030 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Support | The submitter supports the policy as notified. | Retain TR-P3. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P4 | S203.031 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Support | The submitter supports the policy as notified. | Retain TR-P4. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P5 | S203.032 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Support | The submitter supports the policy as notified. | Retain TR-P5. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P6 | S203.033 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Support | The submitter supports the policy as notified. | Retain TR-P6. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P7 | S203.034 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited | Support | The submitter supports the policy as notified. | Retain TR-P7. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | | S102.001 | Susan Taylor | Amend | The rohe of Ngai Tumapuhia-a-Rangi is located on the eastern shores of Wairarapa and extends inland to the Maungaraki Range and south to the Awhea River. The traditional rohe is defined by the following boundary markers "Mai i Whareama ki Taueru, whiti atu ki te Taumata o te Hangatu, ahu atu ki te Karaka o Waimatua ki Wainuioru, ahu atu ki te Karaka ki Te Awhea rere atu ki te ngutu awa o Te Awhea, rere atu ma te takutai ki Whareama". There are numerous wāhi tapu and sites of significance within the traditional markers, that should be included on the planning maps. | Amend to include wāhi tapu and sites of significance in the maps. |
| Tangata Whenua | Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi | S102.002 | Susan Taylor | Oppose | Considers the opt-in/opt-out process for the Māori Purpose Zone was contentious, speculative, and unclear as to the involvement of the Māori Land Court (MLC) in | Amend submissions deadline to afford tangata whenua o Wairapapa time to consult wider with their whānau and beneficiaries that reside within and outside of Wairarapa, |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | relation to opting in of all lands under their jurisdiction. Considers that representatives of MLC should have been involved in consultation and needed to seek permission with Māori o Wairarapa. Considers that the Councils breached Te Tiriti (i.e. Article 2 - not enabling tangata whenua to participate in decision making and solely relying on advice of MLC & Article 3 equitable opportunity to opt-in or out of Māori Purpose Zone opposed to determining just the opt-in advice from MLC). | engage with both the Māori Land Court o Takitimu, and the Combined Wairarapa District Council representatives. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-O1 | S169.002 | Suzanne Rauhina Cooper | Support | Supports MPZ-O1. | It is inferred that the submitter supports and wishes to retain MPZ-O1. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | | S169.004 | Suzanne Rauhina Cooper | Amend | This decision is sought based on all owners of whenua maori in Wairarapa being notified. | Amend rules to allow flexibility to opt in/out of MPZ after the completion of the District Plan review. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-O1 | S169.005 | Suzanne Rauhina Cooper | Support | Support provisions SASM-O1. | Retain SASM-O1. |
| Planning Maps | Historical and Cultural Values | S169.006 | Suzanne Rauhina Cooper | Support in part | Provides flexibility to continue to add SASMs as they become available from iwi, hapu, and whanau. | Insert SASMs on Planning Maps and Amend to allow Council flexibility to continue to insert SASMs to the Planning Maps after the District Plan review, as they become available from iwi, hapu, and whanau. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-O2 | S169.007 | Suzanne Rauhina Cooper | Support | Support provisions in SASM-O2. | Retain SASM-O2. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-O3 | S169.008 | Suzanne Rauhina Cooper | Support | Support provisions in SASM-O3. | Retain SASM-O3. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|--|---|
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-O2 | S169.009 | Suzanne Rauhina Cooper | Support | Supports MPZ-O2. | It is inferred that the submitter supports and wishes to retain MPZ-O2. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-O3 | S169.010 | Suzanne Rauhina Cooper | Support | Supports MPZ-O3. | It is inferred that the submitter supports and wishes to retain MPZ-O3. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-O4 | S169.011 | Suzanne Rauhina Cooper | Support | Supports MPZ-O3. | It is inferred that the submitter supports and wishes to retain MPZ-O4. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | | S140.001 | Teoroi Trust | Not Stated | Submitter is aware of and respects archaeological sites on their property, and notes others may yet be identified. Seeks to carry on farming their land, repair and maintenance on roads and fences, and build houses on the surveyed areas without requiring further resource consents. Do not wish to have public access onto private property. Do not wish to have further regulations imposed on them with regard to sites and areas of significance. | No specific decision requested. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S111.001 | Te Pou Herenga o Hiwaru Māori Reserve | Oppose | Considers the opt-in/opt-out process for the Māori Purpose Zone was contentious, speculative, and unclear as to the involvement of the Māori Land Court (MLC) in relation to opting in of all lands under their jurisdiction. Considers that representatives of MLC should have been involved in consultation and needed to seek permission with Māori o Wairarapa. Considers that the Councils breached Te Tiriti (i.e. Article 2 - not enabling tangata whenua to participate in decision making and solely relying on advice of MLC & Article 3 equitable opportunity to opt-in or out of Māori Purpose Zone opposed to determining just the opt-in advice from MLC). | Amend submissions deadline to afford tangata whenua o Wairarapa time to consult wider with their whānau and beneficiaries that reside within and outside of Wairarapa, engage with both the Māori Land Court o Takitimu, and the Combined Wairarapa District Council representatives. |
| Interpretation | Abbreviations | S-7.001 | Test Submitter1 | Support | | hjkjhkhjhkhkhk |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-P2 | S154.001 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Support in part | Considers whānau and hapū should be allowed to live within the means of the whenua and be enabled to build and use off-grid resourcing and waste ecosystems. | Amend MPZ-P2 to enable off-grid servicing. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-S10 | S154.002 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Amend | Considers there may be intergenerational projects and some of these projects and buildings that relocate may not be implemented in one lifetime, therefore the performance bond may not align with these project timelines. | Amend MPZ-S10 to remove the performance bond for a relocatable buildings. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R10 | S154.003 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Amend | Considers working from home should not be regulated by council provisions and there should be flexibility for families. | Amend MPZ-R10: ... b. No more than 50m² of total gross floor area of all buildings on a site is used for the home business; ... c. No more than 2 persons (fulltime equivalent) who reside off the premises may be employed in the activity; ... d. There is no outdoor storage of goods and materials. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R14 | S154.006 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Amend | Considers rural produce area size shouldn't be a mandated by Council and instead should be a decision made by the land owners/users. | Amend MPZ-R14: ... b. The gross floor area is no more than 40m²; ... |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-S7 | S154.007 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Amend | Considers that Tangata Whenua may have Mātauranga Māori solutions that sit outside the standards of Wellington Water Services but are just as valid. | Amend MPZ-S7 to provide for Mātauranga Māori solutions for drinking water supply. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-S8 | S154.008 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Amend | Considers that Tangata Whenua may have Mātauranga Māori solutions that sit outside the standards of Wellington Water Services but are just as valid. | Amend MPZ-S8 to provide for Mātauranga Māori solutions for wastewater disposal. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-S9 | S154.009 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Amend | Considers Tangata Whenua may have Mātauranga Māori solutions that sit outside the standards of Wellington Water Services but are just as valid. | Amend MPZ-S9 to provide for Mātauranga Māori solutions for stormwater management |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S154.010 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Support in part | Notes the property is not Māori land, but was purposed under general title and is unable to | Amend the planning maps to include the property at 291 Waiohine Valley Road in the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | be moved. Plans are in progress to build out papakāinga and implement cultural initiatives for the whānau and uri of the hapū. | Māori Purpose Zone. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-O1 | S154.011 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Support | Considers the objective allows whānau to build appropriately on our whenua as per papakāinga aspirations, rather than per traditional council zones that do not fit the cultural values. | Retain MPZ-O1 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-O2 | S154.012 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Support | Considers Tangata Whenua are the best judge on how to sustain and support Papatūānuku, therefore there should be an understanding that we will do the best for the whenua. | Retain MPZ-O2 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-O3 | S154.013 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Support | Supports the objective. | Retain MPZ-O3 as notified. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-O4 | S154.014 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Support in part | Supports the objective as long as the ahuatanga is kept in mind that how the whenua is used will be in the best interest of Papatūānuku, whānau and the uri of the hapū. | Retain MPZ-O4 |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S154.015 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Support in part | Notes not all hapū are under the iwi banner and can engage in mahi outside of iwi engagement, e.g., Kahukuraawhitia whānau and Hurunui-o-rangi Marae have direct engagement with Carterton District Council. | Amend references to iwi throughout the plan to "whānau, hapū and iwi - Rangitāne o Wairarapa & Kahungunu ki Wairarapa" |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | Introduction | S154.016 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Support | Considers Tangata whenua require sovereignty to share this data how and where they want to - this needs to be done in partnership between Council and whānau, hapū, tangata whenua, not just through engagement. Notes the section also specifies that it is only sites that have been identified which are protected by the provisions of the district plan. Notes there is no qualifier in Section 6(e) for waahi tapu and other taonga to be identified in a document in order to be protected. | Amend SASM - Introduction to replace 'engagement' with ' partnership ' throughout this section, and: Accordingly, it is only those sites that have been identified which are protected by the provisions of the District Plan. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P5 | S154.017 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Amend | The submission states that hapū has see the desecration of our whenua and the loss of our soil and kai sovereignty in locations that have | Amend GRUZ-P5 to require engagement with whānau and hapū for quarrying activities. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|--|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | allowed quarrying as a permitted activity without understanding the full impacts of the location they are sitting on. | |
| Strategic Direction | TW-01 | S154.018 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Amend | Considers whānau and hapū should be included because it is not always iwi that are engaged and can be engaged with directly as a rōpū without going via iwi. | Amend TW-01 to include whānau and hapū. |
| Strategic Direction | TW-02 | S154.019 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Amend | Notes whānau and hapū can be engaged directly and is not necessarily done via the iwi. | Amend TW-02 to include whānau and hapū. |
| Strategic Direction | TW-03 | S154.020 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Support | Considers whānau and hapū should be included because we hold their own tino rangatiratanga. | Amend TW-03 to include whānau and hapū. |
| Strategic Direction | TW-04 | S154.024 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Amend | Considers whānau and hapū hold their own tino rangatiratanga and should not be engaged through the iwi, but via their own engagements. | Amend TW-04 to include whānau and hapū. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S154.025 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Amend | States Te Tiriti o Waitangi is not the same as Treaty of Waitangi and is not interchangeable. Update the plan with the correct terminology as per the requirements. | Amend the full plan and ensure that Te Tiriti o Waitangi or Treaty of Waitangi is used. |
| Tangata Whenua | The Area of Interest | S154.026 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Amend | While this includes our two iwi, this is heavily focused on iwi and not our hapū. Whānau and hapū are the important part of this and should be given the opportunity to tell their story too. | Amend Tangata Whenua Chapter to include hapū that wish to be included. |
| SCHED4 - Schedule of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | S154.027 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Amend | The destruction of wahi tapu sites are ongoing and should be captured in this list. | Amend SCHED4 - Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori to insert the areas of significance for the uri of Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia. |
| SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies | Significant Waterbodies | S154.028 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Amend | All waterbodies should be captured and highlighted as a taonga and tapu to be protected. | Amend SCHED11 - Significant Waterbodies to include all waterbodies for the uri of Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S154.029 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Support in part | Tangata whenua are kaitiaki as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi and hold tino rangatiratanga over taonga. | Amend the plan where it refers to 'engagement' with tangata whenua, and replace this with 'partnership'. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|---|------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|--|---|
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S154.030 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Amend | Submitter maintains tino rangatiratanga over taonga and as mātauranga māori is as equal to science it is vital this is included in our solutions or we only want to address half of a problem. Our intergenerational knowledge is vital to how we fix ongoing crisis' we face. | Amend the plan to add "Tangata Whenua leading mātauranga māori solutions" for any taiao provisions, such as but not limited to climate change, climate resilience, water resilience and other provisions. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | New provision request | S154.031 | Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia | Amend | Indigenous biodiversity needs to be lead by indigenous people who hold intergenerational knowledge about taonga. | Amend ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter so Tangata Whenua lead this kaupapa. |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S7.001 | The Gold Vault LtdLynnette McManaway | Oppose | The St Andrews church was moved from original site in Whanganui. Only original buildings should be included in heritage schedule. | Delete Hs167 (Former St Andrews Church) from SCHED1 Heritage Buildings and Items |
| SCHED1 - Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Items | Heritage Buildings and Items | S7.002 | The Gold Vault LtdLynnette McManaway | Oppose | Only original buildings should be included in the heritage schedule | Delete buildings that have been relocated from elsewhere from SCHED1 Heritage Buildings and Items |
| SCHED7 - Schedule of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features | Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes | S146.001 | Timothy Paul Druzianic | Oppose in part | Opposes specific provisions of Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes as they relate to the property at 765 Haurangi Road (ONFL14 Ruakokoputuna). However, considers it appropriate that the Patuna Chasm is included. | Amend Schedule 7 (and maps) to exclude 765 Haurangi Road from the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay (ONFL14 Ruakokoputuna) |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-P8 | S177.001 | Tim Williams | Oppose | Considers activities should be permitted where compliance is achieved with the noise rules. | No specific decision requested. |
| NOISE - Noise | Introduction | S10.001 | Toby Mills | Oppose in part | The Proposed District Plan will increase the complexity of noise management. The Operative Plan's noise section was easy to understand and relatively inexpensive for someone to determine compliance of any noise source. The Proposed Plan increases the noise section from 6 pages to 29 pages and introduces many complex rules, exceptions and discretions. Submitter has | Amend Noise chapter to simplify its contents. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|------------|----------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>concerns regarding how councils will be able to ensure compliance as the new rules require a significant degree of knowledge on noise measurement.</p> | |
| NOISE - Noise | NOISE-S1 | S10.002 | Toby Mills | Oppose | <p>Given noise is measured in a logarithmic scale, a reduction in 5dB(A) from 55dBA to 50dBA is essentially a 10 times lowering of the threshold for noise. Submitter considers the standard is impractical and unworkable. It will make the process of determining compliance vastly more complex and expensive. It is impossible to determine measured compliance via the previous method of measuring at a boundary, because there is usually no way of gaining access to private property to conduct a proper measurement exercise. This new standard will make nuisance complaints easier and more damaging, creating large amounts of new work for companies engaged in providing noise reports.</p> | Delete Standard NOISE-S1. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | |
| NH - Natural Hazards | Introduction | S90.001 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Support in part | <p>Liquefaction does not pose serious threat to life safety but can severely affect the structural integrity and liveability of properties, as was seen in the aftermath of the 2010 and 2011 Canterbury earthquake sequence. Liquefaction should therefore be considered a moderate hazard risk. Liquefaction is a widespread risk in the Wairarapa, as demonstrated in Appendix 1. Considers the format in the draft district plan for including fault hazards within the risk categorisation table to be preferable to the system in the Proposed district plan. Removing fault hazard from this table creates confusion on the status of fault hazard areas within the plan, and is not reflected in other parts of the plan, for example NH-R3 makes reference to low and medium fault hazard zones.</p> | <p>Amend Table NH-1 to add the following (please refer to original submission for table layout):</p> <p>High hazard area Flood hazard - river corridors. Fault avoidance area - higher recurrence interval faults (≤3500 years).</p> <p>Moderate hazard area Flood hazard - overland flow path. Possible liquefaction-prone area. Fault avoidance area - lower recurrence interval faults (≥3500 years).</p> <p>Low hazard area. Flood hazard - ponding. Possible liquefaction prone area.</p> |
| NH - Natural Hazards | | S90.002 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Oppose in part | <p>The categorisation of active fault hazard is not consistent with Ministry for the Environment's 2003 guidance for development of land on or close to active faults.</p> <p>The fault hazard areas in the proposed district</p> | <p>Amend the fault hazard overlays to be fault avoidance zones, in line with the guidance for planning in fault zones, and include degrees of complexity in fault zones (e.g. well defined, distributed, and uncertain fault sections), and the differing hazards associated with these</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | plan maps include sections of differing widths, suggesting that the complexity of the fault rupture (e.g. well defined, distributed, and uncertain fault sections) is being taken into account in the mapping of the faults, but these categorisations should be provided in the text of the plan, along with the associated hazard risk. | categories, if this information is available. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | | S90.003 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Support in part | Submitter supports the use of a preliminary zone controlling building and development in areas which may be at risk from coastal hazards in the absence of adequate coastal hazard modelling. However, submitter considers that this layer should be more explicitly hazard related to avoid confusion as to the reason for the restriction. It is unclear from the Proposed Plan and the S32 report whether the Foreshore Protection Area is solely related to coastal hazard risk or controls for other matters. Submitter suggests renaming the overlay to Coastal Hazards Area if it is solely related to coastal hazard risk, or to create a separate Coastal Hazard Area if not. | Amend (rename) 'Foreshore Protection Area' to 'Coastal Hazards Area' if the layer solely relates to risk from coastal hazards. If it relates to other matters, for example biodiversity or ecological concerns, create a new, separate Coastal Hazard Overlay. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-O1 | S90.004 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Support in part | Supports the objective of not increasing the risk and consequences from natural hazards on people, property, infrastructure and the environment, but considers it appropriate to include encouraging reduction of risk from natural hazards. | Amend NH-O1 to read as follows: "The risk and consequences from natural hazards on people, property, infrastructure, and the environment are reduced or not increased. " |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P1 | S90.005 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Support | Support accurate and up to date identification and mapping of natural hazards and a risk based approach to risk management of subdivision, use and development. | Retain NH-P1 as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | CCR-O3 | S90.006 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Support | Supports the objective of developing the Wairarapa in a way that does not increase the risk and consequences of natural hazards. | Retain CCR-O3 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P2 | S90.007 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Support | Supports avoiding hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities within high hazard areas. | Retain NH-P2 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|----------|---|---|
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P3 | S90.008 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Support | Supports avoiding hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities within moderate hazard areas except where there is demonstrable evidence that natural hazard risk is minimised, evacuation routes are safeguarded, and the risk to adjacent properties and people is not increased. | Retain NH-P3 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P4 | S90.009 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Support | Support allowing for hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities in low hazard areas provided that there is demonstrable evidence that natural hazard risk is low, and the risk to adjacent properties and people is not increased. | Retain NH-P4 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P6 | S90.010 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Amend | Unimpeded overland flow paths are important in allowing floodwater to escape and recede. Allowing a path for development within overland flow paths puts more people at risk from flood hazard and may worsen the effects of flooding in the surrounding area. It is appropriate to avoid new buildings within overland flow paths unless a functional or operational need for them to be there. Increase of risk from flood hazard within flood alert areas as a result of new building and development is unacceptable. | Amend NH-P6 to read as follows: Amend to: " Discourage new buildings in flood hazard - overland flow path and ponding areas unless: ...3. the activity incorporates mitigation measures so that the risk of damage to buildings and structures is not significantly increased; and..." and Add new section to NH-P6: Avoid new buildings in flood hazard-overland flow path areas unless: 1. There is a functional or operational need for the building to be located there. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P7 | S90.011 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Oppose | Opposed to allowing a path for development of new buildings within fault hazard areas. MfE's 2003 guidance for development of land on or close to active faults specifies that 20m either side of a fault trace, including any areas of diffuse or distributed fault rupture zones is likely to be an area of intense deformation. Considers that habitable buildings should not be allowed within the Fault Hazard Areas. While life safety risk may be able to be | Amend NH-P7 to read as follows: " For Avoid new buildings and structures that contain habitable rooms and are located within fault hazard areas as shown on the District Planning Maps: 1. Allow buildings and structures to locate within Fault Hazard Area where it can be demonstrated that the fault hazard risk can be avoided or mitigated to prevent |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | minimized in certain types of building, the deformation and building damage within 20m of a fault rupture is not able to be mitigated by engineering solutions or means other than locating buildings outside of this zone. | loss of life. 2. Avoid buildings and structures locating within the Fault Hazard Area where the risk to life can not be avoided or mitigated via distance from the fault, building engineering solutions, or other means. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P8 | S90.012 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Support | Supports allowing for hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities in low hazard areas, provided that it has a functional or operational need for the location, is designed to retain functionality during and after a natural hazard event, and the risk to surrounding properties, activities and people is not increased. | Retain NH-P8 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P11 | S90.013 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Support | Supports a precautionary approach to managing risk from hazards. | Retain NH-P11 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P12 | S90.014 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Support | Support avoiding locating hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities within flood alert areas except where there is demonstrable evidence that the natural hazard risk is minimised, evacuation routes are safeguarded, and the risk to adjacent properties and people is not increased. | Retain NH-P12 as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P13 | S90.015 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Support in part | Any increase of risk from flood hazard within flood alert areas as a result of new building and development is unacceptable. additionally wat constitutes a significant increase in risk is not defined and is open to interpretation. | Amend NH-P13: Discourage new buildings in flood alert areas unless:... 3. the activity incorporates mitigation measures so that the risk of damage to buildings and structures is not significantly increased. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R3 | S90.016 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Amend | Considers that hazard sensitive activities should have at a minimum 'restricted discretionary activity status' within possible liquefaction prone areas. Liquefaction does not pose serious threat to life safety but can severely affect the structural integrity and livability of properties, as was seen in the aftermath of the 2010 and 2011 Canterbury | Amend NH-R3 as follows: ... Permitted where the activity or building is located within the possible liquefaction prone area. Restricted discretionary where: a. Any building located in a flood hazard overlay has a finished floor level above |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | earthquake sequence. Liquefaction should therefore be considered a moderate hazard risk, and potentially hazard sensitive activities should be restricted discretionary within these areas at minimum. | the 1% AEP level; or b. Any building is located within the possible liquefaction prone area; and... " |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R4 | S90.017 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Amend | Hazard sensitive activities should have restricted discretionary activity status at minimum, within possible liquefaction prone areas, for the reasons mentioned in previous submission points in relation to liquefaction and overland flow paths. | Amend NH-R4 to: Additions to buildings within all hazard areas Permitted where: a. the building addition is located within the possible liquefaction prone area; or... c. Any building additions located in the identified overland flow path or ponding area of the flood hazard overlay have a finished floor level above the 1% AEP level. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R6 | S90.018 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Oppose in part | Should not allow a path for development in fault hazard areas. Refer to MfE's 2003 guidance for development of land on or close to active faults, stating 20m either side of a fault trace is likely to be an area of intense deformation. The deformation and building damage within 20m of a fault rupture is not able to be mitigated by engineering solutions or means other than locating buildings outside this zone. If buildings are proposed within this Fault Hazard Area, a report by a suitably qualified professional should be provided to demonstrate the building platform is at least 20m away from the fault. | Amend NH-R6: 1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Discretionary where: ... b. The subject site is located fully or partially within the Fault Hazard Area; and c. A technical report by a suitably qualified professional is provided demonstrating that the building is at least 20m away from the identified fault trace. Consequential amendment: Non-compliance with the above standard (c) should be a Non-complying activity. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R7 | S90.019 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Support | Support Restricted Discretionary activity status for hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities within flood alert areas, except when there is evidence the risk is minimised, evacuation routes safeguarded | Retain NH-R7 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | and risk to adjacent properties and people is not increased. | |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R8 | S90.020 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Support in part | Support Restricted Discretionary activity status for infrastructure within low hazard areas, noting that we consider liquefaction risk should be upgraded to moderate. We support Discretionary activity status for infrastructure within moderate hazard areas. | Retain NH-R8 as notified IF liquefaction risk is upgraded to moderate status (see earlier submission point). |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R9 | S90.021 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Support in part | Support Discretionary activity status for hazard sensitive and buildings within moderate hazard areas and low hazard areas noting that we consider liquefaction risk should be upgraded to moderate. | Retain NH-R9 as notified IF liquefaction risk is upgraded to moderate status (see earlier submission point). |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R10 | S90.022 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Support | Support non-complying status for hazard sensitive activities and buildings within high hazard areas. | Retain NH-R10 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O1 | S90.023 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Support in part | The phrase "respond to risks" is not specific and can be open to interpretation. | Amend SUB-O1 as follows: Subdivision and developments create allotments and patterns of land use and development that: ...f. responds to avoid or minimise where appropriate the risks of natural hazards, and is are resilient to climate change. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P4 | S90.024 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Amend | Support the management and restriction of subdivision within areas at risk from natural hazards. However, the term "significant" is not defined and will be open to interpretation. | Amend SUB-P4 to either remove the term "significant" or, include a definition of the level or risk deemed significant by the District Council. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R6 | S90.025 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Oppose in part | Controlled activity status is not restrictive enough for subdivision in low hazard areas - as these areas include risk from flood ponding and liquefaction which should be classed as a moderate hazard as it can pose serious threat to structural integrity and livability of properties (as mentioned in previous submission points). | Amend SUB-R6 to: "Subdivision of land within or partially within hazard areas. 1. Activity status Controlled Restricted Discretionary where a building platform is located in a low hazard area..." |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R12 | S90.026 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Support | Supports a non-complying activity status for subdivision within the Foreshore Protection Area. | Retain SUB-R12 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---|---|
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P4 | S90.027 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Support in part | Supports the policy that activities and subdivision do not increase the risk and consequences from coastal hazards on people, property, infrastructure and the environment, but considers it appropriate to include encouraging reduction of risk from natural hazards. | Amend CE-P4 to: Manage subdivision, use, and development within the coastal environment to ensure:... x. ensuring that the location, design and scale of structures, buildings, and activities avoid or mitigate risks to people and property from coastal hazards and that the risk to other people, properties, and activities is reduced or not increased . |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O3 | S90.028 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Support in part | Supports the objective of not increasing the risk and consequences from coastal hazards on people, property, infrastructure and the environment, considers it appropriate to include encouraging reduction of risk from natural hazards. | Amend CE-O3 as follows: The risk and consequences from coastal hazards including the impacts of sea level rise on people, property, infrastructure, and the environment are reduced or not increased . |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P5 | S90.029 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Support | Support taking a precautionary approach to the risks from coastal hazards, and avoidance of new residential units within the foreshore protection area. | Retain CE-P5 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P8 | S90.030 | Toka Tū Ake EQC | Support in part | Support precautionary approach to new subdivision, use and development in areas which may be at risk from coastal hazards but where there is inadequate knowledge or modelling of coastal hazard processes. The foreshore protection area should be more explicitly hazard related to avoid confusion as to the reason for the restriction. It is unclear from the Proposed Plan and the s32 report whether the foreshore protection area is solely related to coastal hazard risk or controls for other matters. | Amend CE-P8 as follows: Rename Foreshore Protection Area to Coastal Hazards Area if the layer solely relates to risk from coastal hazards. If it relates to other matters, for example biodiversity or ecological concerns, create a new, separate Coastal Hazard Overlay. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P1 | S55.001 | Toni Demetriou | Oppose | If included, this policy, with mapped Woodside Fault Line and Liquefaction risk areas, will have detrimental impact on development potential of the submitters property. | Amend NH-P1 and Fault Mapping to be consistent with the data provided in the submitter supporting docs, named: ' <i>Active Fault Mapping for the South Wairarapa, Carterton, and Masterton Districts - GNS Science Consultancy Report 2021/117, October 2022</i> '. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|-------------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|--|--|
| SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies | Significant Waterbodies | S260.001 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | These streams are major tributaries to the Waipoua River. | Amend SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies to include: Mikimiki Stream |
| SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies | Significant Waterbodies | S260.002 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | Stream is a major tributary to the Waipoua River. | Amend SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies to include: Wakamoekau Stream in the Matahiwi Valley. |
| SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies | Significant Waterbodies | S260.003 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | Creek is a major tributary to the Waingawa River. It originates on Mount Dagg and drains the Falloon Settlement Road area. | Amend SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies as follows: Black Creek |
| SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies | Significant Waterbodies | S260.004 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | Serpentine Stream at Kaituna draining the large area north and east of Burnetts Road and joining the Makakaweka at the Mokonui fault near Tararua Drive. | Amend SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies to include: Serpentine Stream |
| SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies | Significant Waterbodies | S260.005 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | These streams are all tributaries to the Ruamahanga River. | Amend SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies to include: Lansdowne Stream |
| SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies | Significant Waterbodies | S260.006 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies attributes values to each of the listed waterbodies such as biodiversity, ecological, natural character or amenity values, recreational, public access, scenic or amenity values, cultural and heritage values and water quality values. Only the Waingawa and Ruamahanga Awa are assigned all of the values listed. The value allocation to the remaining 21 and omitted 15 waterbodies needs addressing further. Most of the "unvalued" Awa drain into the Ruamahanga, | Amend SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies to apply values where applicable such as "Biodiversity, Ecological and/or Natural Character values", "Recreational, Public Access, Scenic, and/or Amenity Values", Cultural and Heritage Values", and "Water Quality Values" all waterbodies, including those recommended for inclusion in previous submission points. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | had pre-European Kainga sites, and are or have been home to some 50 species of fish and invertebrates. They all have values to be recorded such as ecological, water quality, biodiversity, heritage, cultural, public access and amenity values. Māori treated these waterbodies as Taonga and highly valued everything they provided. Those allocating values need to take advice from historians, Iwi, Hapū, ecologists, hydrologists, botanists, freshwater zoologists before allocating or not allocating the values in question. These values not being attributed to all other significant waterbodies shows that the progressive, historical downgrading, neglect, and actual degradation and destruction is because those in charge and appointed as guardians of our Whenua believe the ancient Awa are unworthy, useless stormwater drains. In the case of property development and expansion some ameliorating process can be found to minimise the damage to local Awa. | |
| Planning Maps | Natural Environment Values | S260.007 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | The ArcGIS map associated with the draft plan only shows 4 of the "significant water bodies" in blue, the Waingawa, Waipoua, Ruamahanga and a small part of the Makakaweka from Norman's Road to the Railway line only). The Awa names should be added to the map viewer. Perhaps the Tuna Highway map of town Awa could be overlaid on the map viewer, or the Tuna Highway map could be annexed to the plan as SCHED12. | Amend the Significant Waterbodies overlay on the planning maps to include all significant waterbodies and their names. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | New provision request | S260.008 | Tony Garstang | Amend | The plan should encourage riparian planting beside the Awa recognising that it helps lower water temperature and raises oxygen content for the aquatic life. Birdlife is attracted and the Awa could recover their pre-European persona and amenity value. | Insert a new provision to encourage planting beside local rivers and waterbodies to improve the ecosystem and the health of the waterbodies and their fauna, recovering them to their pre-European state. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous | New provision request | S260.009 | Tony Garstang | Support | The Proposed District Plan should include a new provision to encourage the natural meandering of all local Awa where possible without blocking fences (as done to | Insert a new provision into ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter to encourage the natural meandering character |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Biodiversity | | | | | Makakaweka in the Poplars subdivision at Ngaumutawa, dams, barriers, or piping which would impede fish migration up and downstream. | of the local Awa. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S260.010 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | The awa should have their te reo Māori names back, just as we have recovered for the original names for some of the Tararua Maunga - Mount Jumbo now Pukeahurangi and Castlepoint now Rangiwakaoma (the place where the sky runs). Awa should not be treated as stormwater drains but as dynamic living parts of our Mountains to the River landscape, precious Taonga, and home to a host of living revered creatures. | Amend the names of Awa and change back to their original te reo Māori names throughout the Plan. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | New provision request | S260.011 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | Dams, barriers and piping can impede fish navigation up and down stream. | Insert a provision in the ECO-Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter that requires that local awa not be piped, diverted, blocked, nor fenced across the watercourse. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | New provision request | S260.012 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | Considers the regional council is not undertaking this work. | Insert a provision in the ECO-Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter to require Council to monitor Significant Bodies of Water for pollution, chemicals, flow rate, temperature, unauthorised tampering, and livestock incursions. |
| SUB - Subdivision | New provision request | S260.013 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | When considering subdivision applications, the awa should not be altered or polluted in any way. Even bulldozed spoil in streams can kill aquatic life with stream turbidity. If a developer cannot subdivide land because a significant waterbody is stopping it, then the awa should take precedence over developer profits. | Insert a new provision in SUB - Subdivision chapter to require that subdivisions do not alter or disturb rivers in any way. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | New provision request | S260.014 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | No specific reasoning | Amend ECO chapter to prohibit building structures over significant bodies of water. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------------------|------------------|---------------|----------|---|--|
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | New provision request | S260.015 | Tony Garstang | Amend | Submitter states that the Plan should acknowledge that even small Awa need to allow for migratory fish passage. Herbicide use on waterweed should be carefully monitored to protect aquatic life in the Awa. Private land owners wanting to spray herbicide on vegetation on or beside Awa should be required to first obtain Council Permission. | Insert a new provision in the ECO-Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter to require monitoring of herbicide and chemical use in proximity to or in Significant Waterbodies |
| Planning Maps | Natural Environment Values | S260.016 | Tony Garstang | Amend | The Plan should show in its maps the positions of the 3 major fault lines: Masterton, Mokonui, and Wairarapa. The names and positions of the Council reserves where Awa pass through should be shown in the Plan with names of the reserves on signage in situ. Some reserves where this would be helpful include: Coddington Reserve, Tulloch Reserve, Landsdowne Trails, Manuka Reserve, Millenium Reserve, Henley Lake, Burling Park, Douglas Park, Sussex Street Pedestrian Crossing, The crossing between Sussex and Cole Streets, Garlands Bush, the new Poplars Makakaweka Reserve, and Waipoua River Trail. | Amend Planning maps to include the names and positions of the Council Reserves where Awa pass through. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | New provision request | S260.017 | Tony Garstang | Amend | The Plan should extend Awa protection to all Zones including residential, rural, commercial, industrial, open space, and special purpose zones. Much recent modification has been done in the industrial Ngaumutawa area. | Insert new provisions in the General Residential Zone to protect rivers. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S260.018 | Tony Garstang | Amend | The Plan should incorporate a whole new chapter on the Awa network. This would fit with Council's obligation to keep the community informed. This aspect of public education could extend to signage to show the existence of the Awa passing under the roads and through reserves. Submitter undertook a series of Waiwaka Stream public walks in 2019 and 2020. Perhaps the MD could expand on this with guided bus tours around the public viewing points, schools, reserves, and parks shown on the Tuna Highway Map. | Insert new provision on the Awa network. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|-------------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|---|
| SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies | Significant Waterbodies | S260.019 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | These streams are major tributaries to the Waipoua River. | Amend SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies to include: Kiriwhakapapa Stream |
| SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies | Significant Waterbodies | S260.020 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | These streams are major tributaries to the Waipoua River. | Amend SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies to include: Te Mara Stream |
| SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies | Significant Waterbodies | S260.021 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | Tributary of the Ruamahanga River | Amend SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies to include: Opaki Stream |
| SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies | Significant Waterbodies | S260.022 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | Tributary of the Ruamahanga River | Amend SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies to include: Te Ore Ore Stream |
| SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies | Significant Waterbodies | S260.023 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | Tributary of the Ruamahanga River | Amend SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies to include: Awatakouru Stream |
| SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies | Significant Waterbodies | S260.024 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | Tributary of the Ruamahanga River | Amend SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies to include: Mangatepuku Stream |
| SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies | Significant Waterbodies | S260.025 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | Tributary of the Ruamahanga River | Amend SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies to include: Waimateatea Stream |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|-------------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|--|
| SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies | Significant Waterbodies | S260.026 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | Tributary of the Ruamahanga River | Amend SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies to include: Kiripuni Stream |
| SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies | Significant Waterbodies | S260.027 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | Tributary of the Ruamahanga River | Amend SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies to include: Fleet Street Stream |
| SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies | Significant Waterbodies | S260.028 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | Tributary of the Ruamahanga River | Amend SCHED11 - Schedule of Significant Waterbodies to include: Solway Stream |
| Planning Maps | Hazards and Risks | S260.029 | Tony Garstang | Support in part | The Plan should show in its maps the positions of the 3 major fault lines: Masterton, Mokonui, and Wairarapa. | Amend the planning maps to show the positions of the 3 major fault lines: Masterton, Mokonui, and Wairarapa. |
| SETZ - Settlement Zone | New provision request | S260.030 | Tony Garstang | Amend | The Plan should extend Awa protection to all Zones including residential, rural, commercial, industrial, open space, and special purpose zones. Much recent modification has been done in the industrial Ngaumutawa area. | Insert provisions into the Settlement Zone to protect rivers. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | New provision request | S260.031 | Tony Garstang | Amend | The Plan should extend Awa protection to all Zones including residential, rural, commercial, industrial, open space, and special purpose zones. Much recent modification has been done in the industrial Ngaumutawa area. | Insert provisions in the General Rural Zone to protect rivers. |
| RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone | New provision request | S260.032 | Tony Garstang | Amend | The Plan should extend Awa protection to all Zones including residential, rural, commercial, industrial, open space, and special purpose zones. Much recent modification has been done in the industrial Ngaumutawa area. | Insert provisions in the Rural Lifestyle Zone to protect rivers. |
| NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone | New provision request | S260.033 | Tony Garstang | Amend | The Plan should extend Awa protection to all Zones including residential, rural, commercial, industrial, open space, and special purpose zones. Much recent modification has been done in the industrial Ngaumutawa area. | Insert provisions in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone to protect rivers. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|-----------------------|------------------|---------------|----------|---|--|
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | New provision request | S260.034 | Tony Garstang | Amend | The Plan should extend Awa protection to all Zones including residential, rural, commercial, industrial, open space, and special purpose zones. Much recent modification has been done in the industrial Ngaumutawa area. | Insert provisions in the Mixed Use Zone to protect rivers. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | New provision request | S260.035 | Tony Garstang | Amend | The Plan should extend Awa protection to all Zones including residential, rural, commercial, industrial, open space, and special purpose zones. Much recent modification has been done in the industrial Ngaumutawa area. | Insert provisions in the Town Centre Zone to protect rivers |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | New provision request | S260.036 | Tony Garstang | Amend | The Plan should extend Awa protection to all Zones including residential, rural, commercial, industrial, open space, and special purpose zones. Much recent modification has been done in the industrial Ngaumutawa area. | Insert provisions in the General Industrial Zone to protect rivers. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | New provision request | S260.037 | Tony Garstang | Amend | The Plan should extend Awa protection to all Zones including residential, rural, commercial, industrial, open space, and special purpose zones. Much recent modification has been done in the industrial Ngaumutawa area. | Insert provisions in the Natural Open Space Zone to protect rivers. |
| OSZ - Open Space Zone | New provision request | S260.038 | Tony Garstang | Amend | The Plan should extend Awa protection to all Zones including residential, rural, commercial, industrial, open space, and special purpose zones. Much recent modification has been done in the industrial Ngaumutawa area. | Insert provisions in the Open Space Zone to protect rivers |
| SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone | New provision request | S260.039 | Tony Garstang | Amend | The Plan should extend Awa protection to all Zones including residential, rural, commercial, industrial, open space, and special purpose zones. Much recent modification has been done in the industrial Ngaumutawa area. | Insert provisions in the Sport and Active Recreation Zone to protect rivers. |
| FUZ - Future Urban Zone | New provision request | S260.040 | Tony Garstang | Amend | The Plan should extend Awa protection to all Zones including residential, rural, commercial, industrial, open space, and special purpose zones. Much recent modification has been done in the industrial Ngaumutawa area. | Insert provisions in the Future Urban Zone to protect rivers. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | New provision request | S260.041 | Tony Garstang | Amend | The Plan should extend Awa protection to all Zones including residential, rural, commercial, industrial, open space, and special purpose zones. Much recent modification has been done in the industrial Ngaumutawa area. | Insert provisions in the Maori Purpose Zone to protect rivers. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|---------------|------------|--|--|
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | New provision request | S260.042 | Tony Garstang | Amend | Plan should acknowledge even small rivers need to allow for migratory fish passage. | Insert provisions in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter to acknowledge fish passage in all rivers. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | New provision request | S260.043 | Tony Garstang | Amend | Herbicide use on water weed should be monitored to protect aquatic life. Private land owners should need to require permission from council before using aquatic herbicide. | Insert provisions in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter to require resource consent for aquatic herbicide use. |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | New provision request | S260.044 | Tony Garstang | Amend | Considers public reserves in Council ownership should have footpath access from roads, signage (including information about historic significance, etc.), and be fenced from adjoining private property. Public access should be ensured at all times. | Insert provisions in the Natural Open Space Zone chapter to ensure public access to Council-owned reserves, including but not limited to footpath access, signage, fencing from adjoining private property. |
| OSZ - Open Space Zone | New provision request | S260.045 | Tony Garstang | Amend | Considers public reserves in Council ownership should have footpath access from roads, signage (including information about historic significance, etc.), and be fenced from adjoining private property. Public access should be ensured at all times. | Insert provisions in the Open Space Zone chapter to ensure public access to Council-owned reserves, including but not limited to footpath access, signage, fencing from adjoining private property. |
| SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone | New provision request | S260.046 | Tony Garstang | Amend | Considers public reserves in Council ownership should have footpath access from roads, signage (including information about historic significance, etc.), and be fenced from adjoining private property. Public access should be ensured at all times. | Insert provisions in the Sport and Active Recreation Zone to ensure public access to Council-owned reserves, including but not limited to footpath access, signage, fencing from adjoining private property. |
| Whole Plan | | S260.047 | Tony Garstang | Not Stated | Supports Masterton District Councils efforts to install signage to identify rivers where they cross streets. Considers this restores mana, increases public connection to the waterways, and assists the public with navigating the river network. | Continue installing signs to identify rivers where they cross streets. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous | Introduction | S260.048 | Tony Garstang | Support | Supports the aspiration, "The RMA requires District Councils to recognise and provide for the protection of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna" | Retain ECO-Introduction as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|------------|--|--|
| Biodiversity | | | | | | |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P1 | S260.049 | Tony Garstang | Support | Supports ECO-P1, but notes the district has not met such aspirations in the past, with adverse effects on aquatic life. | Retain ECO-P1 as notified. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P4 | S260.050 | Tony Garstang | Amend | Considers ECO-P4 should be expanded to include significant waterbodies as listed in SCHED11. This would protect eels and other indigenous fish and invertebrates in waterbodies. Considers planners should undertake job training to identify and monitor freshwater fish with GWRC or Mountains to Sea. | Amend ECO-P4 to include reference to significant waterbodies as listed in SCHED11 - Significant Waterbodies. |
| NATC - Natural Character | | S260.051 | Tony Garstang | Amend | Notes this chapter protects significant waterbodies listed in SCHED11, but questions why tributaries to these rivers are not also protected (note other submission points requesting tributaries be added to SCHED11). Considers tributaries are as deserving of protection. | Amend NATC provisions to also protect tributary streams. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S260.052 | Tony Garstang | Not Stated | Notes that Coddlington Reserve and the reserve between Derby and Durham Streets requires riparian planting to lower water temperatures and improve oxygen levels for migrating eels. | Undertake riparian planting in Council-owned reserves where needed. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S260.053 | Tony Garstang | Not Stated | Supports the walkway bridge from Sussex Street over the Makoura. Considers this is good urban development as it is away from cars, peaceful, cycle friendly, well-planted, with many tuna visible in the stream. | No specific decision requested. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R10 | S107.001 | Tracey McComb | Support | Support the enabling of a minor residential unit up to 80m ² as permitted activity. This will allow affordable housing to be made available in a more timely and cost-effective fashion, something that is essential in a housing crisis. | Retain GRZ-R10 as notified. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R4 | S107.002 | Tracey McComb | Support | Support the enabling of one residential unit on 350m ² in GRZ and 200m ² in Medium Density Residential Precinct. This slight increase in density will provide for smaller houses to be | Retain GRZ-R4 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | built on smaller sections, thus increasing housing affordability - something that is essential in a housing crisis. | |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R3 | S107.003 | Tracey McComb | Support | Support relocated buildings not requiring resource consent if they meet the bond requirements. This will allow affordable housing to be made available in a more timely and cost-effective fashion, something that is essential in a housing crisis. | Retain GRZ-R3 as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB - Table 1 | S107.004 | Tracey McComb | Support in part | I support the standardizing of lot sizes in the General Residential Zone in all settlements (particularly reducing the lot size from 400m ² to 350m ² for Featherston) and introducing the MDRZ in Masterton with subdivision down to 200m ² . | Retain minimum lot size of 350m ² in the General Residential Zone |
| Planning Maps | Precincts | S107.005 | Tracey McComb | Amend | Submitter would like to see more areas be part of the MDRP. Understands that LDRP applies in South Wairarapa towns to identify servicing constraints to denser development in residential Greytown and Martinborough and discrete parts of Masterton. Considers that as this does not apply in Featherston or Carterton, parts of those settlements could accommodate higher densities. Notes that many submitters on the Draft District Plan support smaller lot sizes in Featherston and Carterton in addition to Masterton, as well as provisions enabling infill housing, and a reduced focus on character and amenity to allow for more housing variety. | Amend the planning maps to extent Medium Density Residential Precinct to central Featherston and Carterton. |
| How the Plan Works | Statutory context | S218.001 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Transpower generally supports the description of the statutory context included in the Proposed District Plan. However, Transpower believes that there is merit in duplicating reference to the relevant RMA national planning instruments (from a usability and clarity perspective) in the table that describes relevant planning documents. | Amend the table in the 'Statutory Context: Relationship with relevant RMA planning and other documents' to also describe relevant national planning instruments, including the NPSET and NESETA. |
| How the Plan Works | General Approach | S218.002 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Transpower generally supports the description of the various parts of the Proposed District Plan included in the 'General Approach'. States that it is critical | Amend the General Approach: Parts of the District Plan description as follows: a. Strategic Direction - the strategic objectives set the direction for the District Plan to guide |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | that the Proposed District Plan clearly articulates the purpose of the Strategic Direction objectives so that there is no ambiguity in future RMA planning approval processes, including in respect of whether there is any hierarchy within the Proposed District Plan. For this reason, Transpower supports the inclusion of further interpretation guidance to be clear there is no hierarchy within the Strategic Direction objectives or between the Strategic Direction objectives and other objectives in the Proposed District Plan. | decision making at a strategic level. All other objectives and policies in the District Plan should be read and achieved in a manner consistent with the strategic objectives. No fixed hierarchy exists between the strategic objectives or between the strategic objectives and other objectives and policies in the District Plan. |
| How the Plan Works | Cross-boundary matters | S218.003 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Transpower generally supports the description of, and responses to, cross-boundary matters included in the Proposed District Plan. However, Transpower considers that these descriptions and responses failed to consider cross-boundary issues in respect of linear infrastructure, including the National Grid. That is, in concluding that cross-boundary issues are not likely to be significant, the needs of linear infrastructure, such as roading and electricity networks have not been considered. Therefore, Transpower seeks that the 'cross-boundary' matters are amended to reflect and respond to the issues identified in the NPSET. Such an approach is consistent with the direction given in 2.5 of the WRPS and Policy P2 of the NRP. | Amend the 'cross-boundary matters' to include the following additional paragraph: Infrastructure networks, including regionally and nationally significant networks, necessarily traverse jurisdictions as they carry people, goods, electricity and other services between and beyond the district boundaries. To recognise and provide for these infrastructure networks, it is important that there are consistent policy and regulatory approaches by local authorities. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S218.004 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Transpower notes that infrastructure or network utilities have not been explicitly classified in terms of risk or consequence of natural hazards. The introduction to the National Hazards chapter states that "any activity that is not specifically listed below is considered a less hazard sensitive activity". Transpower considers that the definition of "less hazard sensitive activities' should be amended to align with the introductory statement. | Amend the definition of 'Less hazard sensitive activities' as follows: Less hazard sensitive activities Means activities that are less sensitive to natural hazards, which are: a. accessory buildings used for non-habitable purposes; b. Park management activity; and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | c. Buildings and structures associated with temporary activities-; and d. not defined as Hazard Sensitive activities or potentially hazard sensitive activities. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S218.005 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Supports the definition of 'National Grid' and acknowledges that the definition is the same as the definition in the NPSET. | Retain the definition of 'National Grid' as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S218.006 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Supports the inclusion of a definition of 'National Grid Subdivision corridor' on the basis that such a definition is necessary for the implementation of associated rules. However, Transpower seeks limited amendments to the definition to reflect the National Grid assets that are located in Wairarapa. | <p>Amend the definition of 'National Grid subdivision corridor' as follows: Means the area measured either side of the centreline of above ground National Grid transmission lines as follows (and illustrated in dark green below):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 14 metres for 66kV and 110kV transmission lines on single poles; b. 16 metres for 66kV and 110 kV transmission lines on pi poles; c. 32 metres for 66kV and 110 kV transmission lines on towers (including tubular steel towers where these replace steel lattice towers); d. 37 metres for 220kV transmission lines on towers (including tubular steel towers where these replace steel lattice towers); e. 39 metres for 350kV transmission lines on towers (including tubular steel towers where these replace steel lattice towers). <p>...</p> <p>Consistent with the amendment set out above, replace the supporting diagram with a new diagram that reflects the assets in Wairarapa. Transpower can provide this diagram to the Councils.</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Interpretation | Definitions | S218.007 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Supports the definition of 'National Grid support structure' and considers that the definition is consistent with the NPSET and NESETA. That said, Transpower notes that the definition is not directly taken from the NPSET and therefore, seeks that the definition is amended accordingly. | Amend the definition of 'National Grid support structure' as follows: "Has the same meaning as in the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission (as set out below): Means a pole, tower, or other support structure ancillary to a transmission line that is part of the National Grid." |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S218.008 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Supports the inclusion of a definition of 'National Grid yard' on the basis that such a definition is necessary for the implementation of associated rules. However, Transpower seeks limited amendments to the definition to reflect the National Grid assets that are located in Wairarapa. | Amend the definition of 'National Grid yard' as follows: "Means (as illustrated in light green below): a. the area located 10 metres either side of the centreline of an overhead 110kV National Grid transmission line on single poles; b. the area located 10 metres either side of the centreline of an overhead 60kV National Grid transmission line on single pole, pi poles, or towers; bc. the area located 12 metres in any direction from the outer edge of a National Grid support structure; cd. the area located 12 metres either side of the centreline of any 110kV overhead National Grid transmission line on pi poles or towers (including tubular steel towers where these replace steel lattice towers)." Consistent with the amendments set out above, replace the supporting diagram with a new diagram that reflects the assets in Wairarapa. Transpower can |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | provide this diagram to the councils. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S218.009 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Supports the definition of 'Sensitive activities' on the basis that it is consistent with the definition included in the NPSET. | Retain the definition of 'Sensitive activities' as proposed. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S218.010 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Supports the definition of 'upgrade' on the basis that the definition is consistent with the use of the term in the NPSET and clearly distinguishes, by excluding, repair and maintenance activities. | Retain definition of 'Upgrade' as notified. |
| National Direction Instruments | National policy statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement | S218.011 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Transpower generally supports the brief commentary that describes the relationship between the Proposed District Plan and national policy statements on the basis that the commentary sets out the statutory obligations in respect of national policy statements and lists the NPSET. | Retain the commentary in relation to national policy statements as notified. |
| National Direction Instruments | National Environmental Standards | S218.012 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Transpower generally supports the brief commentary that describes the relationship between the Proposed District Plan and national environmental standards and lists in the NESETA. | Retain the commentary in relation to national environmental standards as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | Introduction | S218.013 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Transpower considers that it is critical that the Proposed District Plan clearly articulates the purpose of the Strategic Direction objectives so that there is no ambiguity in future RMA planning approval processes, including in respect of whether there is any hierarchy within the Proposed District Plan. Transpower seeks the inclusion of further interpretation guidance to be clear there is no hierarchy between the Strategic Direction objectives and other objectives in the Proposed District Plan. That is, the objectives should be read together, but there should not be primacy or precedence in respect of the Strategic Direction objectives. | Amend the introductory text to the Strategic Direction chapter as follows: "The objectives in the Strategic Direction Chapter outline the key strategic matters for the districts and guide making at a strategic level. The objectives in the Strategic Direction Chapter are to be read together and there is no hierarchy between them strategic objectives or between the strategic objectives and the other objectives and policies in the District Plan. All other objective and policies in the District Plan should be read and achieved in a manner consistent with the objectives in the Strategic Direction Chapter. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | ..." |
| Strategic Direction | CCR-O1 | S218.014 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | The National Grid is the infrastructure on which our zero-carbon future will be built. For this reason, Transpower supports objective CCR-O1 and considers that the Objective appropriately directs outcomes aligned with New Zealand's zero carbon commitment and the National Grid's role in meeting that commitment. | Retain Objective CCR-O1 as proposed. |
| Strategic Direction | INF-O1 | S218.015 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Transpower supports Objective INF-O1 to the extent that the Objective seeks that the benefits of infrastructure are recognised. However, Transpower seeks that the Objective is amended to say how the benefits of infrastructure are recognised. | Amend objective INF-O1 as follows: "The benefits of infrastructure are recognised by enabling the on-going operation, maintenance and upgrading of existing infrastructure and providing for the development of new infrastructure , while ensuring its adverse effects are well managed, and infrastructure is protected from incompatible land use, subdivision and development, including reverse sensitivity effects. |
| ENG - Energy | Introduction | S218.016 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Notes a minor typographic error in the introduction to the Energy chapter. | Amend the introduction to the Energy chapter as follows: "The provisions in this chapter have been developed to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Electricity Generation 2011, which seeks to enable the sustainable management of renewable electricity generation." |
| ENG - Energy | Introduction | S218.017 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Transpower generally supports the Introduction to the Energy chapter but seeks limited amendments to better reflect the role that electricity transmission plays in respect of electricity generation. That is, connecting electricity generation to the National Grid and | Amend the introduction to the Energy chapter as follows: "... Facilities for the transmission of the generated electricity to the National Grid may also be necessary, with potential for |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | transmitting that electricity to distribution networks and major industrial users. | <p>environmental effects.[insert paragraph break]</p> <p>Due to the location of the wind resource in the districts, wind energy facilities are likely to be sited in elevated locations in coastal and rural areas ...</p> <p>Increased demand also increases the need for more electricity transmission and distribution systems, which may bring about adverse effects on the environment. The effects from energy generation, transmission and distribution facilities can generally be effectively addressed through a variety of methods. However, some level of adverse effects may need to be accepted in accordance with the necessity for energy, and as New Zealand moves towards a more sustainable energy future."</p> |
| ENG - Energy | Introduction | S218.018 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Transpower supports the direction given in the Introduction to the Energy chapter in respect of how the provisions apply. However, because the Introduction refers to electricity transmission and distribution, Transpower seeks that the Introduction is clear that the rules for these activities are in the Network Utilities chapter. | <p>Amend the introduction to the Energy chapter as follows:</p> <p>"...</p> <p>The provisions within this chapter apply on a district-wide basis. As such, the rules in the zone and district wide chapters do not apply to renewable electricity generation unless specifically stated within a rule or standard in this chapter. The objectives and policies in district-wide overlay chapters and the objectives, policies and rules of the subdivision chapter apply to renewable electricity generation where applicable. The rules in the Network Utilities chapter</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | apply to electricity transmission and electricity distribution." |
| NU - Network Utilities | Introduction | S218.019 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | <p>Transpower generally supports the introduction to the Network Utilities chapter but seeks very minor corrections to the text. While Transpower prefers that the Network Utilities chapter 'stands alone', with the rules elsewhere in the Proposed District Plan not applying, Transpower acknowledges and supports the clear direction given in the introductory text that the District-wide rules also apply to network utilities, but the zone rules do not. When such an approach is taken, it is important that the District-wide provisions appropriately recognise and provide for the benefits of network utilities and also the specific characteristics of network utilities. The intent of Transpower's submission, as a whole, is to achieve this outcome.</p> | <p>Amend the Introduction to the Network Utilities chapter as follows: "The Wairarapa relies on network utilities, including energy electricity transmission and distribution, radio-communications, telecommunications, meteorological facilities, and water and wastewater reticulation. A network utility operator, as defined by the Act, or other operators may provide these utilities.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Some network utilities have the potential to have adverse effects on the environment. These effects may result from activities involved in establishing the facility, be generated by the facility itself, or be associated with the maintenance and operation of the facility.</p> <p>Potential adverse effects can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the visual impacts of structures; - the risk to public health and safety; and - noise and odour. <p>Likewise, land uses adjacent to network utilities can have an adverse effect on the ongoing function, and operation and development of network utilities.</p> <p>..."</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| NU - Network Utilities | Introduction | S218.020 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Supports the inclusion of explicit reference additional regulatory requirements in the NESETA, the NZECP34:2001 and the Electricity Hazards from Trees Regulations 2003. Further, Transpower supports the inclusion of explicit reference to the statutory direction that the NESTA prevails over the Proposed District Plan in the case of conflict. | Retain the 'relationship with other regulations' in the introduction to the Network Utilities chapter as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O1 | S218.021 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Supports Objective NU-O1 on the basis that the Objective gives effect to the NPSET (particularly Policy 1) and also gives effect to Policy 7 of the WRPS. | Retain objective NU-O1 as proposed. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O2 | S218.022 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Supports Objective NU-O2 on the basis that the Objective is consistent with, and gives effect to, the NPSET. | Retain Objective NU-O2 as proposed. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O3 | S218.023 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | To the extent that Objective NU-O3 is relevant to the National Grid, Transpower supports the Objective but acknowledges that Objective NU-O4 more specifically addresses effects of activities on the National Grid. | Retain Objective NU-O3 as proposed. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O4 | S218.024 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Supports Objective NU-O4 on the basis that the Objective gives effect to Policy 10 of the NPSET. However, Transpower seeks the inclusion of reference to avoiding sensitive activities so that the Objective also gives effect to Policy 11 of the NPSET. | Amend Objective NU-O4 as follows: "Subdivision, use, and development is managed to avoid sensitive activities and reverse sensitivity effects on the National Grid and ensure that the operation, maintenance, repair, upgrading, and development of the National Grid is not compromised." |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P1 | S218.025 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Transpower supports Policy NU-P1 on the basis that the Policy is consistent with, and gives effect to, the NPSET. | Retain Policy NU-P1 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P3 | S218.026 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Supports Policy NU-P3 to the extent that the Policy recognises the benefits of new technologies. However, Transpower seeks a minor amendment to the Policy so that the Policy expresses how the benefits are recognised. Transpower notes that, insofar as the Policy relates to existing National Grid assets, the direction given by the Policy is | Amend Policy NU-P3 as follows: "Recognise the benefits of new technologies for network utilities by enabling new technologies that: a. ..." |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | consistent with the outcomes achieved through the NESETA regulations. | |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P4 | S218.027 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Transpower generally supports the direction given in Policy NU-P4 to the management of adverse effects of network utilities and considers that, to the extent that the Policy relates to the National Grid, the Policy is generally consistent with the discretion given to the management of adverse effects in the NPSET. That said, Transpower seeks a minor amendment to clause (e) to replace 'possible' with 'practicable' in any given circumstances. Further, Transpower is concerned that an absolute requirement to maintain the character and amenity of a surrounding area in clause (f) may be too onerous given the nature and scale of a transmission line. | Amend Policy NU-P4 as follows: "Manage the adverse effects of network utilities, including effects on natural and physical resources, amenity values, sensitive activities, and the health, safety, and wellbeing of people and communities by: a. controlling the height, bulk, and location of network utilities; ... e. mitigating adverse visual effects through landscaping and/or the use of recessive colours and finishes, where possible practicable ; and f. requiring network utilities to adopt sensitive design to integrate network utilities within the site, existing build form and/ or landscape, and to maintain the character and amenity of the surrounding area. " |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P5 | S218.028 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Transpower generally supports in part Policy NU-P5. That said, the relationship between Policy NU-P4 and Policy NU-P5 is not entirely clear. Transpower considers that the requirement to 'ensure' in Policy NU-P5 is a stronger direction than the requirement to 'manage' in NU-P4. Transpower seeks refinement to the direction given in the Policy NU-P5 to achieve consistency with Policies NU-P1 and NU-P4 and to give effect to the NPSET. | Amend Policy NU-P5 as follows: "Ensure that network utilities avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects of network utilities on the environment, while recognising the functional need and operational need of the network utility, and having regard to: ..." |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P6 | S218.029 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Supports Policy NU-P6 because the Policies give effect to Policies 10 and 11 of the NPSET. | Retain Policy NU-P6 as proposed. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R1 | S218.030 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Supports the inclusion of a permitted activity rule for the operation, maintenance, repair and removal of existing aboveground network utilities. However, Transpower does not support the inclusion of permitted activity standards and seeks for them to be removed. It is unclear how the standard in clause (1)(a) would work in practice, the rationale for requiring the removal of redundant underground utilities is unclear; and it is not clear what the anticipated adverse effect of the on-going operation, maintenance and repair of network utilities are. In addition, Transpower considers that the Rule should also make explicit provision for the maintenance and repair of access tracks to existing network utilities so that their ongoing operation and maintenance is appropriately enabled. | Amend Rule NU-P6 as follows: NU-R1 Operation, maintenance, repair, and removal of existing aboveground and underground network utilities, including the access tracks to existing network utilities. All zones 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. All aboveground structures that are no longer required for network utility purposes are removed within two years of being replaced or becoming redundant; b. Compliance is achieved with NU-S1 - NU-S7. All zones 1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with NU-R1(1). Matters of discretion:1. The functional need and operational need of, and benefits delivered from, the network utility including the potential impact on the levels of service or health and safety if the work is not undertaken.2. The effects of non-compliance with any relevant Network Utilities standards.3. The location of network utilities, including the need for connections to existing networks and services. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R3 | S218.031 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Supports the inclusion of a permitted activity rule for the upgrading of existing above ground network utilities. However, for the same reasons as set out above in respect of Rule NU-R1, Transpower does not support reference to the removal of network utilities in the context of being compelled by a rule. It is | Amend Rule NU-R3 as follows: NU-R3 Upgrading of existing above ground network utilities, including the access tracks to existing network utilities All zones 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | noted that, insofar as the provisions in NU-R1 and NU-R3 relate to the National Grid, the NPSET does not direct the removal of redundant parts of the National Grid. In addition, Transpower considers that the Rule should also make explicit provision for the upgrading of access tracks to existing network utilities so that their ongoing ability to serve existing network utilities is appropriately enabled. | a. The realignment, relocation, or replacement of a line, pipe, telecommunication pole, pole, tower, conductor, switch, transformer, or ancillary structure is within 5m of the existing alignment or location; ...vii. all structures that are no longer required for network utility purposes are removed within two years of being replaced or becoming redundant; or b. The realignment, or replacement of any other network utility; i. all structures that are no longer required for network utility purposes are removed within two years of being replaced or becoming redundant; and..." |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R5 | S218.032 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Supports Rule NU-R5 because the Rule appropriately enables temporary network utilities. | Retain Rule NU-R5 as notified. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R6 | S218.033 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Supports Rule NU-P6 because the rule appropriately provides for substations that are not enclosed as a permitted activity, when limited in scale, with a default to restricted discretionary activity status in all other circumstances. | Retain Rule NU-R6 as proposed. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R9 | S218.034 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Supports Rule NU-R9 on the basis that the rule provides for new overhead lines. That said, considers that the use of 'including those that convey electricity below 110kV' is confusing and serves no clear purpose on the basis that the voltage of a line that conveys electricity does not result in any adverse effects. Further, electric and magnetic fields are already appropriately managed by Standard NU-S5. For this reason, Transpower seeks that the clause be deleted. As a | Amend NU-R9 as follows: NU-R9 Overhead lines and associated support structures, including lines that convey electricity (including those that convey electricity below 110kV) Rural Zones, General Industrial Zone 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: b. Compliance is achieved with all |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>consequence, Rule NU-R16 is unnecessary and can also be deleted. Transpower seeks that Rule NU-R9 is amended to align with Rule NU-R16 in respect of 'default' activity status. In this regard, it is considered that the potential adverse effects of the activity are well understood and can be appropriately managed by the matters of discretion that apply in Rule NU-R16. Transpower also notes that there are differences between the matters of discretion in Rules NU-R9 and NU-R16. Transpower seeks limited amendments to the matters of discretion that apply to provide for the appropriate assessment of potential effects and achieve consistency within the Rule.</p> | <p>Network Utilities Standards. Rural zones, General Industrial Zone 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. compliance is not achieved with NU-R9(1). Matters of discretion: 1. The functional need and operational need... ... 5. The location of network utilities, including the need for connections to existing networks and services. 6. The extent to which adverse effects have been addressed through site, and route or method selection 7. Effects on areas of outstanding natural features and landscapes, waterbodies, indigenous vegetation, historic heritage, and sites and areas of significance to Māori. 78. The local, regional and national benefits of network utilities.</p> <p>All other zones 3. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance is achieved with: i. NU-S4; and ii. NU-S5. Matters of discretion:1. The functional need and operational need of, and benefits from, the network utility, including the potential impact on</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | | <p>the level of service or health and safety if the work is not undertaken.2. The bulk, height, location, and design of the network utility, including any associated buildings or structures.3. The amenity values of the respective zone and the extent to which any adverse amenity effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.4. The extent to which the network utility may adversely impact on existing land uses.5. Compliance with recognised standards or guidelines for the potential adverse effects of noise and vibration.6. The extent to which adverse effects have been addressed through site, and route or method selection.7. Effects on areas of outstanding natural features and landscapes, waterbodies indigenous vegetation, historic heritage, and sites and areas of significance to Māori.8. The local, regional and national benefits of network utilities.[As a consequence, delete Rule NU-R16]</p> |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R16 | S218.035 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Oppose | For the reasons as set out above in respect of Rule NU-R9, considers that Rule NU-R9 can appropriately provide for lines that convey electricity at all voltages and, on that basis there is no need for Rule NU-R16. | Delete Rule NU-R16 in its entirety. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R19 | S218.036 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Supports Rule NU-R19 because the Rule: - reflects the approach taken to the management of effects of buildings, structures and activities in the vicinity of the National | Retain Rule NU-R19 as proposed. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | Grid in district plans throughout New Zealand; and - gives effect to Policy 10 and Policy 11 of the NPSET. | |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-R20 | S218.037 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Transpower generally supports Rule NU-R20. However, it is noted that reference to "220kV" can be deleted from the Rule on the basis that there are no National Grid assets that are designed or operated at this voltage in Wairarapa. In addition, seeks the deletion of reference to 2.4.1 of NZECP34:2001 because this 'exception' is for buildings and structures, rather than earthworks or land disturbance. | Amend Rule NU-R20 as follows: "NU-R20 In the National Grid Yard: 1. Land disturbance for the installation of fence posts 2. Earthworks All zones 1. Activity status: Permitted ... b. The land disturbance and earthworks is no deeper than 3m between 6m and 12m from the outer visible edge of a foundation of a 110kV or a 220kV National Grid transmission line tower or pole; ... f. Clauses (a)-(e) do not apply to the following: ... iii. earthworks that otherwise meets the requirements of clause 2.3.1 of the New Zealand Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP34:2001)." |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-S2 | S218.038 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | The relationship between the standards for the heights of towers and pole in Standard NU-S1 and Standard NU-S2 is not clear. Transpower understands that the height of the towers and poles is addressed by Standard NU-S1 and therefore, it is assumed that the Standards in NU-S2 do not apply. Therefore, seeks that this is made explicit in Standard NU-S2. | Amend Standard NU-S2 as follows: NU-S2 Buildings and structure height and setbacks All Zones Except where Standard NU-S1 applies, buildings and structures comply with the building height, setback, and height in relation to boundary standards for the zone. " |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-S5 | S218.039 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Supports Standard NU-S5 on the basis that the Standard gives effect to Policy 9 of the | Retain Standard NU-S5 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | NPSET and is consistent with the regulations in the NESETA. | |
| CL - Contaminated Land | CL-P2 | S218.040 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Supports Policy CL-P2 to the extent that the Policy directs that contaminated land is managed relative to its intended use. | Retain Policy CL-P2 as proposed. |
| CL - Contaminated Land | | S218.041 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Supports the approach taken to rules (or the absence of rules) in relation to contaminated land and particularly reliance of the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011. | Retain the reliance on the National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in the Soil to Protect Human Health as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | Introduction | S218.042 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Notes that infrastructure and network utilities have not been explicitly classified in terms of risk or consequence of natural hazards and, as such, defaults to the 'less hazard sensitive activities' category because the introduction to the Natural Hazards chapter states that "any activity that is not specifically listed below is considered a less hazard sensitive activity". As set out earlier in this submission, seeks that the definition of 'less hazard sensitive activities' is amended to align with the introductory statement. | Amend the definition of 'Less hazard sensitive activities' as follows: "Means activities that are less sensitive to natural hazards, which are: a. accessory buildings used for non-habitable purposes; b. Park management activity; and c. Buildings and structures associated with temporary activities; and d. not defined as Hazard sensitive activities or potentially hazard sensitive activities." |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P8 | S218.043 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Supports the approach of including a specific policy that addresses infrastructure in hazard areas, but considers that, when compared to the policy direction in Policies NH-P4 and NH-P5, the approach to infrastructure in hazards areas is inconsistent and inappropriately stringent. Seeks that the Policy is amended to align with Policies NH-P4 and NH-P5 in order to appropriately address the characteristics of infrastructure including its locational requirements and ability to be designed to be resilient to the potential effects of natural hazard events. | Amend Policy NH-P8 as follows: "Allow for the Enable the operation, maintenance and upgrading of existing infrastructure, and only allow provide for new infrastructure to be established in hazard areas where new infrastructure : 1. it has an operational need or functional need for the location; 2. it will be designed to maintain its integrity and function during and after a natural hazard event, or it will be able to be immediately re-instated after a |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | natural hazard event, and 3. does not increase the risk to properties, activities, and people is not increased." |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-R8 | S218.044 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Supports the approach of including a specific rule that addresses infrastructure in hazard areas, but considers that, when compared to Rule NH-R2, the approach to infrastructure in hazard areas is inconsistent and inappropriately stringent. Seeks that Rule NH-R8 is amended to be generally consistent with Rule NH-R2. | Amend Rule NH-R8 as follows: "NH-R8 Infrastructure in hazard areas All zones 1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Permitted Where: a. New infrastructure is located outside of a moderate or high hazard area within a low hazard area. b. Any buildings must not be located in the overland flowpath or river corridor of the flood hazard overlays. Matters of discretion: 1. The matters set out in NH-P4, NH-P8, and NH-P11: All zones 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Infrastructure is located within moderate or high hazard areas. Compliance is not achieved with NH-R8(1).Matters of discretion:1. The matters set out in NH-P4, NH-P8, and NH-P11. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-P2 | S218.045 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Supports Policy TREE-P2 on the basis the Policy allows for minor trimming of notable trees where the trimming is to prevent damage to property or infrastructure or improve public safety. Such an approach is consistent with the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003. | Retain Policy TREE-P2 as proposed. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-P6 | S218.046 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Supports Policy TREE-P6 on the basis the Policy allows for minor trimming of street trees where the trimming is to prevent damage to property or infrastructure or improve public safety. Such an approach is consistent with the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003. | Retain Policy TREE-P6 as proposed. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-R1 | S218.047 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Supports Rule TREE-R1 on the basis that the Rule appropriately provides for minor trimming of a notable tree where the trimming is required by statute or regulation, including the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations or the trimming is required to address an imminent danger to an electricity line. | Retain Rule TREE-R1 as proposed. |
| TREE - Notable Trees | TREE-R3 | S218.048 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Supports Rule TREE-R3 on the basis that the Rule appropriately provides for minor trimming of a street tree where the trimming is required by statute or regulations, including the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations or the trimming is required to address an imminent danger to an electricity line. | Retain Rule TREE-R3 as proposed. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P4 | S218.049 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Supports Policy SASM-P4 to the extent that the Policy allows the operation, maintenance and repair or upgrading of existing network utility structures. However, considers that, where network utilities are present in sites and areas of significance to Māori, the Policy should also provide for the upgrading of the existing network utilities. Such an approach gives effect to Policy 1, Policy 2 and Policy 5 of the NPSET, insofar as Policy SASM-P4 relates to the National Grid. | Amend Policy SASM-P4 as follows: "Allow for the following activities to occur on, or in proximity to sites and areas of significance to Māori, while ensuring their design, scale, and intensity will not compromise cultural, spiritual, and historical values, interests, or associations of importance to tangata whenua: ... d. operation, maintenance, and repair and upgrading of existing network utility structures; and e. erection of signs." |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of | SASM-P5 | S218.050 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Generally supports Policy SASM-P5, but notes that neither the RMA nor the WRPS direct the absolute protection of the values of sites and areas of significance to Māori. | Amend Policy SASM-P5 as follows: "SASM-P5 Protect the values of sites and areas of significance to Māori from |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Significance to Māori | | | | | Seeks limited amendments to better give effect to SASM-O3 by referencing the appropriateness of activities; and to reflect that alternative methods or locations should be 'viable' or 'practicable'. The use of this term is consistent with the expression in Policy SASM-P6. | inappropriate subdivision, use, and development Only allow any other use and development on, or in proximity to sites and areas of significance to Māori where it can be demonstrated that the cultural, spiritual, and historical values, interests, or associations of importance to tangata whenua of the site or area are protected and maintained, having regard to: a. whether there are practicable alternative methods, locations, or designs that would avoid or reduce the impact on the values, interests, or associations of importance to tangata whenua associated with the site or area of significance;..." |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-P6 | S218.051 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Generally supports Policy SASM-P6, but seeks amendment to the Policy to provide a 'pathway' through the Policy for those activities that have a functional need for their location that are provided for in clause (a). | Amend Policy SASM-P6 as follows: "Ensure the adverse effects of activities and areas of significance to Māori are managed by: a. avoiding activities within sites and areas of significance to Māori, unless there is a functional need to do so and no practicable alternative location; b. avoiding to the greatest extent practicable significant adverse effects on the site or area's cultural spiritual and historical values; and c. for other residual effects: i. where adverse effects cannot be avoided, they are minimised; and ii. where adverse effects cannot be |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>minimised they are remedied to the greatest extent practicable; and iii. where more than minor residual adverse effects cannot be avoided, minimised, or remedied, the activity itself is avoided."</p> |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R2 | S218.052 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | <p>Supports Rule SASM-R2 to an extent. However, considers that the rule should be expanded to provide for land disturbance associated with the maintenance, repair and upgrading of network utilities in the same way as it does for access tracks. Considers that, insofar as the rule relates to the National Grid, such amendments are necessary to give effect to Policies 1, 2 and 5 of the NPSET; and considers that the provisions of the Proposed District Plan clearly identify the types of adverse effects that ought to be considered under Rule SASM-R2 such that full discretionary activity status is not required.</p> | <p>Amend Rule SASM-R2 as follows:</p> <p>"SASM-R2 Land disturbance (excluding earthworks) within a site or area of significance to Māori listen in SCHED4 Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori All Zones except for Settlement Zone 1. Activity status: Permitted Where the land disturbance is for: ... h. the maintenance or repair of existing tracks and culvert provided the area, extent and volume of land disturbed is limited to that which is necessary to maintain an existing track and culvert along its existing alignment; i. the maintenance, repair or upgrading of existing network utilities provided the area, extent and volume of land disturbed is limited to that which is necessary and is along the existing alignment; i-j. authorised works and within an approved area by an existing legal instrument (such as consent notice or local authority covenant) for the site. All zones except Settlement Zone 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | <p>SASM-R2(1).Matters of discretion:1. The matters set out in SASM-P3, SASM-P4 and SASM-P5. 2. The functional need and operational need of, and benefits from, the maintenance, repair or upgrading, including the potential impact on the levels of service or health and safety if the work is not undertaken."</p> |
| <p>SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori</p> | <p>SASM-R3</p> | <p>S218.053</p> | <p>Transpower New Zealand Limited</p> | <p>Support in part</p> | <p>Does not oppose Rule SASM-R3 that has the effect of triggering the requirement for resource consent for earthworks in a Site of Significance to Māori in almost all circumstances. However, considers that the provisions of the Proposed District Plan clearly identify the types of adverse effects that ought to be considered under Rule SASM-R3 such that full discretionary activity status is not required. That is, the effects are known and can be adequately and appropriately addressed by a restricted discretionary activity status.</p> | <p>Amend Rule SASM-R3 as follows: "SASM-R3 SASM-R3 Earthworks within a site or area of significance to Māori listed in SCHED4 Sites and areas of Significance to Māori All Zones except Settlement Zone 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Earthworks are for burials within an existing urupā; or b. Earthworks are authorised by and located within an approved area in an exciting legal instrument (such as consent notice or local authority covenant) for the site. All Zones except Settlement Zone 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with SAS-R3(1).Matters of discretion:1. The matters set out in SASM-P3, SASM-P4 and SASM-P5.2. The functional need and operational need of, and benefits from, the maintenance, repair or upgrading, including the potential impact on the levels of service or health and safety if the work is not</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | undertaken." |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | SASM-R6 | S218.054 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Supports Rule SASM-R6 to the extent that the Rule provides for the maintenance and repair of network utility structures as a permitted activity, subject to standards. However, considers that there is a gap between Rules SASM-R6 and SASM-R7 because neither rule addresses the upgrading of network utilities. Further, considers that the rule should address network utilities generally, as opposed to being confined to structures. Therefore, seeks amendments to Rules SASM-R6 to address these matters along with further refinements to give effect to Policies 1, 2, and 5 of the NPSET. | Amend Rule SASM-R6 as follows: "SASM-R6 Maintenance and repair and upgrading of an existing network utility structure and existing primary production structures within a site or area of significance to Māori listed in SCHED4 Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori All Zones except Settlement Zone 1. Activity status: Permitted ... |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-O2 | S218.055 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Supports Objective ECO-O2 because the Objective directs an outcome that protects areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna from 'inappropriate' activities. | Retain Objective ECO-O2 as notified. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P4 | S218.056 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Supports Policy ECO-P4 to the extent that the Policy provides for activities that have a functional or operational need for their location in areas of significant indigenous vegetation or habitat. Limited amendments are sought to: - include explicit reference to the trimming or removal of vegetation because, as drafted, this activity is provided for within the areas; and - delete clause (2) on the basis that an activity cannot remove an Area because the area is identified in Schedules to the Proposed District Plan. | Amend Policy ECO-P4 as follows: "Protect those areas that are habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna in the Wairarapa from inappropriate subdivision, land use, and development by: a. only providing for activities, including associated vegetation trimming and removal , that demonstrate an operational need or functional need to be located in this area; b. ensuring areas are not removed in whole or part; c. requiring activities within or directly |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | adjacent to these areas... |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P5 | S218.057 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Generally supports Policy ECO-P5 however, considers that the Policy does not give effect to Policy 2 and Policy 5 of the NPSET and needs amendment. | Amend Policy ECO-P5 as follows: "Enable the following activities relating to habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna in the Wairarapa where they contribute to the protection, maintenance, and enhancement of the areas: a. removal of broken branches, deadwood, diseased vegetation, or exotic species; b. maintenance and minor upgrading of the safety and efficiency of network utilities, including associated vegetation trimming and removal; c. maintenance of existing access tracks for network utilities, including associated vegetation trimming and removal; d. maintenance of existing access tracks, fencelines, and firebreaks and the construction of new fencelines and firebreaks; ..." |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P6 | S218.058 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Generally supports Policy ECO-P6 to and extent. That said, Transpower does not support the inclusion of a requirement for no more than minor residual adverse effects to be offset or compensated for. | Amend Policy ECO-P6 as follows: "Manage the effects of subdivision, use, and development of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna in the Wairarapa by: a. avoiding the loss or degradation of areas... ... More than minor residual effects on significant |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, outside the Coastal Environment, that cannot be avoided, remedied, or mitigated in accordance with clauses (a)1 - (c)3 above shall may be offset, or if biodiversity offsetting cannot be reasonably achieved, shall may be addressed through environmental compensation where such offset or compensation measures are proposed or agreed by an applicant or requiring authority." |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P7 | S218.059 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Supports Policy ECO-P7 to an extent. However, Transpower considers that the Policy does not give effect to Policies 2 and 5 of the NPSET because the Policy fails to "recognise and provide for the effective operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the electricity transmission network" (Policy 2) and fails to "enable the reasonable operational, maintenance and minor upgrade requirements of established electricity transmission assets" (Policy 5). | Amend Policy ECO-P7 as follows: "Provide for the modification of vegetation outside of habitats comprising significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna where: a. the indigenous vegetation is kanuka, manuka or tauhinu; ... g. necessary for the avoidance of imminent danger to human life or property; x. necessary for the operation, maintenance and upgrading of the National Grid; h. activities are carried out... ..." |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-R1 | S218.060 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Generally supports Rule ECO-R1, but seeks that the Rule is amended to better align with Rules TREE-R1, and TREE-R3 and to apply (for consistency of regulation) the most stringent activity status that might apply to vegetation trimming or removals under the NESETA. | Amend Rule ECO-R1 as follows: "ECO-R1 Modification of indigenous vegetation within a Significant Natural Area All zones 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The modification of indigenous vegetation is for one of more of the following: i. associated with a conservation activity or a |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>customary activity; ii. trimming that is required to comply with the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003 or the Telecommunications Act 2001; x. modification to address an imminent danger to an electricity line; ..."All zones x. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with ECO-R1(1)(a)(ii) and ECO-R1(1)(a)(x).Matters of discretion:1 The matters set out in ECO-P5 and ECO-P6.2. The functional need and operational need of, and benefits from, the maintenance, repair or upgrading, including the potential impact on the levels of service or health and safety if the work is not undertaken." All zones 2. Activity status: Discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with ECO-R1(1)(a)(i), ECO-R1(1)(a)(ii) to ECO-R1(a)(viii).</p> |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-R2 | S218.061 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Supports Rule ECO-R2 (and particularly clauses (b), (e), (f) and (i)) to the extent that the Rule provides for the modification of indigenous vegetation outside of a Significant Natural Area. However, considers that the Rule fails to give effect to Policy 5 of the NPSET because the Rule does not 'enable' the modification of vegetation associated with minor upgrading. Seeks the inclusion of a further clause in the Rule to achieve this outcome. | Amend Rule ECO-R2 as follows: "ECO-R2 Modification of indigenous vegetation outside of a Significant Natural Area All zones 1. Activity status: Permitted Where one or more of the following applies: a. The modification is associated with conservation activities or customary activities; ... e. The operation and/or maintenance and repair of existing pasture, fences, drains, |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | structures, network utilities, and infrastructure, firebreaks including existing roads or tracks (including walking or cycling tracks); x. The modification is required for the operation, maintenance or upgrading of the National Grid. f. Trimming that is required to comply with the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003. ..." |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-S1 | S218.062 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Generally supports Standard ECO-S1, because the Standard set clear parameters for where the modification of indigenous vegetation is permitted. That said, Transpower seeks that clause (3)(b) is amended to clarify that the maximum area threshold applies to land held in a single record of title. | Amend Standard ECO-S1 as follows: "ECO-S1 Modification of indigenous vegetation 1. Indigenous vegetation is not within 20m of a natural inland wetland; ... 3. Any other indigenous vegetation species where: a. the vegetation height is less than 4m and trunk diameter is less than 30cm as measured 1.4m above ground; and b. all other cases, for land held in a single record title , there is no more than 10% of the total area of vegetation and no more than 200m ² of vegetation is modified in any 5-year period. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-O1 | S218.063 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Supports Objective NATC-O1 because the objective directs an outcome that protects the natural character of the Wairarapa's rivers, lakes, and natural inland wetlands and their margins from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development 'inappropriate' activities in a manner than is consistent with section 6(a) of the RMA. | Retain Objective NATC-O1 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P5 | S218.064 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Generally supports Policy NATC-P5 to the extent that the Policy provides an exemption for structures within waterbody setbacks where the structures have a functional or operational need for their location. Transpower seeks a limited amendment, consistent with Objective NATC-O1, to recognise that a structure may still be appropriate within waterbody setbacks in situations where natural character values are not entirely preserved. | Amend Policy NATC-P5 as follows: "Discourage buildings and structures within 10m of surface waterbodies within the General Rural Zone, 5m of any surface waterbody in any other zone, and 25m of Significant Waterbodies across all zones and only allow buildings and structures within these setbacks where: 1. there is a functional need or operational need for their location within the setback; 2. The location, intensity, scale, design, and form of the building or structure preserves natural character values to the extent practicable ; and 3. any potential cumulative effects on natural character values are minimised." |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-O1 | S218.065 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Supports Objective NFL-O1 because the Objective directs an outcome that protect the outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development 'inappropriate' activities in a manner that is consistent with section 6(b) of the RMA. | Retain Objective NFL-O1 as notified. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-P5 | S218.066 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Supports Policy NFL-P5 to an extent. However, Transpower is concerned that the Policy does not give full effect to Policy 2 & 5 of the NPSET. Policies NFL-P3 & NFL-P4 will prevent activities occurring because with or without clause (4), the firm direction to avoid significant adverse effects in Policies NFL-P3 & NFL-P4 continues to apply. Transpower also considers that the requirement of the National Grid to avoid adverse effects is contrary to Policy 8 of the NPSET and therefore, Transpower suggests amendments to Policy NFL-P5. | Amend Policy NFL-P5 as follows: "Notwithstanding Policy NFL-P3 and Policy NFL-P4, a Allow subdivision, use, and development within an Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes where it is associated with conservation activities or: a. it relates to the maintenance, repair, minor upgrading or removal of existing infrastructure; b. there is a functional need or operational need for the activity to be located in the Outstanding Natural |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | <p>Features and Landscapes; c. the form, scale, and nature of the activity will not detract from the characteristics and values of the Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes by, to the extent practicable: ...d. the activity is consistent with Policies NFL P3 and NFL P4.</p> |
| <p>NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes</p> | <p>NFL-R1</p> | <p>S218.067</p> | <p>Transpower New Zealand Limited</p> | <p>Oppose</p> | <p>Considers that Rule NFL-R1 fails to give effect to the NPSET, including Policies, 1, 2, 5 and 8 of the NPSET in respect of appropriately recognising, providing for and enabling the National Grid. To properly give effect to the NPSET, Transpower considers that the most efficient and effective approach to giving effect to the NPSET is to include a bespoke rule for National Grid activities.</p> | <p>Insert a new rule in the Natural Features and Landscapes Chapter as follows: "NFL-RX Earthworks, modification of indigenous vegetation, or structures for the National Grid within Outstanding Natrual Features and LandscapesAll zones 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. it relates tot he maintenance, repair, minor upgrading or removal of existing infrastructure. All zones x. Activity Status: Restricted discretionary Wherea. Compliance is not achieved with NFL-RX Matters of discretion: 1. The degree of change to the natural landform. 2. The effects of activity on the identified characteristics and values of the Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes. 3. The effects of activity on the identified characteristics and values of the Coastal Environment. 4. The functional need and operational need of, and benefits from, the activity, including the potential impact on the levels of service or health and safety if</p> |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | the activity is not undertaken⁵. The effect of the reflectivity and colour of external materials on the identified characteristics and values of the Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes." |
| PA - Public Access | PA-P3 | S218.068 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Generally supports Policy PA-P3 to the extent that the Policy acknowledges that public access may be restricted in order to protect public health and safety. There are situations where Transpower may need to restrict public access, for instance where work is occurring on transmission lines. Such restrictions would similarly apply in the case of rivers, lakes and wetlands. Transpower suggests that the concept of exceptions to the provision of public access be similarly applied to lakes, rivers and wetlands. Such an approach would give effect to the NPSET and Policy 53 of the WRPS. | Retain Policy PA-P3 as notified. Amend the provisions in the Public Access chapter to allow for similar restrictions to those in Policy PA-P3 (in limited circumstances) on public access to lakes, rivers and wetlands. |
| SUB - Subdivision | Introduction | S218.069 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Supports the clear direction given in the introductory text that the Subdivision chapter contains rules and standards relating to subdivision of land within District-Wide Matters chapters (with explicit mention of the National Grid Corridor) and that the District-Wide Matters chapters contain the objectives and policies that also apply to any subdivision application. Transpower seeks a limited amendment to correct reference to the 'National Grid Subdivision Corridor' (consistent with the definition included in the Proposed District Plan). | Amend the introductory text to the Subdivision chapter as follows: "This chapter contains rules and standards relating to subdivision of land within District-Wide Matters chapters, such as the Coastal Environment, Natural Hazards, Natural Environments and the National Grid Subdivision Corridor. The District-Wide Matters chapters contain the objectives and policies that also apply to any subdivision application." |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R3 | S218.070 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Supports Rule SUB-R3 because the Rule appropriately recognises the unique characteristics of network utilities by providing for subdivision to accommodate network utilities as a controlled activity in a manner than does not impose minimum requirements | Retain Rule SUB-R3 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | that would otherwise apply to subdivisions for other purposes. | |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R11 | S218.071 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Transpower generally supports Rule SUB-R11. Transpower seeks a limited amendment to the Rule to change the title to refer to the National Grid Subdivision Corridor Including reference to 'subdivision' more clearly distinguishes the subdivision corridor from the National Grid Yard and is consistent with the associated definition. | Amend the title of Rule SUB-R11 as follows: "Subdivision of land in the National Subdivision Grid Corridor" |
| FC - Financial Contributions | Introduction | S218.072 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Transpower supports the introduction to the rules for financial contribution on the basis that the introductory text explicitly excludes an additional allotment solely for a network utility from attracting a district-wide infrastructure contribution or reserve financial contribution. | Retain the exclusion of an additional allotment solely for a network utility from the requirement for a financial contribution. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-P3 | S218.073 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Transpower supports ASW-P3 on the basis that the Policy to the extent that the policy does not prevent structures over the surface of the water where they have a functional or operational need for that location, including linear infrastructure. | Retain Policy ASW-P3 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O5 | S218.074 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Transpower supports Objective CE-O5 on the basis that the Objective recognises that subdivision, use and development of the coastal environment is not precluded where particularly values of coastal environment are not compromised. | Retain Objective CE-O5 as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P2 | S218.075 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Oppose | While the National Grid is not currently located in the coastal environment, it is possible that there may be a requirement for the National Grid to traverse the coastal environment in the future. It is important that the provisions of the Proposed District Plan do not preclude such future development of the National Grid. Transpower considers that 'seek to avoid' is an onerous but less absolute policy directive than the 'avoid' used in Policy CE-P2 this should be amended to give effect to the NPSET. | Amend Policy CE-P2 as follows: 'Avoid adverse effects from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development on the identified on the identified qualities, characteristics, and values of Outstanding Natural Character by: 1. only providing for conservation activities, and customary activities, and the National Grid where it has a functional need or operational need for its location; and or |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | 2. avoiding adverse effects on those qualities, characteristics, and values of any other activities. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P6 | S218.076 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Transpower supports the approach taken to infrastructure in some parts of the coastal environment through the inclusion of Policy CE-P6. Transpower seeks amendments to the Policy to give effect to the NPSET and achieve alignment with Policy CE-P3. | Amend Policy CE-P6 as follows: 'a. provide for the maintenance, repair, minor upgrading and removal of existing infrastructure in areas identified as Very High Natural Character; and b. Only allow new infrastructure and the substantial upgrade of existing infrastructure within areas identified as Very High and High Natural Character where: i. it has an operational need or functional need for the location; ii. it is designed to maintain the natural character values; an iii. any significant adverse effects on identified natural character values will be avoided where practicable and avoid, remedy, or mitigate any other adverse effects on the identified values described in Very High and High Natural Character all other effects will be avoided, and where this is not practicable, will be appropriately mitigated. ' |
| CE - Coastal Environment | | S218.077 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Oppose | While the Proposed District Plan includes explicit policy direction in relation to infrastructure in the coastal environment, this Policy is not implemented by any similarly explicit rules. Transpower notes that there are no National Grid assets currently located in | Amend the rules that apply in the Coastal Environment to enable the operation, maintenance and minor upgrading of infrastructure activities as a permitted activity and provide for major upgrades to and new |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | the coastal environment. That said, because the National Grid connects to electricity generation assets, it is possible that there will be a need for new National Grid assets in the coastal environment in circumstances where new electricity generation has a coastal location and requires a National Grid connection. | infrastructure as a discretionary activity. |
| SIGN - Signs | SIGN-P1 | S218.078 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Transpower supports Policy SIGN-p1 on the basis that the Policy 'allows' official signs. Such signs may include those that relate to the safety of people in the vicinity of the National Grid. | Retain Policy SIGN-P1 as notified. |
| SIGN - Signs | Introduction | S218.079 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Transpower supports the clear direction given in the introductory text that states that the provisions in the other Part 2: District Wide Matters chapters also apply to signs and must be compiled with, or resource consent sought. This approach means that signs must comply with the National Grid Yard rules and, as such, contributes to the Proposed District Plan giving effect to the NPSET. | Retain the introductory text that states that the provisions in the other Part 2: District Wide Matters chapters also apply signs as notified. |
| SIGN - Signs | SIGN-R3 | S218.080 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Transpower supports Rule SIGN-R3 on the basis that the Rule provides for official signs as a permitted activity in a manner that implements Policy SIGN-P1. Such signs may include those that relate to the safety of people in the vicinity of the National Grid. | Retain Rule Sign-R3 as notified. |
| TEMP - Temporary Activities | Introduction | S218.081 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Transpower supports the clear definition given in the introductory text that states that the provisions in the other Part 2: District Wide Matters chapters also apply to temporary activities and must be compiled with, or resource consent sought. This approach means that temporary activities must comply with the National Grid Yard rules and, as such, contributes to the Proposed District Plan giving effect to the NPSET. | Retain the introductory text. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O1 | S218.082 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Transpower supports Objective GRUZ-O1. | Retain Objective GRUZ-O1 as notified. Replicate "and other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located within the X Zone" or similar in the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | provisions for all other zones. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O2 | S218.083 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Transpower supports Objective GRUZ-O2, and particularly the recognition that the National Grid forms part of the character of the General Rural Zone in clause (e). | Retain Objective GRUZ-O2 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O4 | S218.084 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | While Transpower generally supports the inclusion of an Objective that enabled compatible activities in the General Rural Zone, Transpower is concerned that Objective GRUZ-O4 inappropriately gives priority to primary production over other activities that have a functional need or operational need for their location in the General Rural Zone. Transpower considers that, insofar as the Objective is relevant to the National Grid should be subject to (at least) the same priority in the General Rural Zone. Transpower considers that the General Rural Zone is generally the most appropriate location for the National Grid. For this reason, Transpower seeks that the Objective is amended to remove any suggestion of primacy. | Amend Objective GRUZ-O4 as follows: 'Primary production activities are enabled, and other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located within the General Rural Zone are enabled where they are not incompatible with primary production activities. ' |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P1 | S218.085 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | While Transpower generally supports GRUZ-P1. However, Transpower is concerned that the Policy inappropriately gives priority to primary production over other activities that have a functional or operational need for their location in the General Rural Zone. Transpower considers that, insofar as the Objective is relevant to the National Grid, the NPSET clearly establishes the importance of, and national significance of, the National Grid such that, the National Grid should be subject to (at least) the same priority in the General Rural Zone. Transpower considers that the General Rural Zone is generally the most appropriate location for the National Grid. For this reason, Transpower seeks that the Policy | Amend Policy GRUZ-P1 as follows: 'a. enable primary production activities that are compatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the General Rural Zone; x. Enable the operation, maintenance, upgrading, and development of nationally significant infrastructure that has a functional need or operational need to be located in the General Rural Zone; b. Provide for other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located in the General Rural Zone |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | is amended to remove any suggestion of primacy. | that are not incompatible with primary production.' |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-P3 | S218.086 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Oppose | While the Mangamaire - Masterton A 110kV transmission line is located in and traverses the General Industrial Zone, Policy GIZ-P3 would suggest that this existing use is inappropriate in the General Industrial Zone. Transpower is of the view that Policy GIZ-P3 should recognise the presence of the transmission line in the General Industrial Zone, and the need to operate, maintain, upgrade and develop the National Grid, as an appropriate use in order to give effect to the NPSET. | Amend Policy GIZ-P3 as follows: 'Avoid non-industrial activities in the General Rural Zone unless the activities: x. are the operation, maintenance, upgrading or development of the National Grid; a. are ancillary to an industrial activity; or ...' |
| NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone | NOSZ-P1 | S218.087 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Transpower generally supports Policy NOSZ-P1 to the extent that the Policy allows activities that are compatible with the values of the zone in the Natural Open Space Zone. Transpower notes that the National Grid traverses the Natural Open Space Zone in a number of locations. As such, it is considered that the purpose, character, and amenity values of the Zone have been identified cognisant of the presence of the existing transmission line. For this reason, Transpower considers that it is necessary and appropriate for Policy NOSZ-P1 to recognise the presence of the transmission line in the Zone, and the need to operate, maintain, and develop the National Grid as a compatible activity in order to give effect to Policies 1, 2 and 5 of the NPSET. | Amend Policy NOSZ-P1 as follows: 'Only allow activities, buildings, and structures that which are compatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the Natural Open Space Zone and are consistent with any applicable Reserve Management Plan or Conservation Management Strategy or Plan or is in the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid , while ensuring their design, scale, and intensity reflects the purpose, character, and amenity values of the Zone.' |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-P1 | S218.088 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Transpower generally supports Policy MPZ-P1 to an extent. However, Transpower considers that it is necessary and appropriate for Policy MPZ-P1 to recognise the presence of the transmission line in the Zone and the need to operate, maintain, upgrade and develop the National Grid as a compatible | Amend Policy MPZ-P1 as follows: 'Allow activities that are compatible with the role, function, and predominant character of the Māori Purpose Zone, including marae, papakāinga, customary use, cultural, the National Grid and small-scale commercial activities while ensuring |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | activity in order to give effect to Policies 1, 2, and 5 of the NPSET. | their scale, design, and intensity is appropriate in the Zone and the wider environmental context of the site.' |
| Planning Maps | Energy, Infrastructure and Transport | S218.089 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Transpower acknowledges that the Planning Maps shows the National Grid transmission lines in Wairarapa and notes that this is a requirement of Policy 12 of the NPSET. That said, Transpower is of the view that the Planning Map legend and notation is not consistent with the National Planning Standards. Transpower seeks the Planning Maps notation and legend be amended to show the National Grid as a solid black line with the legend rationalised to reflect the actual assets with the Wairarapa. Further, Transpower notes that Policy 12 of the NPSET requires all parts of the transmission network to be mapped and therefore, Transpower suggests that the Planning Map is revised to include all parts of the National Grid, including the Greytown and Masterton substations. | Amend the Planning Map to show all parts of the National Grid, including the Greytown and Masterton Substations. Amend the Planning Map to show the National Grid as a solid black line. Amend the Planning Maps legend to only list National Grid assets within the Wairarapa. |
| Planning Maps | Energy, Infrastructure and Transport | S218.090 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support in part | Transpower is generally neutral in respect of location and extent of various zones, areas, overlays and features shown on the Planning Map. However, Transpower's feedback is based on the location of zones and features shown on Planning Map as notified. Should the extent or location of the various zones, areas, overlays and features be revised in the vicinity of the National Grid, Transpower would have an interest in the relevant provisions and would seek that provisions that manage effects on, or enable the development of, the National Grid are extended within the new zones, areas, overlays, and features. | Retain the location and extent of zones, areas, overlays and features shown on the Planning Maps as notified. Alternatively, where amended in the vicinity of the National Grid, amend the relevant provisions to manage effects on, or enable the development of, the National Grid within the new zones, areas, overlays or features. |
| MPZ - Māori | MPZ-P1 | S87.001 | Tū Mai Rā Investments, | Support in part | It is not clear what would be permitted under the current wording, and especially how this | Amend to clarify what small scale commercial activities are. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|----------------|---|--|
| Purpose Zone | | | Rangitāne Tū Mai Rā Trust | | relates to educational and healthcare facilities. | |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R9 | S87.002 | Tū Mai Rā Investments, Rangitāne Tū Mai Rā Trust | Support | MPZ chapter is unclear around whether a resource consent would be required for visitor accommodation. MPZ-R9 states that residential visitor accommodation is permitted, but visitor accommodation is a restricted discretionary activity (requiring resource consent). | Amend MPZ-R9 to clarify the distinction between residential visitor accommodation and visitor accommodation. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R17 | S87.003 | Tū Mai Rā Investments, Rangitāne Tū Mai Rā Trust | Support | | Retain. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R18 | S87.004 | Tū Mai Rā Investments, Rangitāne Tū Mai Rā Trust | Support | Community facilities provide a wide array of benefits to the community, and specifically reflect many of the current and aspirational services provided by iwi groups. | Retain. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R19 | S87.005 | Tū Mai Rā Investments, Rangitāne Tū Mai Rā Trust | Support | Healthcare facilities are at the core of iwi community values and services, with Maori having significantly worse health outcomes currently. Reducing barriers to providing healthcare facilities can result in improving health outcomes. | Retain. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R21 | S87.006 | Tū Mai Rā Investments, Rangitāne Tū Mai Rā Trust | Amend | Aspects of the activities listed in MPZ-R17, MPZ-R18, and MPZ-R19 are commercial in part or total. MPZ-R21 requires commercial activities to have resource consent, which should be amended to exclude the above activities. | Amend MPZ-R21 to specifically exclude the activities listed under MPZ-R17, MPZ-R18, and MPZ-R19. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R4 | S87.007 | Tū Mai Rā Investments, Rangitāne Tū Mai Rā Trust | Support | Supporting the development of Papakainga on rural land will unlock considerable opportunities for Maori landowners and their whanau. This could lead to significantly improved housing for many Maori. | Retain. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-S3 | S87.008 | Tū Mai Rā Investments, Rangitāne Tū Mai Rā Trust | Oppose in part | On land with an underlying zone of residential, the ability to develop using the MPZ policies and rules will be severely reduced. The underlying setbacks should be the same as the zone the land is located on. Adverse impacts on neighbours from building height and bulk can be controlled using the rules on shading and planes. | Amend so that setback distances are no more restrictive than the underlying zone. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|---|
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-O1 | S87.009 | Tū Mai Rā Investments, Rangitāne Tū Mai Rā Trust | Support | Councils' are commended for their initiative to recognise the special nature of Maori land, and the aspirational outcomes that could be achieved. Councils' are also encouraged to work with iwi to fine tune the policies, rules, and standards of the MPZ, including what is on the list of land that the MPZ would apply to. This will further support the development of Maori land to fully enable a wide range of social, cultural, and economic development opportunities that support the occupation, use, development, and ongoing relationship with ancestral land. | Amend to further improve the MPZ. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-P1 | S87.010 | Tū Mai Rā Investments, Rangitāne Tū Mai Rā Trust | Support in part | There is no mention of a minimum lot size for subdivision in the MPZ. Questions whether this means that the underlying zone minimum lot size will apply to subdivision. This should be clarified as it could limit the options for papakāinga and residential development as a permitted activity. | Amend to clarify how this relates to minimum permitted lot size for residential and Papakainga developments. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-R1 | S87.011 | Tū Mai Rā Investments, Rangitāne Tū Mai Rā Trust | Amend | Need to ensure that the MPZ does not result in any rules being more restrictive than the underlying zone. | Amend provision to state that where policies or rules in the MPZ are more restrictive than the underlying zone policies and rules, the more permissive apply. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-O1 | S150.001 | Tupurupuru | Support in part | The submitter expresses concern that the rules and regulations for Māori land under the jurisdiction of the Māori Land Court will change under the Māori Purpose Zone. This includes unused Māori land which is unattractive for commercial renters and therefore is currently unratable, and well as Papakainga built on Tupurupuru land. | No decision requested. |
| MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone | MPZ-O2 | S153.001 | Tupurupuru Ahuwhenua Trust | Support in part | The submission requests answers on several questions that relate, but not directly, to District Plan provisions including power sources, consents, working days. | No decision requested. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | | S129.001 | Vern and Jocelyn Brasell | Amend | The submitter believes the selection of future growth areas do not clearly consider small blocks of land which can be used to form a cohesive urban area making use of existing | Amend the District Plan to ensure that the urban growth area options consider small property adjustments in favour of high productivity land, particularly where they |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|---|---|
| | | | | | infrastructure and avoid over-reliance on high class soils. | connect to existing infrastructure. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S129.002 | Vern and Jocelyn Brasell | Amend | The submitter infers that their land meets growth area objectives as it easily integrated into identified growth areas with existing road infrastructure and services already in place, low to no flood risk, in keeping with the character of Greytown. | Amend to re-zone front of submitters property at 1 North Street, Greytown from General Rural to General Residential Zone. |
| Tangata Whenua | | S28.001 | Victoria Jane Stanbridge | Support | Supports the inclusion and recognition of Tangata Whenua. Submitter states that the content of this section is valuable to the wider community to learn about and recognise the ongoing occupation of Tangata Whenua in the Wairarapa and their connections to their rohe. | Retain the Tangata Whenua chapter in the District Plan. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | | S28.002 | Victoria Jane Stanbridge | Support | Supports the inclusion of SASM - Sites and areas of significance to Māori, and the inclusion of information about mana whenua and iwi connections with their rohe. | Retain SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S28.003 | Victoria Jane Stanbridge | Support | Supports the proposed zoning at Riversdale beach as it recognises and protects the existing character and amenity values of Riversdale within its existing footprint, and protects it against uncontrolled further development/ expansion. | Retain extent of SETZ - Settlement Zone at Riversdale Beach as proposed. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S28.004 | Victoria Jane Stanbridge | Support | Supports the proposed NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zoning at Riversdale Beach as proposed. | Retain extent of NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zoning at Riversdale Beach as proposed. |
| Planning Maps | Natural Environment Values | S28.005 | Victoria Jane Stanbridge | Support | Supports the CE- Coastal Environment overlay at Riversdale Beach. | Retain extent of CE- Coastal Environment at Riversdale Beach as proposed. |
| ENG - Energy | | S286.001 | Vida McDonald | Oppose | Supports the submission made by the South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group (SWWAG). | Amend provisions as requested in the submission by SWWAG (Submission number 207). |
| Planning Maps | Hazards and Risks | S123.001 | Waipoua Catchment Community Group | Not Stated | Considers the flood hazard maps are the result of intensive hydrological research and hydraulic modelling of a wide variety of conditions and is supported by the submitters' own research. Notes they will work with iwi and consult with the community to develop a range of design opportunities to reduce flood | None requested. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|---|------------------|--|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | hazards. Considers critical assets should not be located in a defined flood hazard zone. | |
| SCHED7 - Schedule of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features | Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes | S15.001 | Wairarapa and Norsewood Estate Limited | Amend | The Taipo Minor/Rocky Hills Sanctuary (ONFL7) on the property at Craigie Lee Road (Lots 2 4 6 7 DP 302340 310299 LOT 1 DP) - Lot 1 DP 310299 may have an incorrect reference and should be amended if incorrect. | Amend SCHED7 Outstanding Natural Landscape and features to confirm correct title is listed for Taipo Minor/Rocky Hills Sanctuary (ONFL7) on the property at Craigie Lee Road. |
| SCHED7 - Schedule of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features | Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes | S15.002 | Wairarapa and Norsewood Estate Limited | Amend | This assessment has identified the Taipo Minor/Rocky Hills Sanctuary on the property at Te Wharau Road (LOT 4 DP 503510 LOT 1 DP 48891 SECS 8-11) - these land title references may be incorrect and need to be reviewed. | Amend SCHED7 Outstanding Natural Landscape and features to confirm correct title is listed for Taipo Minor/Rocky Hills Sanctuary (ONFL7) on the property at Te Wharau Road. |
| SCHED10 - Schedule of Very High and High Natural Character Areas | Very High and High Natural Character | S15.003 | Wairarapa and Norsewood Estate Limited | Amend | This assessment has identified the Honeycomb Shoreline (HNC8) on the property at 971 Glenburn Road - the land title references may be incorrect and need to be reviewed. | Amend SCHED10 Very High and High Natural Character Areas to confirm the correct title is listed for Honeycomb Shoreline (HNC8). |
| ENG - Energy | | S284.001 | Wairarapa Eco Farm | Oppose | Supports the submission made by the South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group (SWWAG). | Amend provisions as requested in the submission by SWWAG (Submission number 207). |
| Planning Maps | Natural Environment Values | S136.001 | Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc | Support | The soils covered by the overlay are well suited to viticulture and should be protected. However, there may be some specific land areas where the soils overlay is not justified. This could be assessed on a case by case basis. | Retain Proposed Martinborough Soils Overlay. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O1 | S136.002 | Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc | Support in part | Given that the definition of primary production does not cover "viticulture" and viticulture is not "horticulture" (which is covered by the definition of primary production), viticulture should be specifically referred to in the objective. | Amend Objective GRUZ-O1 as follows: "The General Rural Zone is used primarily for primary production, activities that support primary production, and other activities, including viticulture , that have a functional need or operational need to |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | be located within the General Rural Zone." |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O2 | S136.003 | Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc | Support in part | Supports the emphasis on maintaining and enhancing the predominant character and amenities of the GRUZ, which, for significant parts of the region, especially in and around the vicinity of Martinborough, and in the Te Muna Valley, are heavily reliant on the ongoing viability of viticulture; but requests an amendment to clause (b). to specifically reference viticulture. | Amend Objective GRUZ-O2 clause (b) as follows "... b. sparsely developed landscape with open space between buildings that are predominantly used for agricultural, pastoral, viticultural and horticultural activities (e.g. barns and sheds), low density rural living (e.g. farmhouses, seasonal worker accommodation, and a small degree of rural living (e.g. farmhouses, seasonal worker accommodation, and a small degree of rural lifestyle), and community activities (e.g. rural halls, domains and schools); ..." |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-O7 | S136.004 | Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc | Support | Viticulture and associated activities around 'wine tourism' are essential to Martinborough's future 'sustainability'; and soils suitable for viticulture (i.e. "land with special characteristics") should be recognised (as intended by the Martinborough Soils Overlay) and protected. | Retain Objective GRUZ-O7 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P2 | S136.005 | Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc | Support in part | Supports avoiding activities and development that will result in a fragmentation of land, especially land suitable for viticulture. However, clause (c) should be amended to specifically reference viticulture. | Amend Policy GRUZ-P2 as follows: "... c. will result in reverse sensitivity effects and/or conflict with permitted activities in the General Rural Zone including primary production, viticulture , and ancillary activities. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|--|
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P3 | S136.006 | Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc | Support in part | Supports policy, however, clauses (c) and (d) should be amended to specifically reference viticulture. | Amend Policy GRUZ-P3 as follows: "... c. enabling primary production, viticulture , and ancillary activities; d. providing for varying forms, scale, and separation of structures associated with primary production activities, including viticulture ; ..." |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P4 | S136.007 | Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc | Support in part | Supports avoiding small-lot subdivision in the GRUZ, subdivision that would compromise the ability to use land within the Martinborough Soils Overlay for viticulture. However an amendment needs to be made to clause (a) to specifically reference viticulture. | Amend Policy GRUZ-P4 as follows: "Avoid subdivision in the General Rural Zone that will result in sites that are of a size, scale, or location that is contrary to the anticipated purpose, character, amenity values of the zone, by; a. limiting small lot subdivision within the General Rural Zone to area where there is limited productive potential and where it does not compromise the use of land for primary production activities, including viticulture ; and ..." |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P7 | S136.008 | Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc | Support | Supports the policy and the specific reference to "including viticulture" in clause b. | Retain Policy GRUZ-P7 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-P8 | S136.009 | Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc | Support | Supports the policy and the specific reference to "in particular viticulture" in clause a." | Retain Policy GRUZ-P8 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R4 | S136.010 | Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc | Support in part | Supports Rule, however, it needs amendment to include specific reference to viticulture. | Amend Rule GRUZ-R4 as follows: "1. Activity status: Permitted Where: ... b. Is used primarily to meet labour requirements for land based primary production activity, including viticulture ; ..." |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | e. The seasonal worker accommodation building is not located on highly productive land or the Martinborough Soils Overlay, except where the accommodation is for seasonal workers associated with viticulture. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R5 | S136.011 | Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc | Support in part | Viticulture needs to be specifically referenced in GRUZ-R5. The National Planning Standard definition of "Primary Production" adopted by the WCDP, does not specifically include viticulture, and, viticulture is not a 'subset' of horticulture which is included in the definition. Viticulture has very different characteristics and soil requirements. | Amend Rule GRUZ-R5 as follows: "GRUZ-R5 Primary production, including viticulture (excluding quarrying activities, intensive primary production, and rural industry. 1. Activity status: Permitted" |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R8 | S136.012 | Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc | Support | Supports clause (b) restricting residential activities in the Martinborough Soils Overlay. Protection of sites within the Martinborough Soils Overlay from intensive residential development is essential to the future viability of viticulture. There is sufficient appropriately zoned land for a full range of residential activities within the General Residential Zone and the Future Urban Zone. | Retain Rule GRUZ-R8 as notified. |
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-R15 | S136.013 | Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc | Oppose in part | Considers that visitor accommodation under GRUZ-R15 should not be established (as a discretionary activity) within the Martinborough Soils Overlay. Considers that there would be many suitable sites elsewhere, including the General Rural Zone not subject to the Martinborough Soils Overlay that would be suitable for visitor accommodation. Requests an additional rule that stipulates that visitor accommodation within the Martinborough Soils Overlay is a non-complying activity. | Amend Rule GRUZ-R15 as follows: "GRUZ-R15 Visitor accommodation (excluding residential visitor accommodation) 1. Activity status: Discretionary Where:a. the site is not located within the Martinborough Soils Overlay2. Activity status: Non-complying Where:a. the site is located within the Martinborough Soils Overlay." |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | GRUZ-S3 | S136.014 | Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc | Support in part | Consideration needs to be given to the location and visual amenity of seasonal worker accommodation buildings, especially on the principal 'gateway' roads leading into and around Martinborough. Such buildings should be positioned so that they do not dominate the viticulture landscape. Considers that the proposed 10m setback on a front road boundary of sealed roads may not always be sufficient to protect the visual amenity of Martinborough's gateways. Therefore, requests that an amendment be made in regard to Matters of discretion 1. | Amend Standard GRUZ-S3 as follows: "... Matters of discretion: 1. The extent to which building design, siting, including building setback from any front road boundary , and external appearance adversely impacts on rural character and amenity. ..." |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P5 | S136.015 | Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc | Support in part | Supports subdivision where it does not compromise the purpose, character and amenity values of the GRUZ, but requests an amendment to clause (c) and clause (d) to specifically reference viticulture. | Amend Policy SUB-P5 as follows: "... b. enabling and promoting a productive working landscape; c. enabling primary production and ancillary activities, including viticulture ; d. providing for varying forms, scale, and separation of structures associated with primary production activities, including viticulture ; ..." |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P6 | S136.016 | Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc | Support in part | Supports the intention to avoid subdivision of land suitable for viticulture (Martinborough Soils Overlay) into parcels too small to enable viable viticulture and requests an amendment to the policy to specifically reference viticulture. | Amend Policy SUB-P6 as follows: "... a. limiting small lot subdivision within the General Rural Zone to only areas where the soil resource is fragmented, is not located on highly productive land, and it does not compromise the use of land for primary production activities including viticulture ; and b. avoiding the cumulative..." |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-R4 | S136.017 | Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc | Support | Supports the specific reference to the Martinborough Soils Overlay in clause (b). | Retain Rule SUB-R4 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|---|------------------|--|----------------|--|--|
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB - Table 1 | S136.018 | Wairarapa Winegrowers' Association Inc | Oppose in part | Generally supportive of the 40ha minimum lot size to apply in the GRUZ; however, it nevertheless requests that within the Martinborough Soils Overlay provision should be made for a 4ha minimum allotment size where the subdivision is for viticulture activities. The reality is that for smaller 'boutique' vineyards, which are a strong feature of Martinborough's wine industry, 40ha is simply too large an area. The 4ha lot size requested is essentially a 'rollover' of the 4ha that applies under the Operative District Plan (Section 20.1.2) for subdivision in the Rural (Special) Zone. | Amend SUB Table 1 - Minimum lot sizes by adding to the right hand column: 4ha in the Martinborough Soils Overlay where the allotment will be used for viticulture activities. |
| Tangata Whenua | Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi | S194.001 | Warren Cooper | Oppose | The submission states that despite the fact that consultation hui were held, the information provided on how lands owned or administered by individuals, whānau, marae, land trusts etc, the process of opt-in and opt-out was very contentious and speculative. The involvement of the Māori Land Court (MLC) in relation to opting in of all lands under their jurisdiction was not made clear until the last consultation hui held on 10 December 2023. Representatives of MLC should have been involved with the series of consultation and more so, needed to seek permission direct with Māori o Wairarapa in regard to the Māori Purpose Zone opt -in or out, kaupapa. The combined Wairarapa Councils breached Te Tiriti i.e. Article 2 - not enabling tangata whenua to participate in decision making and solely relying on advice of MLC & Article 3 equitable opportunity to opt-in or out of Māori Purpose Zone opposed to determining just the opt-in advice from MLC. | Amend the consultation period to afford tangatawhenua o Wairapapa time to communicate with their whānau and beneficiaries that reside within and outside of Wairarapa. To enable this process to occur, extending the submission date for tangata whenua and to engage with both the Māori Land Court o Takitimu and Combined Wairarapa District Council representatives is requested. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S64.001 | Warren Reiri | Amend | To keep a Mangaakuta marae as was before where my tipuna lived, it was the oldest marae around the area. | Amend the Plan to keep the Mangaakuta marae (98 Te Whiti Road) Special Rural Zone / Primary Production Zone instead of the proposed Māori Purpose Zone (inferred). |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|--|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S64.002 | Warren Reiri | Amend | I lived at this address many years and whanau before me. They have changed the name of the road 3 times and none of the names have anything to do with this area. | Amend the Plan to change the name of (Te Whiti Road) to Mangaakutu Road from (Makoura) College to Pokohiwi Road (inferred). |
| SCHED4 - Schedule of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | S64.003 | Warren Reiri | Not Stated | There was a marae up by the dump and a urupa on Nursery Road, and the road was put through the urupa | Amend the Plan to clear the area and put memorials for the 'marae' located near the Masterton Recycling Centre and the 'urupa' located on Nursery Road (inferred). |
| Designations | | S64.004 | Warren Reiri | Amend | Address changed 3 times with no connection to the area. The area is named "mangaakuta". This should be the name of the road from the boundary to the Makoura Stream Bridge. | Amend the Plan to change the name of (Te Whiti Road) to Mangaakutu Road from 98 Te Whiti Road to Makoura Stream Bridge (inferred). |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S64.005 | Warren Reiri | Amend | Submission discusses housing storage and going into business to help my whanau. | Amend Plan to allow housing development on Mangaakuta marae (98 Te Whiti Road) (inferred). |
| ENG - Energy | | S274.001 | Warren Woodgyer | Oppose | Supports the submission made by the South Wairarapa Whenua Advisory Group (SWWAG). | Amend provisions as requested in the submission by SWWAG (Submission number 207). |
| Strategic Direction | CCR-O2 | S186.001 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support in part | Climate change and resilience adaptations integrate resilience with restoration and protection of the natural environment, including freshwater, and allow for new modalities such as giving rivers room to move as knowledge and technology become known into the future. | Amend CCR-O2 to also include reference to the integration of resilience with restoration and protection of the natural environment. |
| Strategic Direction | CCR-O4 | S186.002 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support in part | Strongly encourage CCR-O4 just needs the word "which" added. | Amend CCR-O4 to read "Land use activities which support and enhance water resilience and adaptive management is encouraged." |
| Strategic Direction | NE-O1 | S186.003 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support this provision. | Retain as notified. |
| Strategic Direction | NE-O3 | S186.004 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Strategic Direction | NE-O5 | S186.005 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support in part | Support with amendments, and include stakeholders in the provision and in consultation policies, as stakeholders often have a wealth of knowledge and expertise developed over time. | Amend NE-O5 as follows: "...in collaboration with tangata whenua, the community, stakeholders , and other government entities." |
| Strategic Direction | NE-O5 | S186.006 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support in part | Valued introduced species such as trout and their habitats have legislative protections, which can often lead to improvements for indigenous freshwater species. | "The biological diversity of indigenous and valued introduced species and habitats within the Wairarapa are maintained and enhanced, and restored where degraded. |
| Strategic Direction | RE-O3 | S186.007 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Neutral | It is important to allow for flexibility in planning and forward thinking to preserve land integrity. This could include options such as giving rivers more room to move, allowing floodplain recharge and river inputs to land to increase soil health without extensive inputs of nutrients and fertilizers. Highly productive land is a vital resource; however it is important to allow flexibility for future land use technology and culture changes. | No specific change requested. |
| Strategic Direction | INF-O1 | S186.008 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Not Stated | Ensure there is a focus on managing the potential adverse effects of infrastructure on the environment, and that reverse sensitivity issues do not prevent environmental restoration projects. | No decision requested. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-O2 | S186.009 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support objective. | Retain as notified. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P2 | S186.010 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support in part | If there is a functional need for the activity to occur, then the effects management hierarchy should be embedded in this clause as a directive for future consent pathway as per the NPSFM 2020 3.21. | Amend ENG-P2 to account for activities that may have a functional need to occur, via an effects management hierarchy. |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P3 | S186.011 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support in part | To give effect to the RMA, NBEA, and the NPS-FM (2020), plans also need to provide for protections of habitat of trout spawning and trout fishery rivers | Amend ENG-P3(h) as follows: "...h. potential for adverse effects on natural features and landscapes, waterbodies, indigenous biodiversity, trout habitat and trout spawning habitat , historic |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | heritage, and sites of significance to Māori..." |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P4 | S186.012 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support in part | To give effect to the RMA, NBEA, and the NPS-FM (2020), plans also need to provide for protections of habitat of trout spawning and trout fishery rivers. | Amend ENG-P4 (i) as follows: "...i. potential for adverse effects on natural features and landscapes, waterbodies, indigenous biodiversity, trout habitat and trout spawning habitat , historic heritage, and sites of significance to Māori." |
| ENG - Energy | ENG-P5 | S186.013 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Not Stated | Reverse sensitivity concerns should not be used to disallow improvements to land use activities which will lease to improved environmental outcomes. | No decision requested. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-O2 | S186.014 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Amend | Where there is a functional need for infrastructure and supporting activities to occur in certain locations and times, then the consequent adverse environmental impacts should be avoided, remedied, mitigated, or minimised using the effects management hierarchy and best practice. | No decision requested. |
| NU - Network Utilities | NU-P5 | S186.015 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Not Stated | Where there is a functional need for infrastructure and supporting activities to occur in certain locations and times, then the consequent adverse environmental impacts should be avoided, remedied, mitigated, or minimised using the effects management hierarchy and best practice. | No decision requested. |
| TR - Transport | TR-O2 | S186.016 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support objective. | Retain as notified. |
| TR - Transport | TR-P6 | S186.017 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support Policy. | Retain as notified. |
| CL - Contaminated Land | CL-O1 | S186.018 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support in part | Contaminated land also needs to be managed so it does not contribute to pollution of further environments, particularly freshwater. | Amend to include reference to managing contaminated land so it does not contribute further to the pollution of the environment and fresh water. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | HAZ-O1 | S186.019 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | "Minimised" appears to not be strongly directive enough to speak to the Drinking Water value of the NPS-FM 2020. Hazardous substances should not impact on drinking water quality. | Amend HAZ-O1 (b) to take away the term "minimised" and replace with stronger wording. |
| HAZ - Hazardous Substances | HAZ-P1 | S186.020 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support Policy. | Retain as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-O1 | S186.021 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support objective. | Retain as notified. |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P8 | S186.022 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support in part | Needs provision for environmental health. | Amend NH-P8 (3) as follows: "...3. the risk to properties, activities, the environment , and people is not increased..." |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P9 | S186.023 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support in part | To provide for environmental health as far as practicable. | Amend NH-P9 (2) as follows: "...2. the risk to properties, activities, the environment , and people is not increased..." |
| NH - Natural Hazards | NH-P10 | S186.024 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Neutral | Noting giving effect to Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM (2020). | Amend to give effect to Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM (2020), and activities which degrade the ecosystem and mauri of the waterbody (such as gravel extraction, ripping and raking, and control and command flood works) should be minimised where possible and better solutions for people and communities to co-exist with waterways should be actively explored now and into the future |
| ECO - Ecosystems and | ECO-O1 | S186.025 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support objective. | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Indigenous Biodiversity | | | | | | |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-O2 | S186.026 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support objective. | Retain as notified. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P1 | S186.027 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support in part | Include stakeholders in this consultation policy, as stakeholders often have a wealth of knowledge developed over time. | Amend ECO-P1 as follows: "Coordinate with other agencies, stakeholders , and organisations..." |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P4 | S186.028 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support in part | This ensures greater protection for areas with significant indigenous vegetation and habitats. | Insert a clause, where is a functional need for inappropriate subdivision, land use, and development to be located in an area of significant indigenous vegetation or habitat, then the consequent adverse environmental impacts should be avoided, remedied, mitigated or minimised using the effects management hierarchy and best practice. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P5 | S186.029 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support policy. | Retain as notified. |
| ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity | ECO-P6 | S186.030 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support policy. | Retain as notified. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-O1 | S186.031 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support objective. | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P1 | S186.032 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support policy. | Retain as notified. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P2 | S186.033 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support policy. | Retain as notified. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P3 | S186.034 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Oppose in part | So maintenance also does not contribute to degradation of waterbodies, adding that any 'more-than-minor' adverse effects should be avoided or mitigated. Allowing for 'remedy' of adverse effects could prove detrimental to the environment, as some adverse effects (loss of habitat or species, for example), are unable to be remedied. | Amend NATC-P3: Insert the clauses from NATC-P4 to this policy. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P4 | S186.035 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support in part | Any 'more-than-minor' adverse effects should be avoided or mitigated. Allowing for 'remedy' of adverse effects could prove detrimental to the environment, as some adverse effects (loss of habitat or species, for example), are unable to be remedied. | Amend NATC-P4 to include that any effects that are more than minor should be avoided or mitigated (not remedied). |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P5 | S186.036 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support in part | To further protect the environment. If there is a functional need for the activity to occur, then the effects management hierarchy should be embedded in this clause as a directive for future consent pathway as per the NPS-FM 2020 3.21. | Insert a clause for the effects management hierarchy. |
| NATC - Natural Character | NATC-P6 | S186.037 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support in part | Any 'more-than-minor' adverse effects should be avoided or mitigated. Allowing for 'remedy' of adverse effects could prove detrimental to the environment, as some adverse effects (loss of habitat or species, for example), are unable to be remedied. | Amend NATC-P6 to include mention that any more than minor effects should be avoided or mitigated (not remedied). |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes | NFL-O1 | S186.038 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support Objective. | Retain as notified. |
| NFL - Natural Features and | NFL-O2 | S186.039 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support Objective. | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| Landscape s | | | | | | |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscape s | NFL-P3 | S186.040 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support in part | <p>Any 'more-than-minor' adverse effects should be avoided or mitigated. Allowing for 'remedy' of adverse effects could prove detrimental to the environment, as some adverse effects (loss of habitat or species, for example), are unable to be remedied.</p> <p>If there is a functional need for the activity to occur, then the effects management hierarchy should be embedded in this clause as a directive for future consent pathway as per the NPSFM 2020 3.21</p> | Amend NFL-P3 to include that any more than minor effect should be avoided or mitigated (not remedied). If there is a functional need for the activity to occur, include reference to the effects management heirarchy. |
| NFL - Natural Features and Landscape s | NFL-P5 | S186.041 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support in part | <p>To further protect the environment. If there is a functional need for the activity to occur, then the effects management hierarchy should be embedded in this clause as a directive for future consent pathway as per the NPS-FM 2020 3.21.</p> | Insert a clause for the effects management hierarchy. |
| PA - Public Access | PA-O1 | S186.042 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support Objective. | Retain as notified. |
| PA - Public Access | PA-P1 | S186.043 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support Policy. | Retain as notified. |
| PA - Public Access | PA-P2 | S186.044 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support policy. | Retain as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O1 | S186.045 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support objective. | Retain as notified. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-O2 | S186.046 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Neutral | Further protection of the environment. | No decision requested. Submitter notes Council staff will need to be resourced to monitor and managefor consent compliance regarding waste and stormwaterconsent conditions. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB-P3 | S186.047 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support policy. | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| FC - Financial Contributions | FC-O1 | S186.048 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support, and require transparency to show that financial contributions are being allocated towards projects that directly protect, maintain, and restore the environment as needed. | Retain as notified. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-O1 | S186.049 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support Objective. | Retain as notified. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-P1 | S186.050 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support Policy. | Retain as notified. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-P2 | S186.051 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support policy. | Retain as notified. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-P3 | S186.052 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support policy. | Retain as notified. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-P4 | S186.053 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support policy. | Retain as notified. |
| ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water | ASW-P5 | S186.054 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support policy. | Retain as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-O1 | S186.055 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support objective. | Retain as notified. |
| CE - Coastal | CE-O2 | S186.056 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support objective. | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Environment | | | | | | |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P2 | S186.057 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support | Support policy. | Retain as notified. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P3 | S186.058 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support in part | <p>Any 'more-than-minor' adverse effects should be avoided or mitigated. Allowing for 'remedy' of adverse effects could prove detrimental to the environment, as some adverse effects (loss of habitat or species, for example), are unable to be remedied.</p> <p>If there is a functional need for the activity to occur, then the effects management hierarchy should be embedded in this clause as a directive for future consent pathway as per the NPSFM 2020 3.21.</p> | Amend CE-P3 to include that any more than minor adverse effects shall be avoided or mitigated (not remedied). Insert an effects management hierarchy into the clause if there is a functional need for the activity to occur. |
| CE - Coastal Environment | CE-P4 | S186.059 | Wellington Fish and Game Council | Support in part | <p>Any 'more-than-minor' adverse effects should be avoided or mitigated. Allowing for 'remedy' of adverse effects could prove detrimental to the environment, as some adverse effects (loss of habitat or species, for example), are unable to be remedied.</p> <p>If there is a functional need for the activity to occur, then the effects management hierarchy should be embedded in this clause as a directive for future consent pathway as per the NPSFM 2020 3.21.</p> | Amend CE-P4 to include that more than minor adverse effects, shall be avoided or mitigated rather than remedied. Insert the effects management hierarchy into the clause, for activities with a functional need. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S202.001 | Woolworths New Zealand Limited | Support | The submitter supports the application of the Town Centre Zone to the Countdown Masterton site of Workshop Road, Dixon Street and surrounding sites. | Retain as proposed. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S202.002 | Woolworths New Zealand Limited | Amend | The PDP has removed the operative split zoning of Industrial and Town centre (refer Figure 2 overleaf) but has proposed to retain residential zoning over the long established supermarket car park and part of the building all of which are related to the supermarket activity on the wider site. The zoning should reflect this established and consented use. | Amend the zoning at the FreshChoice site at Haswell Street in Greytown from General Residential/Town Centre to Town Centre. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>Appropriate boundary interface controls relative to the adjacent residential zoning can continue to occur, either as consented and implemented, or through application of the PDP's proposed boundary controls - which include height in relation to boundary relative to the Residential zone (TCZ-S2), setbacks of 3m to the boundary with the Residential zone (TCZ-S3), fence height not exceeding 1.8m as a permitted activity adjacent the Residential zone (TCZ-S4), screening of outdoor storage or service areas (TCZ-S6).</p> <p>Alongside zone provisions, the PDP appropriately continues to implement general amenity standards in relation to glare, noise and other nuisance effects, all of which will contribute to ensuring an appropriate interface between residential and commercial zone boundaries in this instance.</p> | |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S202.005 | Woolworths New Zealand Limited | Support | The submitter supports the Town Centre zoning of the SuperValue site at 42 Fitzherbert Street, Featherston. | Retain as notified. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | | S202.006 | Woolworths New Zealand Limited | Support | The submitter supports supermarkets being a permitted activity in the Town Centre Zone. Considers that the PDP should be enabling of supermarket development within the District. This reflects the widely accepted approach that recognises the importance of supermarkets in communities to assist in delivering well-functioning urban environments, where such activities are conveniently located relative to the catchments they serve. | Retain as notified. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S202.007 | Woolworths New Zealand Limited | Support | The submitter supports the PDP in that where activities infringe identified standards, a restricted discretionary activity consent status is appropriate. This is because the effects of such infringements can be assessed in a more targeted way. Such assessments in the consenting framework can therefore be | Retain as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | comfortably limited in discretion for certainty and proportionality. | |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-S7 | S202.008 | Woolworths New Zealand Limited | Support | <p>The submitter supports the PDP's recognition of the operational and functional requirements in the assessment criteria in relation to Standard TCZ-S7. This standard seeks that new buildings, or additions or alterations to a building on an active street frontage in the Town Centre zone should meet core activation and articulation requirements listed in the standard.</p> <p>Supermarkets, by their function and associated form, may require facades that cannot achieve compliance with this standard (addressed further below). Therefore, assessment criterion 4 enables the decision-maker to consider the operational and functional requirements of the activity that might influence compliance or otherwise. The operational and functional requirements for supermarkets can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Store visibility from the street and surrounding area. b) Where provided, customer car parking is clearly visible and accessible to motorists approaching the store from the local roading network and to customers on site. c) Where large format buildings are required, there is provision for some solid facades to facilitate internal shelving and fresh produce display (the latter having regard to the potential adverse effects on produce arising from solar gain through extensive glazing). d) Adequate, safe and accessible servicing areas that are preferably separated from customer vehicle traffic and pedestrian movements in accordance with health and safety obligations, and for amenity reasons. | Retain as proposed. |
| Appendix 3 - Centres | Centres Design Guide | S202.009 | Woolworths New Zealand Limited | Oppose | The Centres Design Guide that has been notified with the PDP is anticipated to be used to "assist with the assessment of a proposal" | Amend so that the importance of operational and functional requirements is elevated in the Design Guide or PDP assessment criteria; |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Design Guide | | | | | in meeting the objectives, policies and assessment criteria, and is referenced throughout the PDP accordingly. The submitter does not support this approach. It results in a statutory status by reference and/or proxy compliance with the Design Guide is required in order to be considered consistent with the PDP provisions. There should be a trigger in respect of the scale of development that is required to carry out a design assessment relative to the Design Guide - i.e. wholesale redevelopment of existing buildings or new buildings over a certain gross floor area, rather than any and all additions and alterations or minor schemes. | OR thereference to Design Guides within the PDP assessment criteria is deleted, andinstead the Councils publish and promote consideration of the Design Guide outside the statutory assessment framework. |
| Planning Maps | Precincts | S130.001 | Xavier Warne | Oppose | Considers the areas identified for Low Density Residential Precinct (LDRP) are not uniquely different from Featherston, Carterton or other areas in Masterton. Protection of some neighborhoods not justified and the LDRP may increase rising housing unaffordability. | Delete the Low Density Residential Precinct from the planning maps. |
| Strategic Direction | New provision request | S130.002 | Xavier Warne | Support in part | Considers the Plan needs to respond to housing unaffordability and is an opportunity to enable more abundant, diverse, and affordable homes for the Wairarapa. The Plan needs to articulate the importance of housing supply and affordability through objectives, notably existing character and amenity. | Insert strategic direction objective(s) that address housing supply, affordability, and existing character and amenity. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-R1 | S130.003 | Xavier Warne | Amend | Considers the limit on the number of units is unnecessary and do not support mixed use development, which provides benefits for vibrancy, walkability, and liveability of the city centre, and housing affordability. Other matters provide adequate control to address specific identified problems. | Amend TCZ-R2 to remove limit on number of units in order to support mixed use development. |
| Whole Plan | Whole Plan | S130.004 | Xavier Warne | Amend | Affordable housing is critical. Housing affordability pressures are increasingly being felt in the Wairarapa. The Wairarapa Combined District Plan is an important tool to recognise and respond to the severity of this issue. | Amend the Plan to enable more housing and a wider variety of housing. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|----------|--|---|
| MUZ - Mixed Use Zone | MUZ-R1 | S130.005 | Xavier Warne | Amend | Considers the limit on the number of units is unnecessary and do not support mixed use development, which provides benefits for vibrancy, walkability, and liveability of the city centre, and housing affordability. Other matters provide adequate control to address specific identified problems. | Amend MUZ-R1 to remove limit on number of units in order to support mixed use development. |
| SUB - Subdivision | SUB - Table 1 | S130.006 | Xavier Warne | Amend | Unclear why there is a minimum lot size given other rules account for building bulk and form, neighbourhood character, access to open space, financial contributions, and provision of infrastructure. Considers infrastructure capacity constraints are not a reason to have minimum lot sizes given SUB-P2 already requires consideration of existing and planned infrastructure. Considers having a minimum lot size does not provide certainty for landowners enquiring about subdivision given a consent process is always necessary. | Amend SUB Table 1 to remove minimum lot sizes, or significantly reduce minimum lot sizes. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-O1 | S130.007 | Xavier Warne | Amend | Considers the objective should clearly link residential zone to meet demand for housing. Amend to more explicitly denote that variety includes types of housing, homes that are affordable for different income levels, and homes in locations that meet different needs. | Amend GRZ-O1: The purpose of the General Residential Zone primarily consists of is predominately to meet demand for residential activities that cater for a variety of housing needs (including typologies, price points and locations) that integrate with existing or planned reticulated infrastructure. |
| Strategic Direction | UFD-O2 | S130.008 | Xavier Warne | Amend | Considers the objective should reflect the fact that current needs, not only future needs, may not be met. Considers Council should be proactively planning for anticipated housing demand, not just responding. Update to reflect the National Policy Statement - Urban Development, Objective 4. | Amend UFD-O2: The Wairarapa's urban areas grown in a planned, efficient, and structured way to meet current and future needs in a proactive responsive -manner that: ... 3. is compatible with the character and amenity of the urban areas, recognising that amenity values, develop and change over time in |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities, and future generations. |
| TR - Transport | Introduction | S130.009 | Xavier Warne | Support in part | Supports transport choice from an affordability and cost of living perspective and considers the Wairarapa should take the cost of infrastructure and private transport seriously. | Amend the TR - Transport chapter to remove assumptions of travel by car and more consistently reflect stated objectives across rules and standards to encourage a mix of transport options. |
| TR - Transport | TR-S16 | S130.010 | Xavier Warne | Amend | Considers removal of car parking requirements should be extended to all three districts to better align with the PDP's objective to greater coherence to how the plan is applied across the three districts. Considers the exclusion of Carterton and South Wairarapa Districts from needing to implement the National Policy Statement - Urban Development is poorly reasoned. Considers retaining minimum car parking requirements gives the implicit assumption that driving is and remains the principal transport option in the future, which conflicts with the intent for multi-modal transport choice set out in TR-O1 and TR-P1. Considers parking requirements are arbitrary. | Amend TR-S16 to remove minimum car parking requirements for Carterton and South Wairarapa districts. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P7 | S130.012 | Xavier Warne | Amend | Considers provision should be made for developments that are not expected to contribute towards demand for reticulated infrastructure services, for example through on-site water management. This will support more innovative developments that could support more intensification (and resulting rates revenue) without straining local government infrastructure budgets. | Amend GRZ-P7: Avoid residential development where there is insufficient capacity in existing reticulated infrastructure or where residential development would occur prior to planned reticulated infrastructure installation, unless that residential development is expected to have little to no impact on demand for reticulated infrastructure (eg. through use of on-site services). |
| Planning Maps | Precincts | S130.013 | Xavier Warne | Amend | Considers the Plan needs to recognise and respond to the severity of housing | Amend the planning maps to remove the Low Density Residential Precinct applying to the |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | unaffordability. Considers this review is an opportunity to enable more abundant, diverse and affordable homes for the Wairarapa and reap the benefits this will create for individuals, families, and the wider community. Align with National Policy Statement - Urban Development Policy 5. | area north-west of Masterton town centre and apply the Medium Density Residential Precinct and extent this towards Kuripuni. |
| Planning Maps | Precincts | S130.014 | Xavier Warne | Amend | Considers residential areas around central Carterton with good access to the town centre and train station should have the Medium Density Residential Precinct, and this would better align with NPS-UD Policy 5. | Amend the planning maps to apply the Medium Density Residential Precinct to residential areas around central Carterton |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P5 | S130.015 | Xavier Warne | Oppose | Consequential to reasons and request to move the Low Density Residential Precinct | Delete GRZ-P5. |
| Planning Maps | Precincts | S130.016 | Xavier Warne | Amend | Considers residential areas around central Featherston with good access to the town centre and train station should have the Medium Density Residential Precinct, and this would better align with NPS-UD Policy 5. | Amend the planning maps to apply the Medium Density Residential Precinct to residential areas around central Featherston. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | Introduction | S130.017 | Xavier Warne | Oppose | The density and built form of Greytown and Martinborough are not unique compared to Featherston, Carterton or Masterton, nor are the other general suburban descriptors listed particularly unique to these towns. | Amend GRZ - Introduction: ... Greytown and Martinborough are generally characterised by lower suburban densities with one house per site and suburban-scale built form with houses that are 1- or 2- storeys in height set on generous sized sections. There are high standards of on-site amenity and privacy, and houses are surrounded by areas of private open living space, with some trees and garden/landscaping. However, residential character is expected to change over time to meet changing needs. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-O2 | S130.018 | Xavier Warne | Amend | Considers the first bullet should be amended to reflect that it is not the relationship of open space to the buildings that defines the quality of life in the residential area, but the accessibility of open space more generally. Considers that a section with the home | Amend GRZ-O2: ... 1. a built form comprising a range of residential unit types and sizes, characterised by predominantly 1- to 2-storey buildings and openness around and between buildings and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | clustered towards the front of the section, leaving a larger cohesive green space behind, could arguably offer a higher amenity value than the same-sized home in the middle of the same-sized section, with some low value open space on either side and in front (in setbacks). The fifth bullet is circular and redundant, and as character changes over time in response to changing needs, which is mentioned in the introductory paragraphs, but should be explicit in the objectives. Add concluding statement regarding character changing over time in response to changing needs. | a generous allocation of public and private open space. ... 5. development that is highly compatible with existing special character and amenity values. However, residential character is expected to change over time to meet changing needs. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P2 | S130.020 | Xavier Warne | Support in part | Considers this an opportunity to strengthen the Plan's focus on affordability. | Amend GRZ-P2: Promote variety, innovation, and good design outcomes in residential development to meet a range of residential needs for current and future generations in a way that reflects the General Residential Zone and any applicable precinct (including, but not limited to, a variety of siting, landscaping and trees, housing typologies to support housing affordability , and opportunities to reduce emissions and energy use) through housing and subdivision design as supported by the Residential Design Guide. |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-P4 | S130.021 | Xavier Warne | Amend | Considers the policy should be amended to reflect the fact that it is buildings, not units, that contribute towards the character of the neighbourhood in the ways addressed. Requests clarification on whether the intention is to indicate that multi-unit and retirement villages are only appropriate for larger sites, or that larger-scale developments (on larger sites) should be evaluated for potential character impacts. Considers the policy could also better reflect the potential for public and shared private amenity to meet | Amend GRZ-P4: Provide for activities and structures that support the planned character for the General Residential Zone, which provides for: 1. intensity of residential and infill development that is predominantly single detached or semi-detached residential buildings units on single sites with suburban lot sizes generous open space provision , and providing for high quality and spacious on-site and |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | people's needs and achieve a desired character/lifestyle. | neighbourhood amenity; 2. building height, bulk, and form that achieves the planned built character of predominantly 1- to 2-storey residential units buildings within a generally spacious setting; ... 6. larger multi-unit residential development and retirement villages on larger sites where it is demonstrated that they achieve the planned character for the zone |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R4 | S130.022 | Xavier Warne | Oppose | Considers allocation of open space on a per-unit basis is already provided for by GRZ-S6. It is not clear what this rule is controlling. If it is kept, the rule should have smaller site areas and use the clearer wording from the Medium Density Residential Precinct for all three (no more than one residential unit per xm2 of net site area). | Delete GRZ-R4 or amend the rule as it relates to the General Residential Zone to have smaller site areas and use the clearer wording (i.e. "no more than one residential unit per Xm2 of net site area"). |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R8 | S130.023 | Xavier Warne | Amend | Requests removal of barriers to people setting up home businesses that have no clear impact on the street character. Considers that if the activity is achieving the other matters outlined in a., then compliance with b. and c. shouldn't be a problem. | Amend GRZ-R8(1) to delete permitted activity standards (b) and (c). |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-R10 | S130.024 | Xavier Warne | Amend | Considers that if the minor residential unit is achieving the standards listed in a., then compliance with the additional requirements are irrelevant. Minor residential units are an opportunity to support housing affordability. | Amend GRZ-R10(1) to delete permitted activity standards (b) and (c). |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-S3 | S130.025 | Xavier Warne | Amend | Considers the front setback should be reduced to no greater than that required of side setbacks and side setbacks should be consistent at 1.5m. Considers that allowing buildings closer to the street more adequately supports the Plan's objective to support passive surveillance of the street and more pedestrian-oriented sense of enclosure to the | Amend GRZ-S3: ... 1. Buildings or structures must not be located within 3m 1.5m of the front boundary of a site... |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | street. Considers the risk of overbearing buildings and sunlight impacts is already adequately accounted for by building height and recession plane rules. | |
| GRZ - General Residential Zone | GRZ-O4 | S130.026 | Xavier Warne | Oppose | Consequential to reasoning and request to delete the Low Density Residential Precinct. | Delete GRZ-O4 as it relates to the Low Density Residential Precinct. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S215.001 | Z Energy Limited | Support | The submission supports the definition of noise sensitive activities. | Retain noise sensitive activities as notified. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S215.002 | Z Energy Limited | Support in part | The submission seeks to exclude aboveground tanks at service station or truck stops. The submission suggests an alternative to this definition change which would amend standards TCZ-S6 and GIZ-S6 to exclude these. | Amend outdoor storage definition as follows: Means the use of land for the purpose of storing vehicles, equipment, machinery, natural and processed products, and wastes, on a permanent or semi-permanent basis and outside a fully enclosed building.; excludes aboveground tanks at service stations and truck stops. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S215.003 | Z Energy Limited | Not Stated | The submission states the importance of defining reverse sensitivity for clarity and interpreting rules. | Insert new definition for reverse sensitivity as follows: Means the potential for the operation of an existing lawfully established activity to be compromised, constrained, or curtailed by the more recent establishment or alteration of another activity which may be sensitive to the actual, potential or perceived adverse environmental effects generated by the existing activity. |
| Interpretation | Definitions | S215.004 | Z Energy Limited | Support | The submission supports the definition for sensitive activities. | Retain definition for sensitive activities as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Planning Maps | Zones | S215.005 | Z Energy Limited | Support | The submission states that the TCZ and active street frontage are appropriate for this site (78 Chapel St Masterton). | Retain Town Centre Zoning for Z Masterton service station. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-O4 | S215.006 | Z Energy Limited | Support | The submission support the objectives of the TCZ with the exception of O4 which the submission suggests should only relate to new activities in this zone. | Amend TCZ-O4: The amenity values of any adjacent Residential or Open Space and Recreation Zone are protected from the adverse effects of new activities within the Town Centre Zone. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-P1 | S215.007 | Z Energy Limited | Support in part | Policy TCZ-P1 is supported in principle and its identification of use and development that are compatible with the zone. However, Z Energy considers that the existing environment and the operational and functional requirements of activities should be recognised when the effects of buildings on the streetscape are assessed under this policy. Operational and functional requirements are recognised under matter of discretion (4) of Rule TCZ-S7 (New buildings or additions or alterations to a building on an active street frontage). | Amend TCZ-P1: ... b. the design and scale of any buildings enhances the streetscape, while recognising the existing environment and the operational and functional requirements of activities; ... |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-P2 | S215.008 | Z Energy Limited | Support in part | Agrees with the general intent of the policy in relation to new activities but considers the use of "avoid" will significantly impact the continued operation, maintenance and upgrade of existing activities, including the Masterton Z service station. Considers some drive-through activities appropriate such as service stations that provide essential services and products to businesses and communities that operate and/or live within town centres, and support the function of town centres and the development of well-functioning urban environments | Amend TCZ-P2: Avoid new activities that are incompatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the Town Centre Zone. ... d. Some drive-through activities on active street frontages and historic heritage precincts within the Town Centre Zone. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-P3 | S215.009 | Z Energy Limited | Support | Supported as it seeks to provide for residential activities where they meet the clauses of this policy and, in particular, | Retain TCZ-P3 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | minimise reverse sensitivity effects on commercial activities (clause (d)). | |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-P5 | S215.010 | Z Energy Limited | Support in part | Considers that it is important to recognise the existing environment and the operational and functional requirements of activities. | Amend as TCZ-P5: New development in the Town Centre Zone complements the amenity of adjacent areas, particularly Residential and Open Space Zones, while recognising the existing environment and the operational and functional requirements of activities. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-P7 | S215.011 | Z Energy Limited | Support in part | Considers it important to recognise the existing environment and operational and functional requirements of activities | Amend TCZ-P7: ...b. Recognise the operational and functional requirements of activities and that these requirements may necessitate alternative design responses. c. Provide for large-scale vehicle-oriented activities... |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-R15 | S215.012 | Z Energy Limited | Support in part | The submission states the rule should apply to new drive-through activities. | Amend TCZ-R15 New Drive Through Activities Where: a. The new activity is not located inside a heritage precinct or on an active street frontage... |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-S6 | S215.013 | Z Energy Limited | Support in part | The submission states an alternative to this change is to exclude aboveground tanks at service stations and truck stops from the outdoor storage definition. | Amend TCZ-S6 to add an exemption: Except TCZ-S6(1) does not apply to aboveground tanks at service stations |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Planning Maps | Zones | S215.014 | Z Energy Limited | Support | The submission supports the GIZ zone for Caltex Masterton located at 7 Buchanan Place Masterton. | Retain the General Industrial Zoning for Caltex Masterton. |
| Planning Maps | Zones | S215.015 | Z Energy Limited | Support | The submission supports the GIZ zoning for Z Masterton Truck stop located at 11 Norfolk Road Casterton. | Retain the General Industrial Zoning for Z Masterton Truck Stop. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-O3 | S215.016 | Z Energy Limited | Support | While service stations and truck stops are not industrial activities, Z Energy considers that they support the role and function of industrial activities in the zone | Retain GIZ-O3 as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-P2 | S215.017 | Z Energy Limited | Support | The submission supports GIZ-P2. | Retain GIZ-P2 as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | New provision request | S215.018 | Z Energy Limited | Support | Considers new and existing service stations, and additions and alterations should be a permitted activity in the General Industrial Zone. While they are not industrial activities, considers they are appropriate to and support the role and function of industrial activities in the zone. Notes service stations are not specifically provided for in the zone and would fall under the ambit of "drive through activities" which is not considered comparable. The proposed rule aligns with | Insert a new rule as follows: GIZ-RXX Service station 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with: i. GIZ-S6. 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with GIZ-RXX(1)(a). Matters of discretion: 1. The matters of discretion for any infringed standard(s). 2. The operational need and functional need of the activity. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-S6 | S215.019 | Z Energy Limited | Support in part | Seeks that storage of aboveground fuel tanks and truck stops not be subject to this standard. | Amend GIZ-S6 to add an exemption: Except GIZ-S6(1) does not apply to aboveground tanks at truck stops |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-O1 | S215.020 | Z Energy Limited | Support | Objective TCZ-O1 is supported and the purpose it establishes for the zone and town centres across the districts. | Retain TCZ-O1 as notified. |

| Plan Section | Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-O2 | S215.021 | Z Energy Limited | Support | Objective TCZ-O2 is supported and the planned character and amenity values it seeks for the zone. | Retain TCZ-O2 as notified. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-O3 | S215.022 | Z Energy Limited | Support | Objective TCZ-O3 is supported and that it seeks town centres are accessible and safe environments for people. | Retain TCZ-O3 as notified. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-O5 | S215.023 | Z Energy Limited | Support | Objective TCZ-O5 is supported and that it seeks town centres to be the districts' principal retail and servicing areas with associated activities of varying type and scale. | Retain TCZ-O5 as notified. |
| TCZ - Town Centre Zone | TCZ-O7 | S215.024 | Z Energy Limited | Support | Objective TCZ-O7 is supported in principle; Z Energy has other submission points related to active street frontages and the control of use and development in these areas | Retain TCZ-O7 as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-O4 | S215.025 | Z Energy Limited | Support | Considers that service stations and truck stops are an appropriate commercial activity in the zone and will not compromise the viability and vibrancy of the Commercial and Mixed Use Zones | Retain GIZ-O4 as notified. |
| GIZ - General Industrial Zone | GIZ-P3 | S215.026 | Z Energy Limited | Support | Considers that service stations and truck stops are an appropriate commercial activity in the zone that supports the role and function of industrial activities in the zone and will not compromise the viability and vibrancy of the Commercial and Mixed Use Zones. | Retain GIZ-P3 as notified. |

| | |
|---|---|
| To: | Joint Committee for the Wairarapa Combined District Plan |
| From: | Nick Eagle, Acting Planning Manager, South Wairarapa District Council Solitaire Robertson, Manager, Planning and Regulatory, Carterton District Council Christine Chong, Planning Manager, Masterton District Council |
| Endorsed by: | Russell O’Leary, Group Manager Planning and Environment, South Wairarapa District Council Geoff Hamilton, Chief Executive, Carterton District Council Karen Yates, General Manager – Strategy and Development, Masterton District Council |
| Date: | 6 March 2024 |
| Subject: | Appointment of Deputy Chairperson for Joint Committee for the Wairarapa Combined District Plan |
| DECISION | |
| Recommendation: | |
| That the Joint Committee: | |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Receives the information. 2) Resolves that <either System A or System B> of the procedures as set out in Clause 25 Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002 be adopted for the election of the Deputy Chair of the Joint Committee for the Wairarapa Combined District Plan. 3) Appoints <insert name of Committee member> as the Deputy Chair of the Joint Committee for the Wairarapa Combined District Plan. | |

Purpose

This report provides the opportunity for the Joint Committee to appoint a Deputy Chairperson to act as another Chairperson for the hearings, as well as to act for the Chairperson if he is unable to perform his duties.

Context

The statutory process for preparing a District Plan is set out in Schedule 1 of the RMA.

The Councils have delegated to the Wairarapa Combined District Plan Joint Committee all functions, powers, and duties under Schedule 1 of the RMA. The Terms of Reference for the Joint Committee states the responsibilities of the Joint Committee include (emphasis added with underline):

The Committee will act as the governance advisory through the review period of the District Plan project and in preparing a new plan and act as the hearings panel for the submissions to the formal notification process.

Legal Requirements

The Terms of Reference for the Wairarapa Combined District Plan Joint Committee provide for the Joint Committee to appoint one of its members as the Deputy Chairperson.

The Deputy Chairperson can act as the chair for upcoming hearings if the chairperson vacates the chair or can be called on to fulfil the duties of the Chairperson if he is unable to perform his duties.

All Committee members are eligible to be nominated for the Deputy Chairperson role.

There are no requirements for a formal nomination. The Chairperson will call for nominations at the next Joint Committee meeting.

Where there are multiple nominations, an election will be required under clause 25, Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA). For this election, the Committee must resolve to use one of the two systems of voting under the LGA, being System A and System B.

'System A' is set out in clause 25(3) of Schedule 7 of the LGA. The LGA stipulates that 'System A' requires that a person is elected or appointed if he or she receives the votes of a majority of the members of the committee present and voting; and has the following characteristics:

- (i) there is a first round of voting for all candidates; and
- (ii) if no candidate is successful in that round there is a second round of voting from which the candidate with the fewest votes in the first round is excluded; and
- (iii) if no candidate is successful in the second round there is a third, and if necessary subsequent, round of voting from which, each time, the candidate with the fewest votes in the previous round is excluded; and
- (iv) in any round of voting, if 2 or more candidates tie for the lowest number of votes, the person excluded from the next round is resolved by lot.

'System B' is set out in clause 25(4) of Schedule 7 of the LGA. The LGA stipulates that 'System B' requires that a person is elected or appointed if he or she receives more votes than any other candidate, and has the following characteristics:

- (i) There is only one round of voting; and
- (ii) If two or more candidates tie for the most votes, the tie is resolved by lot.

The advantage of choosing System A over System B is if there were more than two nominations for the Deputy Chair position, a person elected under System B could be elected without the support of the majority of the Committee.

The term of the Deputy Chairperson of the Joint Committee is the duration of the triennium. However, a member may terminate (or have terminated) their office by:

- Resigning as Deputy Chairperson.
- A majority decision of the Joint Committee.

- A resolution of the Joint Committee.
- Being no longer eligible to hold office.

Analysis and Advice

With the anticipated number and length of hearings, the Joint Committee needs to decide whether all or only some Joint Committee members will sit on all or only some of the hearings. Based on other Proposed District Plan hearings, all Hearing Panel/Committee members are anticipated to sit on the first hearing relating to strategic direction. In addition, all Committee members are anticipated to sit on other specific hearings for significant topics – for example, all Committee members may hear the submissions on rural subdivision.

For most hearings, a sub-group of Committee members is anticipated to sit on each hearing. The Joint Committee Terms of Reference states the quorum is five members and must include at least one member of each territorial authority. In addition to at least one member of each territorial authority on each hearing, it is also suggested that an iwi representative sits on each hearing. Therefore, the composition of the hearing panel for each hearing would be:

- a) Chair or Deputy Chair
- b) One iwi representative
- c) One member from each territorial authority.

It is suggested that a Deputy Chairperson is appointed by the Joint Committee to provide an alternative to the Chairperson. The Deputy Chairperson role would provide the opportunity to gain experience in chairing hearings when providing backup in the event that the Chair needed to vacate the chair or became unavailable due to unforeseen circumstances.

Recommendation

For the above reasons, it is recommended that a deputy chairperson be appointed by the Joint Committee.

Summary of Considerations

Strategic, Policy and Legislative Implications

The Joint Committee has delegated authority to appoint the Deputy Chair under the Terms of Reference of the Joint Committee.

Significance, Engagement and Consultation

The decisions or matters of this report are not considered significant in accordance with each Councils Significance and Engagement Policy.

Communications/Engagement

The appointment of the Deputy Chair will be communicated via the Minutes to be issued for the hearing process for the Proposed District Plan.

Financial Considerations

Remuneration is already included as part of the delegated authority to the Joint Committee by each Council and part of the Long-Term Plan process.

Implications for Māori

There are no implications for Māori considerations associated with this decision.

Environmental/Climate Change Impact and Considerations

There are no environmental or climate change impact considerations associated with this decision.

Next Steps

The Joint Committee to consider whether it wishes to appoint a Deputy Chair.